TRANS LATION
IN CULTURE

**EDITED BY
AGNIESZKA ADAMOWICZ-POŚPIECH, MARTA MAMET-MICHALKIEWICZ**

Copy editing
Gabriela Marszołek

Cover design
Piotr Kossakowski

Proofreading
Joanna Zwierzyńska

Text make-up
Paulina Dubiel

Typesetting
Bogusław Chruściński

Kinga Lis*

JOHN PAUL II CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN

Why Differ? – Divergent Lexical Choices in Two Middle English Prose Psalter Translations and Their *raison d'être*

ABSTRACT: The objective of the paper is to establish the motivation behind the lexical divergences between otherwise surprisingly uniform late-fourteenth-century Middle English Wycliffite Psalters and observe how it affects the etymological make-up of the texts. For this purpose the paper analyses the nominal layer of the first fifty Psalms and tries to assign each case of divergence between the texts to one of four groups of probable causes, both intra- and extratextual, prompting the variation, while juxtaposing these nominal lexical items with the corresponding data from two earlier 14th-century Psalters – Richard Rolle's rendition and the *Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter*.

KEYWORDS: etymology, lexical divergences, nouns, Psalter, Wycliffite Bible

Introduction

The objective of the paper is to try to establish the motivation behind the lexical divergences between otherwise surprisingly uniform late-fourteenth-century Middle English Psalter renditions from Latin and to examine how it affects the etymological make-up of the texts as far as nouns are concerned.

The texts under analysis are the first fifty Psalms of the Early and the Late Wycliffite Psalters (henceforth EV and LV respectively),[1] as presented

---

1   The two Psalters are parts of the Early and the Late Wycliffite Bibles produced in England in the late 14th century. EV is usually described as extremely literal and charged with introducing numerous Latinisms into the English language (Delisle and Woodsworth 1995, 32), which, however, does not seem to be the case (Lis 2014a). LV was the preferred rendition and enjoyed greater popularity despite being illicit (Wilkins 1737, 317). Therefore,

in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013), which, what is important for the purposes of this paper, are frequently considered a text and its revision rather than two independent translations (e.g., Hargreaves 1969). This might be unanticipated for someone acquainted with the *General Prologue* to LV, whose author, expounding upon the process and principles of the translation, gives the impression that the whole rendition was made from scratch (Forshall and Madden 1850, 57). The paper offers (only) a glimpse into the matter from the lexical point of view. It allows one to appreciate the divergences between the texts, while undertaking to indicate, frequently only tentatively, the possible reasons for the variation. The divergences, however, as shall become apparent, are not numerous.

The expected sources of variation can be divided into four major categories:

I.   Translators' consistency, that is, employing the same lexical item to render also other occurrences of the Latin noun in question where the other text uses different word(s).

II. Influence of the Latin source text, that is, translators of one version opt for the lexical item whose morpho-phonological form is akin to that of the Latin word – the Middle English (ME) item is a borrowing (a loanword, a loan-blend or a loan translation) of Romance origin or it is a cognate of the Latin noun.

III. Changes in the ME lexicon, that is, some changes took place in the lexicon in the time separating the translations (ca. 20 years), which offered LV's translator(s) more choice as regards noun selection: new words were borrowed, others acquired new meanings or ditched some of the already existing ones, new words were created via morphological processes.

IV. Other – the most varied group comprising all the items whose selection cannot be accounted for by I–III, that is, the lexical items gathered under IV could have been chosen since they felt to be 'a most natural choice' for the translators in a given context or for a variety of other reasons, including for instance the influence of the Psalter commentaries with which the translators could have been acquainted.

---

it should in principle be quite distinct from EV in both respects mentioned above. Yet, even though the comparison of the two texts is always in favour of LV, opinions concerning the degree of 'the success of revision of EV' vary (Charzyńska-Wójcik 2013, 88).

Undeniably, clear-cut division of the data into such groups is unattainable as the categories are not mutually exclusive and due to the fact that each Psalter can employ a different item for a different reason or for what seems to be from the modern reader's perspective no apparent reason at all. Therefore, the data are presented in the sections established on the basis of the etymological oppositions, native vs. native,[2] native vs. foreign,[3] and foreign vs. foreign, and percentage figures concerning translators' incentive for selecting given lexical items are provided for each of the item groupings enumerated above in I–IV.

For the same reasons, the analysis of the motivation behind translators' nominal choices is made separately for each Psalter, but the data are always given in relation to the other text.

Additionally, the data from EV and LV are juxtaposed with the relevant data from two other ME Psalter renditions (compiled approximately half a century earlier) to establish whether the lexical choices in EV and LV are exceptional in relation to what other translators opt for in the same contexts. The two texts were Richard Rolle's Psalter (henceforth RR) and the *Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter* (GP),[4] both as presented in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013).

The structure of the paper is the following. Section 2 outlines the contemporary conceptions of Scriptures translation against the linguistic and cultural backdrop of medieval England as these cannot be overlooked in an investigation of the type proposed here. The methodological issues pertaining to the research are expounded upon in Section 3, which is followed by the section introducing the data and commenting on the intertextual

---

2   On the basis of the assumption that the early loans (which functioned in the English lexicon already in the Old English (OE) period alongside the truly native items and underwent the same morpho-phonological processes) may indeed be treated as native in the language, I regard as native also nouns with mixed Romance-OE and Old Norse (ON)-OE etymologies.

3   'Foreign' items are differentiated into those of Romance and ON origins. Romance nouns are not further divided into groups of items of French, Latin or mixed Latin and French provenance due to a number of reasons, both linguistic and lexicographical, which are discussed in detail in Lis (2014a).

4   Four manuscripts of the Psalter have been discovered so far but only two of them, that is, the British Library Additional Manuscript 17376 (the London manuscript) and the Trinity College Dublin Manuscript 69 (the Dublin manuscript), were used in this study.

divergences in relation to the possible sources of variation (I–IV) and the etymological make-up of the texts. Section 5 aims at formulating some conclusions that can be drawn from the lexical divergences between EV and LV and endeavours to answer the question concerning their *raison d'être*.

Approach to Translation at the Cultural and Linguistic Background

The statements squarely critical of the 'quality' of the translations analysed here[5] usually do not take into consideration the cultural and linguistic circumstances which shaped the texts, nor do they acknowledge in any way the differences in the purpose of and attitude towards the translation.

One of the pivotal features of the medieval Christian world was an extremely cautious attitude to any attempts at rendering the Scriptures into vernacular. The efforts to translate them seemed to contemporaries to renounce the common conviction that solely Latin is an adequate means of transmitting the Bible and "the principle that every word of the text was sacred: even the order of the words […] must be preserved in translation" (Hargreaves 1965, 123). To endeavour to render the Scriptures into English "would seem, could end only in a complete enfeeblement of meaning and a general abasement of values" (Shepherd 1969, 366).

Thus, when this traditional approach to the Bible was confronted with the need to enable people with no knowledge of Latin to understand the Scriptures, the dilemma could only be resolved by means of a faithful, that is, literal translation. Even those among the renditions that aimed, as LV did, at sense-for-sense correspondences could not violate this principle to an extent that would satisfy the standards of a modern translation of this type.

What also needs to be taken into account is the linguistic background. The three languages in use in England at the time, (Middle) English, (Anglo-)French, and (Anglo-)Latin, were intermingled, especially in terms of vocabulary, to an extent which frequently thwarts any attempt at differentiating between them (Rothwell 2000). Thus, since Romance lexical items were readily admitted into English, there was no necessity for the translators

---

5   For references, cf. Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013, 84–90) and Lis (2014b).

to look far for an equivalent term in the recipient language. The difference between words of native and Romance origin lay in the perceived social prestige of the languages, with French and Latin having been the written media for approximately the three centuries preceding the emergence of EV and LV and English only just beginning to regain its stand as one (Kibbee 1991). Thus, one may suspect that, due to the exceptional status of the Bible, quite a high proportion of Romance-derived items might be employed in the translation so as to render its contents in what would seem to be a more dignified manner. Yet, due to the fact that the three languages were at the time so closely interwoven and having no access to the translator's mind it is well-nigh impossible to provide evidence for this type of motivation behind a particular lexical choice despite the fact that one may suspect this to be *a* factor in many instances.

Methodology

As stated in the introduction, the study focuses on the nominal layer of the first fifty Psalms of the two Wycliffite Psalters, both translations from the Latin Vulgate. Therefore, it was necessary to use the Latin text as the starting point since only such an approach allows one to compare parallel lexical items in both texts while excluding all nouns from either of the English Psalters that are not warranted by the Latin source text and stem from the procedures necessitated by the process of translation. The Latin Psalter used for this purpose was the *Gallicanum*, or rather *four* Gallican Psalters,[6] as edited in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013), despite the fact that these are not the original Latin texts on which the renditions are based as it is impossible to establish these source texts (Charzyńska-Wójcik 45–46).

At the outset of the study all the nouns[7] were extracted from the Latin text, annotated with Psalm and verse numbers and sorted alpha-

---

6   Cf. Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013) for details.

7   For the purposes of the research a 'noun' is an item labelled as such in the relevant dictionaries used in the study: for Latin it is *WORDS Latin-to-English & English-to-Latin Dictionary* by William Whitaker, whereas for the data from English these are the *Middle English Dictionary* and the *Oxford English Dictionary*. All proper nouns, however, are excluded from the study.

betically, which allowed for the multiple instances of the same lexical item to be grouped under one headword understood as the citation form as presented in Whitaker's dictionary. In total 2,865 occurrences of Latin nouns constituted the core of the database, which was then supplied with the corresponding lexical items from EV and LV. The Middle English headwords used in the research are those provided by the *Middle English Dictionary* (henceforth MED). The etymological information and the dates of first attestations of individual nouns in the relevant meanings in written records were then added as provided by the MED and the *Oxford English Dictionary* (hereafter OED). When the database was complete, all the Latin nouns whose corresponding ME lexical items were not nouns according to the information provided in the relevant dictionaries as well as those which had been translated by means of more than one lexical item into English were excluded. All these procedures resulted in reducing the number of nouns to 2,566. The data obtained in this manner were then analysed from the perspective of the concordance between EV and LV and all the divergent cases were extracted from the database and supplemented with the relevant information from the remaining two Psalters, that is, RR and the two manuscripts of GP. As mentioned in the introduction, the data thus assembled were divided into three groups based upon the etymological oppositions, that is, native vs. native, native vs. foreign, and foreign vs. foreign items, scrutinised from the angle of the motivation lying behind the different lexical choices of the translators of EV and LV and classified into categories I–IV. The findings obtained in the course of this analysis are presented in the following section.

The Analysis of the Data

General information

What transpired in the course of the research was that the two Psalters resemble each other unquestionably too far in respect of nominal lexical choices to be considered completely independent translations. Out of the total number of the nouns which were analysed in the study, that is, 2,566 items in each of the Psalters, only 258 diverge between the texts, which translates into 10% of the data, the remaining 90% being identical for EV and LV.

Native vs. native items

The most numerous group of nouns divergent between EV and LV is the one exhibiting native vs. native item oppositions, which is not surprising in the light of the fact that the majority of nouns in both Psalters are of OE provenance (Lis 2014b). In total, there are 124 such pairs in the first fifty Psalms, constituting 48% of the divergent items.

Table 1 below presents the percentage participation in these nouns of items belonging to categories I–IV listed in the Introduction and based on the motivation guiding translators' choice, that is, I – translators' consistency, II – influence of the Latin source text, III – changes in the ME lexicon, and IV – other reasons.

Undoubtedly, such a classification is extremely oversimplified, tentative and to a considerable extent subjective since there is no certainty as to the translators' actual guiding principle, if any. There are numerous unknowns looming at every step, such as the following. It is impossible to determine whether a particular decision regarding nominal choices was motivated by a change in the lexicon, which seems to be the case in some instances in the light of the data provided in the MED and the OED, or whether it was rather what felt to be 'a most natural choice.' Similarly, there is no certitude as to whether the presence of certain nouns in the source text evoked the response in the shape of employing particular items that are formally similar to them, whether the choice simply hinged on the closest semantic equivalence or whether both factors were involved. For these reasons mixed categories were also established, allowing, however, for only two combinations: I&II and I&III, since not a single word has been classified as belonging to both II&III. Combinations with items for which one of the reasons listed under I–III would need to be compounded with IV are assigned only to the relevant one of the categories I–III. Such a decision was taken, despite the lack of indisputable evidence, since certain measure of simplification was called for in order to offer some tentative answers.

Additionally, the table provides the data pertaining to the use, or lack thereof, of the lexical items employed in either EV or LV in the other two Psalters mentioned in the introduction: RR and two manuscripts of GP, London and Dublin, referred to as GP L and GP D respectively. For this

purpose, the second column lists the types of categories established for such a juxtaposition, enabling one to gather the following information:

I. The number of items which appear also in the parallel verses in:

    1. all the remaining Psalters,

    2. RR and GP L,

    3. RR and GP D,

    4. GP L and D,

    5. RR only,

    6. GP L only,

    7. GP D only.

II. The sum of all the items which agree between either EV or LV and:

    8. RR, that is, the sum of the items listed in (1), (2), (3) and (5),

    9. GP L, that is, the sum of the items listed in (1), (2), (4) and (6),

    10. GP D, that is, the sum of the items listed in (1), (3), (4) and (7).

Row (11) sums the items shared by EV or LV with any of the remaining Psalters, (12) provides the number of items which appear uniquely in either EV or LV, whereas (13) adds up the two figures providing the total number of nouns analysed in a given column.

As regards the division into categories based upon the supposed principles guiding translators' lexical selection, it can be inferred that in the majority of the analysed cases it was translators' consistency (I), that is, the fact that the translator employed the word in other contexts to translate the same Latin lemma, that motivated its use in a given instance (60% in EV and 46% in LV).

The second most numerous category is IV, which means that in 38% of cases for EV and 33% in LV one cannot pinpoint the factor which led the translators to employ a particular noun. Probably, in the majority of these instances it was 'a most natural choice' for them. Nothing, however, can be said for certain with respect to their motivation.

It might seem surprising to find any nouns classified as belonging to category II or mixed I&II among the nouns of the native vs. native type, while I have noted three such occurrences for EV and four for LV. Such a classification is motivated by three disparate factors, depending on particular instances. For *lāk(e* (LV), *mǒunt* (2 EV) and *seint(e* (LV), that is, four occurrences in sum, the explanation is that these are nouns with mixed OE-Romance etymology which are treated as nouns of native origin

TABLE 1. Nouns of the native vs. native type

N°	Category		I		II		III		IV		I&II		I&III		SUM EV	SUM LV
	Other texts		EV	LV	EV	LV	EV	LV	EV	LV	EV	LV	EV	LV		
1.	RR +	GP L&D	6	5					11	3					17 14%	8 6%
2.		GP L	1												1 1%	
3.		GP D	1												1 1%	
4.	GP L&D		1	27	1				3	1					5 4%	28 23%
5.	RR		40	2					7	8		1		14	47 38%	25 20%
6.	GP L			2						2						4 3%
7.	GP D		7	8					3						10 8%	8 6%
8.	all	RR	48	7					18	11		1		14	66	33
9.		GP L	8	34	1				14	6					23	40
10.		GP D	15	40	1				17	4					33	44
11.	all		56	44	1				24	14		1		14	81 65%	73 59%
12.	unique		18	13	2	3		8	23	27					43 35%	51 41%
13.	SUM		74 60%	57 46%	3 2%	3 2%		8 6%	47 38%	41 33%		1 1%		14 11%	124	124

(cf. introduction) but exhibit inevitable resemblance to Romance nouns from which they were originally derived and thus their use seems to have been motivated by the presence of these Latin nouns. *Unwēlsumnesse* (EV) 'misfortune, unhappiness,' on the other hand, despite being formally a native noun, is classified as a loan translation of *infelicitas, infelicitatis* 'misfortune,' with **wēlsumnesse* not being attested at all and the only quotation provided by the MED for *unwēlsumnesse* being the exact same

verse from EV which is under analysis here, i.e. verse 13.3 in EV. The presence of the last of the nouns assigned to category II, *lōrd* (2 LV), must also stem from the influence of the source text, which differed at this point from the one serving as the basis for EV as it employs there the noun *God* indiscriminately. Additionally, for one of these occurrences the Latin Gallican Psalters collated in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013) exhibit discord, with only one of them reading *Deus*, *Dei* in verse13.9 and the others opting for *dominus*, *domini*. This suggests that the source text which served as the Latin basis for the translators of LV differed from the Latin text edited in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013) in this respect also in the other instance where *lōrd* appears and allows one to classify the use of *lōrd*, causing divergence between EV and LV in these verses, as determined by the reading of this original.

What is evident from the data presented above with respect to the Psalters juxtaposed with EV and LV is that in the majority of the divergent cases of native vs. native type both EV and LV employ nouns which have already been used in these very contexts by either RR or GP. EV agrees in over 50% of instances with RR, whereas LV happens to concur slightly more frequently with GP (either of its manuscripts) than it does with RR. The concordance between EV and/or LV and RR may not be coincidental since the Lollards were not only well acquainted with Rolle's rendition but they also adjusted it to comply with their views by supplementing Rolle's commentary with their own additions to such an extent that "the differences are so great that it would be more fitting to speak of two independent works, the first comprising the original work of the Hermit, the second being an independent Lollard commentary" (Paues 1902, xxxiv). The concordance between LV and GP, on the other hand, although also substantial cannot be attributed to translators' acquaintance with this rendition due to the lack of relevant evidence and as such might represent coincidence.

It can also be inferred from the data provided thus far that LV seems to be the more innovative of the two texts since 41% of the native vs. native type of nouns are employed in given contexts uniquely in this Psalter. This is accounted for by the fact that 17% of these items belong either to category III or are of the mixed I&III type, which assumes their being either fresh borrowings or new words created by means of word-formation or simply

supplemented with meanings thus far unknown, at least in accordance with the information gathered by the OED and the MED.[8]

Native vs. foreign items

The second group of nouns with respect to etymological oppositions represented by the words analysed in this paper is native vs. foreign type, where foreign encompasses both ON and Romance etymology. However, not a single noun of ON provenance is to be found among nouns analysed in this section. The group is less numerous by roughly one fourth than the class of native vs. native nouns, that is, it counts 91 items and constitutes 35% of the nouns scrutinised in this paper. The numerical and percentage data concerning them are provided in Table 2. The table differs from Table 1 in that it gives in parentheses the number of items of Romance origin.

The data presented above seem to be more evenly distributed between different categories than those in Section Native vs. native items with the most numerous one for EV being category I and for LV – IV. It might appear, on the face of it, that LV employs far fewer nouns whose presence in the translation would be motivated by the source text (II) or such whose appearance would be dictated by the translators' consistency in word choice (I). Yet, this is not the case since attestations of as many as 17 nouns may well have been motivated by both these factors combined, which is why they are assigned to the mixed I&II category. It might be of interest to note also that EV seems to employ more nouns with Romance etymology: 50 as opposed to 41 used in LV.

---

8   There are two nouns in LV, *middes* (5 occurrences) and *strōnd(e*, which are postdated by the MED (to 1400 and 1395 respectively) since they both appear in the parallel verses already in RR, which complies with the earlier datings provided by the OED. Thus, they have not been assigned to category III.

Two other items, *ram* and *dogge*, on the other hand, although provided with first quotes dating them to 1200 and 1300 respectively, have been classified as belonging to category III. The motivation behind such a decision is that they have their second citations dated to 1390s, which contravenes MED's policy of supplying quotes at roughly 25-year intervals (Adams 2009, 341) and, compounded with the information from the OED, seems to indicate that the words in question were relatively unknown, despite their first recorded usages antedating EV.

TABLE 2. Nouns of the native vs. foreign type

N°	Category	I EV	I LV	II EV	II LV	III EV	III LV	IV EV	IV LV	I&II EV	I&II LV	SUM EV	SUM LV
1.	RR + GP L&D	3	1	1 (1)	1 (1)		1 (1)	8 (1)	5 (2)		9 (9)	12 (2) 13%	17 (13) 19%
2.	RR + GP L			2 (1)	1 (1)				4 (2)		1 (1)	2 (1) 2%	6 (4) 7%
3.	RR + GP D	4 (4)						2 (1)	1			6 (5) 7%	1 1%
4.	GP L&D	6 (5)	4	2 (2)				5 (5)	3 (3)		2 (2)	13 (12) 14%	9 (5) 10%
5.	RR	7 (1)	10	2 (2)				3	7	2 (2)	1 (1)	14 (5) 15%	18 (1) 20%
6.	GP L			1 (1)					1		1 (1)	1 (1) 1%	2 (1) 2%
7.	GP D	2 (1)						2	3 (1)		1 (1)	4 (1) 4%	4 (2) 4%
8.	all RR	14 (5)	11	5 (5)	2 (2)		1 (1)	13 (2)	17 (4)	2 (2)	11 (11)	34 (14)	42 (18)
9.	all GP L	9 (5)	5	6 (6)	2 (2)		1 (1)	13 (6)	13 (7)		13 (13)	28 (17)	34 (23)
10.	all GP D	15 (10)	5	3 (3)	1 (1)		1 (1)	17 (7)	12 (6)		12 (12)	35 (20)	31 (20)
11.	all	22 (11)	15	8 (8)	2 (2)		1 (1)	20 (7)	24 (8)	2 (2)	15 (15)	52 (28) 57%	57 (26) 63%
12.	unique	13 (1)	9	16 (16)	2 (2)			10 (5)	21 (11)		2 (2)	39 (22) 43%	34 (15) 37%
13.	SUM	35 (12) 38%	24 26%	24 (24) 26%	4 (4) 4%		1 (1) 1%	30 (12) 33%	45 (19) 49%	2 (2) 2%	17 (17) 19%	91 (50)	91 (41)

As regards the other dimension of the study, that is, the correspondences between lexical choices in EV/LV and RR and GP, the situation is reversed with respect to the nouns analysed in the previous section, with EV turning to nouns not attested in other Psalters in their respective verses more frequently (43%) than LV (37%).

At least one of the words analysed in this section deserves special attention. These are two occurrences of *unpitŏusnesse* 'wickedness, impiety; […] an act of wickedness, a transgression' as a translation of *impietas*, *impietatis* 'failure in duty or respect,' which I ascribe to the influence of the source text. The decision was motivated by the fact that the rendition appears to be a translator-specific loan-blend which underwent further word-formation processes, whose form, however, still clearly points to the Latin lexeme in question. This seems to be corroborated by the fact that five out of seven quotations provided for it in the MED are taken from the Wycliffite Bible, being the earliest attestations of the word. The MED lists also the following synonymous nouns whose first (and in the case of the first of them only) attestations also originated in the Wycliffite Bible: *unpitŏustē* and *unpitē*.

Foreign vs. foreign items

The final category of the nouns divergent between EV and LV encompasses these items for which each Psalter employs a different noun of non-native provenance to render the same Latin item. This is by far the least numerous group consisting of 43 pairs of nouns and constituting only 17% of all the analysed items.

Table 3 provides all the relevant data. The figures presented below refer to nouns of Romance origin unless stated otherwise.

In the case of the items of this type, it is LV that incorporates a greater number of nouns whose presence in particular verses is unique with respect to the remaining fourteenth-century English Psalter translations. Such nouns constitute 51% of the items analysed in this section, whereas the relevant figure for EV equals 44%. In the majority of cases where LV happens to correspond in its lexical choices with one of the other Psalters, it is predominantly GP D that it agrees with.

TABLE 3.   Nouns of the foreign vs. foreign type

N°	Category		I		II		III		IV		I&II		SUM EV	SUM LV
	Other texts		EV	LV	EV	LV	EV	LV	EV	LV	EV	LV		
1.	RR +	GP L&D		3	2	1				1	3		5 12%	5 12%
2.		GP L												
3.		GP D							1				1 2%	
4.	GP L&D			1					2	2	3		5 12%	3 7%
5.	RR			3	4				2				6 14%	3 7%
6.	GP L		7	0									7 16%	
7.	GP D			9						1				10 23%
8.	all	RR		6	6	1			3	1	3		12	8
9.	all	GP L	7	4	2	1			2	3	6		17	8
10.	all	GP D		13	2	1			3	4	6		11	18
11.	all		7	16	6	1			5	4	6		24 56%	21 49%
12.	unique		2	7	2	3		2	6	9 +1 ON	9		19 44%	22 51%
13.	SUM		9 21%	23 53%	8 19%	4 9%		2 5%	11 26%	14 33%	15 35%		43	43

As regards the division into categories based upon the probable motiva-
tion behind a given nominal choice, for LV it is predominantly the trans-
lators' preference or consistency (I) that guided the selection. The second
most numerous category for this Psalter is IV, which means that the incen-
tive behind these decisions remains unknown.

Among the nouns from EV analysed in this section, the category of
items whose presence in the rendition may stem from two sources, one
of them being the Latin base text (II) and the other – translators' consist-
ency (I) is by far the most numerous, containing 35% of all the items. The
second category in terms of number of nouns is again IV (26%), whereas

the use of almost one fifth of the items analysed in this section seems to have been at least reinforced by the presence of a related noun in the Latin base text (cf. category II).

Conclusion

Having presented the numerical and statistic data disjointly for each type of etymological oppositions in Section 4 and having discussed them in as much detail as space permits, I would like to draw some general conclusions as regards the motivation hidden behind the nominal divergences between the Psalters of the two versions of the Wycliffite Bible, EV and LV. The ratio between the three types of item oppositions, that is, native vs. native : native vs. foreign : foreign vs. foreign, is the following 124 : 91 : 43, which means that the three categories constitute respectively 48%, 35%, and 17% of the nouns analysed in this paper.

Table 4 below summaries all the data scrutinised for the purposes of the present paper and grants an opportunity to view them from a broader perspective.

The data when presented in such a condensed form do not seem to vary greatly between the two Psalters. What differences there were when these were viewed from a closer perspective in The Analysis of the Data almost disappear now, which is what one would expect due to the contemporary views on Scriptures translation (cf. Approach to Translation at the Cultural and Linguistic Background).

The number of items used in EV or LV and attested in the other two Psalters is almost identical. Interestingly, also the number of nouns of foreign origin does not seem to differ substantially, with EV employing ten more Romance items (93) than LV and LV using additionally a single ON noun. It appears also that the prestige of French, even if it was *a* factor did not generally determine translators' choices.

As regards the reasons for divergence between the texts, ca. 40% of the analysed occurrences seem to have been prompted by translators' preferences and consistency as regards the noun choice. Different occurrences of a particular Latin lemma tend to be rendered, certainly with exceptions, by means of a single ME noun consistently throughout, which is congru-

TABLE 4. Summary table

	Type	I EV	I LV	II EV	II LV	III EV	III LV	IV EV	IV LV	I&II EV	I&II LV	I&III EV	I&III LV	SUM EV	SUM LV
I	attested elsewhere	56	44	1				24	14		1		14	81	73
	unique	18	13	2	3		8	23	27					43	51
	sum	74	57	3	3		8	47	41		1		14	124	124
II	attested elsewhere	22 (11)	15	8 (8)	2 (2)		1 (1)	20 (7)	24 (8)	2 (2)	15 (15)			52 (28)	57 (26)
	unique	13 (1)	9	16 (16)	2 (2)			10 (5)	21 (11)		2 (2)			39 (22)	34 (15)
	sum	35 (12)	24	24 (24)	4 (4)		1 (1)	30 (12)	45 (19)	2 (2)	17 (17)			91 (50)	91 (41)
III	attested elsewhere	7	16	6	1			5	4	6				24	21
	unique	2	7	2	3		2	6	9 +1 ON	9				19	22
	sum	9	23	8	4		2	11	14	15				43	43
SUM	attested elsewhere	85 54%	75 50%	15 10%	3 2%		1 1%	49 31%	42 28%	8 5%	16 11%		14 9%	157 (52)	151 (47)
	unique	33 33%	29 27%	20 20%	8 7%		10 9%	39 39%	58 54%	9 9%	2 2%			101 (41)	107 (36) +1 ON
	sum	118 46%	104 40%	35 14%	11 4%		11 4%	88 34%	100 39%	17 7%	18 7%		14 5%	258 (93)	258 (83) +1 ON

ent with the principle of faithfulness to the source text, also as regards the form. Unfortunately, lexical choices concerning 34% of the nouns in the case of EV and 39% when it comes to LV cannot be easily accounted for, with five of the items classified here having been most probably motivated by translators' acquaintance with Lyra's, *Postilla*, a commentary on the Psalms. Note that I have not established a separate category for such nouns since that would assume consulting Lyra for all the items and analysing also the text of other commentaries, which has not been done. Instead I list the five items I have found in *Postilla*'s facsimile, as suspected due to what seemed 'bizarre' word choices of the translations, in the form of Table 5, additionally providing references to works which mention them.

TABLE 5.   Influence of Lyra's *Postilla*

Type	Verse	Latin text	EV / LV		Lyra's Postilla	Source
I	30.18	*sors, sortis* 'lot, fate'	LV	*tīme*	*tempus, temporis* 'time, condition, right time'	Hargreaves 1965, 130
II	8.5	*homo, hominis* 'man, human being, person, fellow'	LV	*virğīn(e*	*virgo, virginis* 'maiden, young woman […]; virgin […]'	Hargreaves 1955, 81 Charzyńska-Wójcik 2013, 680
III	15.5	*calix, calicis* 'cup, goblet, a vessel for drinking; chalice […]'	LV	*passiŏun*	*passio, passionis* 'suffering, passion'	Hargreaves 1955, 76 Charzyńska-Wójcik 2013, 688
	41.9	*cataracta, cataractae* 'cataract/ rapid; waterfall; sluice, watergate […]'	LV	*windou(e*	*fenestra, fenestrae* 'window, opening for light'	Hargreaves 1965, 130
	7.7	*synagoga, synagogae* 'synagogue, congregation <of Jews>'	EV	*congregăciŏun*	*congregatio, congregationis* '[…] association, community; brotherhood; congregation'	

With respect to the nouns whose appearance in the renditions has most probably been motivated by the source text (categories II, and I&II), they are more frequently attested in EV (21%) than in LV (11%). In effect, EV may seem to adhere more closely to the original (as the more 'literal' one) but the difference between the two is in fact negligible when the remaining 2,308 nouns, that is, the ones which appear in parallel verses in both texts, are taken into account. Linguistic changes (III, and I&III) in their turn may explain only roughly 9% of the variation as regards the noun choices analysed here.

On the whole, then, one can tentatively conclude that the main sources of divergence between EV and LV are translator-dependent. The presence of the items assigned to category I and most probably of the majority of nouns in IV stems presumably from translators' convictions as regards the translation and these in turn derive from the contemporary approaches and beliefs pertaining to its substance.

Bibliography

Adams, M. 2009. "The Period Dictionaries." In *The Oxford History of English Lexicography. Vol. I: General-Purpose Dictionaries*, edited by A. P. Cowie, 326–352. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Charzyńska-Wójcik, M. 2013. *Text and Context in Jerome's Psalters: Prose Translations into Old, Middle and Early Modern English*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.

Delisle, J., and J. Woodsworth. eds. 1995. *Translators through History*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Forshall, J., and F. Madden. eds. 1850. *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apocryphal Books, in the Earliest English Versions Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and His Followers*. Oxford: University Press.

Hargreaves, H. 1955. "The Latin Text of Purvey's Psalter." *Medium Aevum* 24, 73–90.

Hargreaves, H. 1965. "From Bede to Wyclif: Medieval English Bible Translations." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48, 118–140.

Hargreaves, H. 1969. "The Wycliffite's Versions." In *The Cambridge History of the Bible. Vol. 2: The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*, edited by G. W. H. Lampe, 387–415. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kibbee, D. A. 1991. *For to Speke Frenche Trewely. The French Language in England, 1000–1600: Its Status, Description and Instruction*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lis, K. 2014a. "The Latinity of the Wycliffite Psalters." In *Language Change: Faces and Facets*, edited by M. Charzyńska-Wójcik, A. Bloch-Rozmej, and J. Wójcik, 129–171. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.

Lis, K. 2014b. *An Etymological Study of the Nominal Layer of the First Fifty Psalms in Two Late Fourteenth-Century English Bibles*. Unpublished manuscript.

Lyra, Nicolas of. 1492. *Postilla Super Totam Bibliam*. Strasbourg: Johannes Gruninger. http://www.umilta.net/nicholalyra.html.

MED = Kurath, H, S. McAllister Kuhn et al. eds. 1952–2001. *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

OED = Simpson, J. and E. Weiner et al. eds. 1989. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Paues, A. C. 1902. *A Fourteenth Century English Biblical Version Consisting of a Prologue and Parts of the New Testament Edited from the Manuscripts together with Some Introductory Chapters on Middle English Biblical Versions (Prose-Translations)*, Cambridge: University Press.

Rothwell, W. 2000. "Anglo-French and Middle English Vocabulary in *Femina Nova*," *Medium Aevum* 69, 34–58.

Shepherd, G. 1969. "English Versions of the Scriptures before Wyclif." In *The Cambridge History of the Bible. Vol. 2: The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*, edited by G. W. H. Lampe, 362–387. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whitaker, W. *WORDS: Latin-to-English & English-to-Latin Dictionary*. http://ablemedia.com/ctcweb/showcase/wordsonline.html.

Wilkins, D. 1737. *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae ab Anno MCCCL ad Annum MDXLV*. Volume III. London: R. Gosling, F. Giles, T. Woodward and C. Davis.

Kinga Lis

Dlaczego różne? – rozbieżne dobory leksykalne
w dwóch przekładach średnioangielskich psałterzy i ich *raison d'être*

STRESZCZENIE: Artykuł ma na celu zbadanie motywacji leżącej u podstaw rozbieżnych dobo-rów leksykalnych pomiędzy dwoma niezwykle zbliżonymi średnioangielskimi przekładami psałterza z XIV wieku związanymi z kręgami Wycliffe'a i ustalenie jak rozbieżności te prze-kładają się na warstwę etymologiczną tekstów. W artykule badaniu poddane są rzeczowniki z pierwszych pięćdziesięciu psalmów, a każde z badanych słów próbuje się przypisać do jednej z czterech kategorii ustalonych na podstawie prawdopodobnych zarówno intra-, jak i ekstratekstualnych powodów stojących za rozbieżnościami. Analizowane tu dobory leksy-kalne zestawiane są w trakcie badania z analogicznymi danymi dotyczącymi dwóch innych czternastowiecznych psałterzy: psałterza w tłumaczeniu Richarda Rolle'a i *Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter*.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: etymologia, różnice leksykalne, rzeczowniki, psałterz, Biblia Wycliffe'a

Kinga Lis

Warum verschieden? – lexikalische Diskrepanzen in zwei Übersetzungen
der mittelenglischen Psalter und deren Zweck

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG: Der vorliegende Beitrag bezweckt, die Beweggründe der lexikalischen Diskrepanzen zwischen den sehr ähnlichen mittelenglischen Übersetzungen des Psalters aus dem 14.Jahrhundert, die mit Wycliffs Kreisen verbunden waren, zu untersuchen und festzustellen, inwieweit diese Diskrepanzen die etymologische Ebene der Texte beeinflusst haben. Untersucht werden die den ersten fünfzig Psaltern entnommenen Substantive, die man einer der vier Kategorien zu zuschreiben versucht, die anhand der wahrscheinlichen hinter den Diskrepanzen stehenden sowohl intertextuellen als auch extratextuellen Ursachen unterschieden wurden. Die hier untersuchte lexikalische Auswahl wird mit den analogischen Daten verglichen, die zwei andere Psalter aus dem 14.Jh. betreffen: den von Richard Rolle übersetzten Psalter und den *Middle English Glossed Psalter*.

SCHLÜSSELWÖRTER: Etymologie, lexikalische Diskrepanzen, Substantive, Psalter, Wycliffs Bibel