



ALL AROUND THE WORD



PAPERS IN HONOUR
OF BOGDAN SZYMANEK
ON HIS 65TH BIRTHDAY

EDITORS
ANNA BONDARUK, KRZYSZTOF JASKUŁA

Reviewers

Prof. dr hab. Katarzyna Dziubalska-Kolaczyk
Prof. dr hab. Piotr Stalmaszczyk

Typesetting
Krzysztof Jaskuła

Cover design
Agnieszka Gawryszuk

© Copyright by Wydawnictwo KUL, Lublin 2019

ISBN 978-83-8061-631-8

Wydawnictwo KUL, ul. Konstantynów 1 H, 20-708 Lublin, phone +48 81 740-93-40, fax +48 81 740-93-50,
e-mail: wydawnictwo@kul.lublin.pl, <http://wydawnictwo.kul.lublin.pl>

Print and cover: volumina.pl Daniel Krzanowski
ul. Ks. Witolda 7-9, 71-063 Szczecin, phone +48 91 812 09 08, e-mail: druk@volumina.pl

The vicissitudes of hope – an insight into a forgotten translation of the Psalter by John Caryll

Magdalena Charzyńska-Wójcik

John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin

ABSTRACT

The objective of the paper is to examine English equivalents of selected Latin verbs in all English prose translations of Psalms 1-50 executed between the late 9th and the early 18th century. The study revealed consistency of choices in the case of five renditions from the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries. In contrast, the earliest and the latest translations: King Alfred's and John Caryll's Psalters, though consistent in the case of semantically simpler equivalents (*love* and *hate*), showed quite a lot of variation when equivalents of *hope* were examined. Divergent choices in the case of the former have for some time been associated with a particular sociolinguistic situation in Anglo-Saxon England, which induced a particular translation approach. Moreover, this Psalter emerged as the first in the line of the many translations, so it had no model to lean on or relate to. Later translations were characterised by strict fidelity to the source text, as evidenced by the five medieval and early modern texts analysed here. Yet John Caryll's English translation of the Psalter diverges from the established tradition. The examined equivalents of *sperare* show unexpected freedom, which can be accounted for by referring to the linguistic deficiencies of the existing Psalter text and the intended audience of his rendition.

KEY WORDS: Psalter translation, medieval and Early Modern English Psalms, equivalents

1. Introduction

Judging from the English prose translations of the Psalms, love is stable, and (almost exactly) so is hate, while hope is capricious. This of course is

not a theological claim but a conclusion following from the analysis of English equivalents of Latin *diligere* ‘to love’, *odisse/ odire*¹ ‘to hate’ and *sperare* ‘to hope’. No other Latin verbs expressing these senses are found in the text of Psalms 1–50, except for *amare*, which features in the examined text only once, so it cannot contribute to the present study. In contrast, *diligere* appears in the examined corpus 12 times, *odisse/ odire* 16 times, and *sperare* has 39 valid occurrences. English equivalents of these Latin items are examined in seven prose translations of the Psalter which come from a period spanning 800 years, with the earliest text translated about 900 and the latest published in 1700. In effect, the study covers 67 contexts in seven translations, which gives us 469 English verses to examine. Observe that each of the verbs is represented by a sufficient number of occurrences to warrant conclusions relevant for a study which focuses on the stability of selected equivalents, not only across time, but also within a text. It is important to add that the seven texts examined in the paper represent all prose renditions of the Psalter from Jerome’s Latin into English in the examined period.²

The basic information about the texts is laid out in Section 2. The source text and the accompanying methodology are introduced in Section 2.1, while the relevant information concerning the analysed English translations is presented in Section 2.2. Section 3 discusses the data for each of the three Latin verbs whose English equivalents are the focus of this study, with a separate subsection devoted to each verb (3.1–3.3). Conclusions following from the analysis of the data are offered in Section 4.

¹ A decision to analyse jointly the English equivalents of *odisse* and *odire* is motivated by the fact that, although formally different, the two verbs express exactly the same range of meanings and for some inflected forms (e.g. *odit*) it is impossible to tell whether they represent *odisse* or *odire*.

² To the best of my knowledge, the only exception to this claim is Coverdale’s 1540 prose rendition of the Vulgate Psalms. However, this translation, as shown in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013: 131, 765), was strongly influenced by his three earlier renditions of the Psalter which were derived from other sources.

2. Texts and methodology

2.1. The source text and the accompanying methodology

For a study which compares lexical equivalents in vernacular renditions of the Bible to be methodologically correct, it must assume that the source texts of all renditions are identical. By definition the source text of the Psalter analysed here is associated with Jerome and while it might seem enough of an identification, it is certainly not so for several reasons associated both with Jerome's output and the mode of textual transmission in the medieval period.³ Therefore, a few comments are necessary here.

First of all, the term *Jerome's Psalter* is not a unique identification since there are as many as three versions of the Psalter associated with the venerated translator: the *Romanum*, the *Gallicanum*, and the *Hebraicum*. The first of them represents a cursory revision of the copies of the Old Latin translation of the Septuagint Psalter (itself being a translation from Hebrew) circulating in Rome in the fourth century AD.⁴ The copies were compared with the Septuagint and brought into line. This version is referred to as *Psalterium Romanum*. The second of these revisions, the *Gallicanum*, is the fruit of another revision executed by Jerome, this time against a much richer corpus, i.e. the text of Origen's *Hexapla*. In contrast, the *Hebraicum* is Jerome's original translation of the Hebrew Psalter. So, the first two of Jerome's Psalters represent the same textual tradition and therefore, do not exhibit significant differences, while the last one is a completely new text. As for the popularity of the three

³ To these one should add one more factor which greatly complicated the picture, in particular the status of the Psalter text (in fact of the whole Bible) before the Council of Trent, which formally established the biblical canon. While Jerome's *Psalterium Gallicanum* had for a long time been overwhelmingly the liturgical Psalter of the Western Christendom, it was by no means the only one and – more importantly – it was not formally authorised until 1546.

⁴ The identification of the *Romanum* with the first revision performed by Jerome has been questioned in the literature. The arguments against Jerome's authorship of the *Romanum* were voiced by de Bruyne (1930), but, as noted by Sutcliffe (1969: 84–85), they are not convincing. Other authors who challenge the identification of Jerome with the *Romanum* (cf. for example Jellicoe 1968: 252; and Rebenich 1993: 52) do so exclusively on the authority of de Bruyne, offering no evidence of their own.

versions of the Psalter, the *Romanum* was in wide circulation in England in the Old English period – it was the Psalter *per se* of Anglo-Saxon England (Pratt 2007: 245). With time, it was replaced with the *Gallicanum*, as a result of the Benedictine reform (Hargreaves 1965: 132; Brown 1999: 8, and Harris 2012: 296; for more detailed comments, cf. Charzyńska-Wójcik 2013: 26).

Secondly, hand-written copies were characterised by a considerable degree of variation, which was inherently ingrained in the mode of textual transmission. The differences displayed by copies of the same text in the Middle Ages were not only accepted but – what is more – they were appreciated (Cerquiglini 1989 [1999]). Naturally, this appreciation did not extend to biblical texts, so correction protocols were devised to reduce the variation to the minimum but it was still there (Linde 2012 [2015] and Wakelin 2014). In view of this variation, the methodological assumption that for the study to show valid results the renditions have to be based on identical source texts, has to be approached from a particularly medieval perspective. This perspective assumes (an attempt at) identifying – as much as it is possible – either the original source text the translator worked with or the text which was in circulation in the chronological and geographical proximity of the emergence of the translation.

The study reveals that the English prose renditions of Jerome's Psalms executed in the Old, Middle and Early Modern English were based on two versions of the Psalter. In particular, the sole Old English translation (as opposed to glosses) – the ninth-century Paris Psalter – was predominantly based on the text of the *Romanum*,⁵ whereas all later translations were based on the *Gallicanum*. These were: Richard Rolle's Psalter, Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter (both from around mid-14th century), Early and Late Wycliffite versions (both from the late 14th century), the Douay-Rheims Psalter (1610), and John Caryl's Psalter (1700).

The fact that the translations were based on different versions of the Psalter, which additionally circulated in manuscripts in all cases except for the last two, poses two major problems. First of all, it seems that the Old English translation has to be excluded from the study, as it is based on a different version of the text. Secondly, in view of what has been said above with respect to the variation observed in texts transmitted via

⁵ Cf. Section 2.2 for a more detailed treatment of the source text of the Paris Psalter.

manuscripts, the translations executed over a span of 350 years cannot be assumed to have been based on identical Latin texts. Each copy of the *Gallicanum* would naturally differ slightly from another.

In relation to the first issue, observe that eliminating the Old English rendition from the examination would reduce the time range of this study by 450 years – a very significant loss of historical depth – which can perhaps be avoided. Note that, as has already been remarked, the *Romanum* and the *Gallicanum* represent the same textual tradition so one can arrive at the common core of the two versions by eliminating the differing contexts. As it appears, the procedure applied individually to a particular study, rather than representing a general elimination of all differing contexts, reduces the size of the corpus of data to a negligible degree.

To illustrate the observed differences between the compared texts of the *Romanum* and *Gallicanum* and give an estimation of the amount of the text excluded as a result of the procedure of comparison, let me remark that in this study out of all the contexts in which *diligere* appears in Psalms 1–50 only one verse had to be exempted from the study of the equivalents (see 1 below).⁶

(1)

33.12

a. the *Romanum*⁷

Quis est homo qui vult vitam et cupit videre dies bonos?

b. the *Gallianum*

Quis est homo qui vult vitam *eternam*: diligit [cupit] dies videre [~ videre dies] bonos.

As is clear from the above set, the difference between the *Romanum* and the *Gallicanum* consists in the presence of the conjunction *et* ‘and’ in (1a) and the choice of the third verb (underlined here), which is *cupere* ‘to

⁶ The Latin examples are quoted here after Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013). The variation <v> vs. <u> and <ii> vs. <ij>, though recorded in the edition for the sake of preservation of the historical detail, has been ignored here as irrelevant for the study.

⁷ Except for Caryll’s text, all quotations are presented after Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013), together with the common numbering imposed there for all the edited Psalter. Caryll’s text is presented here after the original edition. All original conventions have been retained.

wish, desire, want' (after William Whitaker's Dictionary at <http://archives.nd.edu/words.html>) in the *Romanum*, but *diligere* in Richard Rolle's Psalter, the Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter, in the two Wycliffite versions, and the two early Modern English renditions. The bracketed [cupit] belongs to the mainstream text of the *Gallicanum*, reconstructed in the Stuttgart edition.⁸ While the Stuttgart edition, first published in 1969, was naturally not the source text of any of the English renditions, it is important as a reference point since it compares many textual families of the *Gallicanum* and has therefore also been considered a valid reference point in the analysis. In particular, whenever the Stuttgart text shows a difference, the passage is excluded from the study. This is probably too much of a precaution but it seems better to err on the side of caution and exclude a passage from an analysis than to draw unfounded conclusions.

An additional difference between the texts of the *Romanum* and the *Gallicanum* relied on by the English translators is the word order in the last clause in (1b) above: *videre dies bonos* vs. *dies videre bonos*. Observe that the Stuttgart edition agrees with the ordering of the *Romanum*. One more comment is due here, namely the Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter, as will be laid out in more detail in Section 2.2 below, contains Latin glosses incorporated in the text. This is a rather complex issue which cannot be given a comprehensive treatment here but whenever the glosses expand the lexical items to be compared or influence a passage to an important degree, it is clear that the verse should be excluded from a comparative study. Here, the gloss in the Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter is italicized in (1b): *eternam* and while it does not seem to affect the choice of the verb, the verse is already excluded for other reasons. This still leaves us with 12 valid verses with *diligere*, as signalled in the Introduction.

The same procedure was applied to sifting the data for the remaining items to be examined in this paper, i.e. *odissere/ odire* and *sperare*. No contexts needed to be eliminated in the case of the former, so all 16 occurrences qualify for the study, while the procedure of elimination in the case of *sperare* left us with 39 out of 40 verses in which we find

⁸ The Stuttgart Bible is a critical edition of the Latin Vulgate resulting from a comprehensive revision prepared by Robert Weber and first published at Stuttgart in 1969 (Achtmeier 1996: 1127).

sperare. Consider (2) below, which presents the only verse that had to be excluded from the study of the equivalents of *sperare*.

(2)

24.18

- a. Custodi animam meam, et eripe me. Non confundar, quoniam invocavi te /t'é*/.
- b. Custodi animam meam & erue me: non erubescam, quoniam speravi in te.

The underlined items in (2) above show the differences between the two major textual traditions, with no observed intratextual divergences in the choice of verbs.

When it comes to the second issue raised above, i.e. the actual source text of the remaining six renditions based on the *Gallicanum*, one needs to assume the perspective alluded to above, i.e. try to identify either the original source text (some translations come with the original Latin) or arrive at an approximate text on the basis of texts that were in circulation at the time of the rendition. This latter procedure is time consuming and arduous but it has been implemented for the four medieval, i.e. pre-Tridentine translations analysed here (the details of the procedure together with the identified textual traditions are presented in Charzyńska-Wójcik 2013). The decision of the Council of Trent, i.e. the establishment of the authorised version of the Psalter did not immediately put an end to textual variation and did not eliminate the necessity for revisions but, as the release of the authoritative text⁹ took place at the time when textual transmission was mediated via print, it considerably reduced the range of variation. In effect, with the introduction of the printing press, the variation so characteristic of the Middle Ages, when each copy represented a slightly different text, largely disappears.¹⁰ This leaves us with a much simpler task (the details are again spelt out in Charzyńska-Wójcik 2013).

One more issue needs to be raised before we can go on to a description of the texts analysed here. In particular, in view of the fact that the

⁹ The history of the authoritative text – especially in the initial stage after the canonisation of the Bible – was turbulent but space limitations preclude a discussion along these lines, especially that these do not bear directly upon the issue pursued here.

¹⁰ This naturally is a simplification but a necessary and unavoidable one at this stage.

complete Psalter consists of 150 Psalms, the decision to limit the analysis to Psalms 1–50 needs justification. This limitation is imposed on the study for two major reasons. First of all, the Old English rendition of Psalms consists of a prose part: Psalms 1–50, and a poetic rendition: Psalms 51–150. The study is limited to the prose portion, as in metrical and rhyming translations the choice of equivalents can be significantly influenced by considerations of rhythm and rhyme. Such choices, therefore, cannot constitute valid data for comparative study of lexical equivalents of Latin lemmata. Secondly, it appears that the corpus based on 50 Psalms is sizeable enough to warrant valid conclusion on a broad number of issues.¹¹

In conclusion so far, the two Latin texts (the *Romanum* and the *Gallicanum*) with the associated intratextual variation have been compared in all contexts which exhibit the relevant lexical items and the study was limited to these verses in which all compared revisions show the analysed verbs, with the intention to trace their English equivalents over the span of 800 years.

2.2. *The English translations*

Each of the seven English translations analysed here deserves a monograph of its own, and some of them have already been treated at length. This being the case, and considering the space limitations imposed on this contribution, I will limit the presentation of the examined renditions to an absolute minimum, referring the reader to the relevant literature whenever it is available.

Beginning with the sole Old English translation of the Psalter, known as the Paris Psalter, it covers Psalms 1–50 in prose, as has already been noted. The authorship of this translation had for a long time been a matter

¹¹ An additional reason for limiting the scope of examination to Psalms 1–50 is that a collation of Old English glossed Psalters prepared by Pulsiano (2001) – an invaluable *tertium comparationis* for a study of OE equivalents of Latin lemmata – is also limited to this portion of the text. Relying on the information concerning Old English glossed Psalters did not shed light on this study (hence only references in the footnotes) but information contained in the Old English glossed Psalter is often helpful in interpreting the data on equivalents.

of debate,¹² until it was finally established beyond any doubt by Bately (1982) that King Alfred the Great (849-899) is to be credited with the authorship of the translation (cf. also O'Neill 2001 and Charzyńska-Wójcik 2013 for a history of the attribution). The translation is unique not only in being the first but also in offering more than the source text. In particular, King Alfred was intent on the addressee of the translation to understand the message of the Psalter, not only its wording. Bearing in mind the central position of the Psalter in Christian spirituality on the one hand and the complexity of the text on the other, Alfred frequently resorted to explanations and paraphrases. In effect, the resulting translation is often referred to as the Old English “explanatory paraphrase” (Sisam and Sisam 1959), or “paraphrase” (the appellation used by Thorpe 1835 and in O'Neill's studies) rather than “translation”. Wiesenekker-Huizen (2000: 84) insists on calling it “in the first place a translation with periphrastic element” on the basis of the proportion of translation to explanation.¹³ The author admits that “[i]t is sometimes difficult to decide between what may be still felt to be a (perhaps very free) translation and an undoubted paraphrase” (Wiesenekker-Huizen 2000: 42). Whatever the exact classification, the fact remains that the Old English text is generally longer than the Latin Psalter. This brings us to the next issue, in particular its source text.

The Paris Psalter is preserved in a single manuscript – *Psalterium duplex* (kept in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Latin 8824), which postdates the translation by over a century. It contains the Latin text on the left-hand side and the Old English on the right-hand side. The Latin text is the *Romanum*. However, it is certainly not the direct source text of the vernacular rendition (Cook 1898: xxxvi). As pointed out by O'Neill (2001), the text of the Old English translation is based on the *Romanum* but there are places where Alfred clearly relied on the *Gallicanum*, where its readings are superior to the corresponding passages in the *Romanum*.¹⁴

¹² The first scholar to attribute the translation to King Alfred was Wülker (1885), but it was not until almost a century later that this attribution received general recognition.

¹³ The total number of verses preserved in psalms 1–50 is 782, while 208 verses are added for the sake of explanation.

¹⁴ Moreover, some influence of the *Psalterium Vetus* (a pre-Jeromian Latin version) and the *Hebraicum* is identified by O'Neill (2001), who also manages to trace the influence of the Psalter commentaries upon the expansions found in Alfred's rendition.

So, the Paris Psalter is a unique production: not only is it based on more than one source text, with the selection governed by the superiority of readings, but it also provides the reader with passages from the commentaries on the Psalms seamlessly incorporated into the translation. It follows that Alfred was determined to offer the reader a text with a clear message and was not constrained by “the straitjacket of fidelity” (Lawton 1999: 473) of later medieval translators to be discussed here. In effect, Alfred as a translator “is also being a conscious educator here, sparing no effort to place the message of the text in a context that would permit a proper understanding” (Charzyńska-Wójcik 2013: 55) and “the function of the finished product was the determining factor in the translation process” (Bassnett 1980[2002]: 58).

Richard Rolle’s Psalter is dated to the second quarter of the fourteenth century (cf. Charzyńska-Wójcik 2016 for a historical overview of the dating of the rendition). Each copy of the Psalter contains the Latin source text, Rolle’s very close rendition and an explanatory commentary. This makes working with Rolle’s equivalents a fairly straightforward task. Rolle’s translation has been tackled by many researchers (for example Allen 1927; Allen 1988; Bramley 1884, and several contributors in Fanouos and Gillespie 2011), so there is no need to expand on it here any further.

The next text to be analysed here is the Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter. This Psalter has been covered in mystery ever since it was first introduced in the literature on biblical translations. It is special on several counts. First of all, the source text is not pure *Gallicanum* but a glossed Latin text. The glosses have been incorporated into the Latin text rather than presented in the margin or in the commentary, as was the custom (cf. Charzyńska-Wójcik 2017a). Secondly, the text was first translated into Anglo-Norman and French and the translator sometimes rendered the Latin lemmata, sometimes the glosses and occasionally both. Next the text was rendered into English, with the English translator certainly acquainted with the Anglo-Norman productions, as the translation sometimes relies on the Latin text but there are passages, which are certainly based on the Anglo-Norman as an intermediary. All of this makes this Psalter a fascinating object of study, hence scholars working on it (Bülbring 1891; Paues 1902; Deanesly 1920; Reuter 1938; Muir 1948; St-Jacques 1989; Lavender 2004; Black and St-Jacques 2012) have

differed widely in nearly all aspects. To top it all up, even the title associated with this production has been subject to constant change – an issue I discuss in my earlier publication (Charzyńska-Wójcik 2017b).

The next two translations come from the end of the fourteenth century. They are generally known in the literature as the Early and Late Wycliffite versions. These Psalters, unlike the ones discussed so far, form part of complete Bible translations. The Early Version is criticised for its overly literal character: its text was not comprehensible on its own. The Late Version, in contrast, presents a much more refined text. The details concerning the relationship between the two versions and the speculations concerning the authorship and Wycliffe's role in the whole enterprise are presented in Waterland (also known as Waterton) (1724), Lewis (1739), Forshall and Madden (1850), Devries (1889), Kenyon (1895 [1903]), Pollard (1911), Slater (1911), Deanesly (1920), Drabble (1932 [1985]), Hargreaves (1955), Bruce (1961 [1963]), Partridge (1973), Fowler (1995), Norton (2000), Bobrick (2001), Metzger (2001), Davies and Thomson (2002), Dove (2007), Cooper (n.d.).

The Psalter of the Douay-Rheims Bible first appeared in print in 1610 as the second part of the Old Testament. Its emergence is described in sufficient detail by Smith (1865), Eadie (1876), Kenyon (1895 [1903]), Ward (1909), Greenslade (1963), Daniell (2003), and Edgar and Kinney (2011). It has to be observed, though, that generally speaking not much attention has been devoted to it in the literature on biblical translations. The translation was executed to counteract what was viewed as adverse effects of the widespread English translations performed under the auspices of the Reformed Church. This objective was consonant with the number of print-runs the Douay-Rheims translation went through (three editions of the New Testament and one reprint of the whole Bible in the 17th c). In the mid-18th century, there was significant revising activity by Richard Challoner, which resulted in five editions of the New Testament and two of the Old Testament.¹⁵ This is to be contrasted with hundreds of editions of the various biblical versions produced by the Reformed Church. It was only after Challoner's death that we witness an increased production of the Douay-Rheims Bible (cf. Edgar and Kinney 2011).

¹⁵ The New Testament was issued in 1749, 1750, 1752, 1764, 1772; the Old Testament in 1750 and 1763-64. The changes introduced by Challoner are so extensive that it seems more correct to call it a new translation (cf. Charzyńska-Wójcik 2013: 92).

The last text included in this examination is the work of John Caryll, Carryll or Carryl, as his name is spelt depending on the source. His biography is generally little known, and so is the text of the renditions itself. He tends to be confused with his nephew, John Caryll, also referred to as John Caryll the younger, generally known for being the dedicatee of Alexander Pope’s “The Rape of the Lock”. Among the hundreds of post-medieval translations of the Psalter, Caryll’s text, printed in 1700 and reprinted twice in 1704 (“review’d and corrected”) has escaped notice, hence the initiative to offer an edition of Caryll’s Psalter undertaken by Charzyńska-Wójcik (in prep.). The almost complete neglect of this Psalter in histories of biblical translations and Psalter translations is surprising, his *Psalmes of David* being one of the very few English translations of the Psalter from the Vulgate to English in the Early Modern period. Since not much more is known now about the emergence of this rendition, we will approach the text without any further introduction.

3. Data

3.1. English equivalents of *diligere*

The English equivalents of *diligere* are consistent throughout (4.3, 5.12, 10.6, 10.8, 17.1, 25.8, 30.27, 32.5, 39.19, 44.9, 46.4, 50.7). All texts, beginning with the Old English (OE) version through the Middle English (ME) and the Early Modern English (EMnE) renditions use *love* to render *diligere*.¹⁶ The form of the verb naturally underwent phonological and morphological modifications, from OE *lufian*, through ME *lōven*, to the EMnE form *love* but the choice of the verb is the same. This is illustrated by the example set below.

(3)

4.3

a. Paris Psalter

...	hwi	<u>lufige</u>	ge	idelnesse,
	why	love	you-PL	vanity
	and	secað	leasuncga?	
	and	seek	lies	

¹⁶ The examination of all Old English glossed Psalters confirms the stability of the choice.

- b. Richard Rolle
... wharetil luf 3e vanyte & sekis leghe.
- c. Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter
... wherto loue 3e ydelnes and secheþ lesyng?*. [—Ha: men: segeþ.]
- d. Early Version
... whereto looue 3ee vanyte and sechen lesing?
- e. Late Version
... whi louen 3e vanite, and seken*. [seken .e S.] a*.[Om. I.] leesyng?
- f. Douay-Rheims
... why loue you vanitie, and seeke lying
- g. John Caryl
... Why do you love vanity, and seek after lyes?

There are two minor exceptions to this pattern. One is encountered in Alfred's rendition, where, as has already been signalled, divergences are to be expected. The other is found in Caryl's text.

Let me begin with Alfred's Psalter (cf. 4 below). The Old English text of 39.19 translates *diligere* as *hopian* 'to hope, trust'. O'Neill (2001) ascribes this passage in the Paris Psalter to the influence of the Epitome of Julian of Eclanum's commentary on the Psalms, which Alfred was familiar with. We do not, therefore, treat it as a signal that *diligere* could be translated as *hopian* but an instance where Alfred explains rather than translates the text of the Psalter, as he does so often.

(4)

39.19

- a. Paris Psalter
... þa þe hopiað to þinre hælo,
those who trust in your salvation
- a. Richard Rolle
... that lufis thi hele.
- b. Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter
... þat louen þyn helffe,
- c. Early Version
...and that loouen thin helthe 3iuere,
- d. Late Version
thei, that louen thin helthe,
- e. Douay-Rheims
them that love thy saluation,
- g. John Caryl
... And who love thy saluation,

Note in this context that Alfred's text, which does not exclusively focus on translating but sets out to explain, sounds more natural than the perfectly consistent choice of *love* in the case of the remaining six renditions. Being the only translator-educator, Alfred is also the only one to diverge from the selected equivalent here. I have examined all the other Theme objects of *diligere* and nowhere else does the meaning of the verb discord with that of the Theme as it does here. In particular, the object is either human, as in *diligam te domine, Diligite Dominum, speciem Iacob quam dilexit*, where *love* sounds perfectly natural or an abstract one: *vanitatem, iniquitatem, iustitiam (x2)/ iustitias, misericordiam et iudicium, veritatem, decorem domus tue, nomen tuum*. Observe that the selection restrictions of these objects agree with the verb *love*. The situation is different in the case of *salutare tuum* 'your salvation', where *your salvation* is naturally to be understood as 'salvation by you', not 'salvation of you'. Here the verb *love* does not appear to be a natural choice, with *hope* certainly contributing to a more natural text.

Let me now move on to the other exception encountered in the *diligere*-set, i.e. Caryl's translation of *diligere veritatem*. Consider the example below.

(5)

50.7

a. Paris Psalter

Ic wat

I know

þæt þu symle lufast rihtwisnesse,
that you always love righteousness ...

b. Richard Rolle

ffor lo thou lufid soth|fastnes...

c. Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter

Se! for þou loued soþenes...

d. Early Version

Lo! forsothe treuthe thou loouedist...

e. Late Version

For lo! thou louedist*. [hast loued I.] treuthe ...

f. Douay-Rheims

For behold thou hast loued truth...

g. John Caryl

But thou are a lover of truth...

Looking at the example above, it is hard to say why Caryll felt the need to give up his usual and perfectly natural equivalent in this context. Latin *dilexisti* (PERF ACTIVE IND 2 S), could very well be translated as in the Douay-Rheims text by the English present perfect tense of the verb *love*. It seems, however, that the question must remain without an answer, at least for the time being.

3.2. *English equivalents of odisse/ odire*

The data concerning the English equivalents *odisse/ odire* in Psalms 1–50 are quantitatively comparable to those concerning *diligere* and show a similar degree of stability. In the sixteen verses included in the study (5.5, 10.6, 17.18, 17.38, 20.9, 24.17, 25.5, 30.6, 33.21, 34.19, 35.4, 37.19, 43.9, 43.12, 44.9, 49.18), beginning with the Old English translation of King Alfred, through the Middle and Early Modern English, the equivalents are the same: OE *hatian*¹⁷ > ME *hāten* > EMnE *hate*, except for three instances where Caryll changes his equivalent. Moreover, it needs to be noted that one verse (20.9) is missing from the Old English rendition, but it does not exclude the verse from the study as a whole but eliminates one context in the Old English text. In all the 15 passages which are present in the text, *odisse/ odire* is translated by Alfred as *hatian*. Returning to Caryll, the three differing verses show two different choices: *have hatred* (24.17 and 35.4) and *detest* (25.5).

The context in 24.17 is: *odio iniquo oderunt me* ‘they hated me with unjust hatred’, i.e. a clause with a cognate object. This is generally rendered literally, with a replica of the cognate object, as in: *in wickid hatredyn thai hatid me* (Richard Rolle), *hij hated me wyfl wycked hatyng* (Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter), *with wicke**. [*wickid AH.*] *hate thei hateden me* (Early Version), *thei haten**. [*hatiden Ksec. m.*] *me bi wickid hatred* (Late Version), and *with vniust hatred hated me* (Douay-Rheims). In contrast, Alfred does not go for the cognate objects but sticks to the stable verbal equivalent (6a). Neither does Caryll but, in contrast to Alfred, he changes the verbal equivalent (cf. 6b).

¹⁷ *Hatian* was not the dominant equivalent in the Old English glossed Psalters.

(6)

24.17

a. Paris Psalter

hu unrihtlice hi me hatiað

how unrighteously they me hate

b. John Caryl

And how unjust a hatred they have towards me.

However, the same explanation is not applicable to 35.4, where *astitit omni vie non bone, maliciam autem non odiuit* is translated by Caryl as: *he follows all bad ways, and has no hatred of evill*, which renders the avoidance of the cognate object as a reason for the divergence in 24.17 doubtful. We are equally at a loss for an explanation in the case of 25.5, where *Odiui ecclesiam malignancium*¹⁸ is rendered by Caryl as: *I have detested the conventions of malitious men, nor will I ever sit in company with the Impious*.

In search of the source of these divergences I examined the types of objects accompanying the remaining fourteen occurrences of *odisset/odire*. It turns out that there are two major types of objects: human (mostly personal) – eleven cases and abstract – three occurrences. The object type, therefore, was not likely to have prompted the different choice. Once again, we are forced to conclude that the reason behind this divergence is not clear.

3.3. English equivalents of *sperare*

Sperare appears as many as 40 times in the text of Psalms 1–50 in the *Gallicanum*, but, as remarked in Section 2.1, only 39 times in the *Romanum*, so the context has been excluded from the whole study by virtue of the assumed methodology. The remaining 39 contexts (4.6, 5.12, 7.1, 9.10, 12.5, 15.1, 16.7, 17.2, 17.29, 20.8, 21.3(a), 21.3(b), 21.4, 21.7, 25.1, 26.4, 27.8, 30.1, 30.7, 30.17, 30.21, 30.28, 31.12, 32.16, 32.17, 32.18, 33.8, 33.22, 35.8, 36.3, 36.5, 36.39, 37.15, 39.3, 40.9, 41.6, 41.14, 42.6, 43.8) converge as far as the use of the verb is concerned. In one

¹⁸ The text of the *Romanum* shows the same verb but the object – though of the same type and expressing the same sense – is phrased as *congregationem malignorum* rather than *ecclesiam malignancium*.

instance (20.8), the OE text is missing, but, as was the case with *odisse/odire* in (20.9), the verse is not excluded from the analysis as a whole. We are thus left with 38 verses to analyse in the 7 texts and 1 verse (20.8) to analyse in 6 texts, which gives us a total of 272 passages. The dominant equivalent in all periods of the history of the language examined here was *hope*, as illustrated by the set below.¹⁹

(7)

7.1

a. Paris Psalter

Drihten, min God, to þe ic hopige ...

Lord my God in you I have-hoped

b. Richard Rolle

Lord my god i. hopid in the ...

c. Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter

Lord, my God, ich hoped in þe ...

d. Early Version

Lord, my God, in thee I hopide ...

e. Late Version

Mi Lord God, Y haue hopid in thee ...

f. Douay-Rheims

O Lord my God I haue hoped in thee ...

g. John Caryl

O Lord, my God! in thee have I hoped ...

But, unlike in the case of *diligere* and *odisse/odire*, the examined corpus shows other equivalents here. However, they are limited, predictably by now, to the earliest and latest texts examined here, i.e. King Alfred's translation and Caryl's work. King Alfred, besides the predominant *hopian* (30 instances) and a single instance of its prefixed variant: *to-hopian*, resorts to *gehyhtan* (3), *ge-lȳfan* (1), *trūwian* (1), *getrūwian* (1), and *cleopian* (1).

When it comes to Caryl, apart from *hope* (21 instances), the variation includes equivalents such as *confide* (7), *put trust* (3), *trust* (2), *have*

¹⁹ Interestingly, in Old English glossed Psalters *hopian* was only a marginal equivalent of *sperare*, with the dominant choice being *(ge)hyhtan*.

confidence (2), *put confidence* (1), *place hope* (1), *rely* (1), and *my hope in this should still be firm* (1). In contrast, in the remaining 5 texts, i.e. the four Middle English texts and one EMnE rendition, i.e. in the 195 verses, the observed variation is limited to two places: *hāven hope* (9.10) in the Late Version and *trouen* (17.29) in the Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter. All in all, however, the variation, is significantly greater for the equivalents of *sperare* than the diversity observed in the case of equivalents of *diligere* and *odisse/ odire*, yet still practically limited to the two texts: the earliest and the latest of the translations analysed here.

On examining all the relevant verses, it turns out that the 39 contexts can be classified into 5 types:

(8)

- (i) the verb is complemented with a noun denoting God: *sperare in Domino/ Deo/ Deum* (12);
- (ii) the verb is complemented by a pronoun:
 - a. denoting God: *sperare in eo/ eum/ te/ se/ ipso* (19);
 - b. denoting a human being (1);
 - c. denoting an abstract notion (the protection of God) (1);
- (iii) the verb is complemented by an abstract object: *sperare in/ super (Romanum/ Gallicanum) miserecordia eius/ in nomine sancto eius/ in miserecordia tua/ in protectione/ tegmine (Romanum/ Gallicanum) alarum tuarum* (4);
- (iv) the verb is complemented by a concrete object: *sperare in arcu meo* (1);
- (v) the verb appears in an elliptical structure, where the elided object is clearly identical with the object of *sperare* in the first part of the coordinated structure, i.e. a pronoun referring to God (1).

King Alfred seems quite consistent in his choices even though, as has been emphasised on many occasions, he often tends to explain rather than translate the text. Type (i) is uniformly rendered by *hopian*, type (ii) shows some variation in subtype (a), where all three instances of *gehyhtan* are found, next to *to-hopian* and *cleopian*; in (b) *trūwian* is used. Type (iii) is rendered by *hopian* (3) and *ge-lȳfan* (1). Type (iv) shows *ge-trūwian*, and type (v) appears with *hopian*.

As for Caryl's data, the following conclusions can be drawn. For some of the categories listed above, *sperare* is never translated by Caryl by *hope*. This happens when *sperare* is complemented by an abstract object,

whether expressed by a noun (iii) or a pronoun (iic). Instead, Caryll uses *confide* (2), *have confidence* (1) and *place hope* (1) and *my hope in this should still be firm* for (iic). Neither is *hope* used when the object is a pronoun referring to a person (iib), where Caryll uses *rely*. All other categories of objects do appear with *hope*, though for no object type can we formulate any valid generalisations, except for a single-member group (iv), where *hope* is used. This latter observation, however, does not have a status of a generalisation: for conclusions drawn on the basis of a single example to be valid, they would need to be verified against further data, such as the text of the remaining Psalms (51–150).

Let me then look at the object types represented by more occurrences and see whether they shed any light on Caryll's decisions. Types (i) and (ii) seem promising: not only do they form a semantically homogenous group but they are also represented by a large number of occurrences. As far as type (i) is concerned, let me observe that if Caryll's lexical choices are governed by an underlying principle, be it syntactic or motivated by selection restrictions, we would expect identical equivalents here. This, however, is not borne out by the data: only 6 of the 12 examples are translated as *hope*, 4 as *confide*, 1 as *have confidence*, and 1 as *trust*. It has to be observed, however, that 3 of the 4 instances translated as *confide* represent identical verses in Latin (41.6, 41.14, and 42.6):

(9)

41.6, 41.14, 42.6

Spera in deo [Deum] quoniam adhuc confitebor illi: salutare vultus mei & deus meus.

They are translated by Caryll in the same way, though in one of them the word order is slightly different, which might suggest that Caryll did not *copy* the text but *translated* it in the same way.

(10)

John Caryll

a. 41.6, 42.6

Confide in God, for still I will praise him, who is my Saviour, and my God.

b. 41.14

Confide in God, for I will still praise him, who is my Saviour, and my God.

When it comes to type (iia), represented by 19 occurrences, 13 instances are translated as *hope*, 3 as *put trust*, 1 as *trust*, 1 as *put confidence*, and 1 as *confide*, and this is clearly not accountable for in terms of any principled approach. The last type to be examined is type (v), which should in fact be viewed as a subtype of type (ii), with the object deleted under identity with the pronominal object of *sperare* in the first part of the coordinated structure referring to God and therefore representing type (ii). The use of *hope* in type (v) is neither surprising nor relevant, considering the absence of similar examples.

In conclusion, while variation is expected in King Alfred's text due to his methodological assumptions, the same cannot be extended to Caryll's rendition, especially in view of the consistency observed in the 5 other translations preceding his. The analysis of the 9 different ways in which Caryll translates *sperare* does not suggest a principled approach to the selection. This, however, is not to say that Caryll was a careless translator because the consistency of the data on *diligere* and *odisse/ odire*, presented in Section 3.1 and 3.2 respectively, preclude such generalisation. What, then, motivated Caryll's choices? What was his guiding principle in translating the Psalms?

4. Conclusions

In the course of the study of the English translations of the 12 verses with *diligere*, 16 with *odisse/ odire*, and 39 with *sperare*, we analysed 67 contexts in the 7 English texts spanning 800 years. As two passages are missing in the Paris Psalter (one with *odisse/ odire* and one with *sperare*), the total number of compared equivalents amounts to 467.

Several generalisations present themselves upon the analysis of the data. First of all, five of the seven texts are characterised by stable choices. These are Richard Rolle's Psalter, the Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter, the Early and Late Wycliffite versions, and the Douay-Rheims Bible Psalter. This is to be expected, considering that the Psalter is a biblical text and as such it was meant to be translated as closely as

possible,²⁰ both in the Medieval and in the Early Modern period.²¹ Two texts, however, stand out: the medieval rendition by King Alfred the Great from the late ninth century and the Early Modern translation by John Caryl from 1700.

The two translations were executed in extremely different sociolinguistic situations and in different literacy conditions. They were meant to be distributed by different modes of textual transmission and directed at different audiences, yet they seem to show similarities as far as equivalent selection is concerned. The sources of divergences in Alfred's translations have already been made clear, so it is John Caryl's dissimilarity to the 5 texts preceding him that is to be accounted for.

Let me first of all repeat that very little is known about John Caryl and his production. But the general context of the emergence of his translation of the Psalter is that of a multitude of Protestant renditions of the Psalms, most of them metrical and none of them based on Jerome's *Gallicanum*. Some of them were licensed for liturgical use. In contrast, there was only one Catholic rendition of the Psalms – the Douay-Rheims Psalter as part of the complete Bible. As has already been signalled, the Bible was translated as a countermeasure to the widely circulating Protestant renditions, which offered the English text of the Psalter and hence might constitute a temptation for English-speaking Catholics. The situation being so, it was decided to offer Catholics an alternative, based on the treasured text, which enjoyed ecclesiastical authority. Naturally, the English Psalter of the Douay-Rheims Bible did not enjoy a liturgical status and the extremely scarce number of print-runs and re-editions (cf. Section 2.2) best testifies to its position in the Catholic Church. It clearly had a subservient status to the Latin *Gallicanum* and was not meant to replace it; hence its near-medieval literalness. In 1700, when Caryl's rendition was first printed, the text of the Douay-Rheims Psalter was over 100 years old: it was translated in the late 16th century but – due to financial deficiencies – it had to wait several years for the publication before being printed in 1610. This being so, we may conclude that John Caryl undertook the translation which was 'sanctioned' by the existence

²⁰ An excursion on the principles of biblical translation would be due here, but limitations of space do not allow me to expand upon the issue.

²¹ This comment is not applicable to vernacular translations of the Bible executed by the Reformed Church.

of the Douay-Rheims Bible, but his text was not part of the official production of the Church. It was not meant as a liturgical text either. The decision to translate the Psalms despite the existence of the English Psalter must have been motivated by the text's deficiencies. It is, therefore, natural that Caryll wanted to improve upon it. This is not to say that Caryll's text is a revision of the Douay-Rheims Bible Psalter. It is not, unless the translation technique is considered. That the Douay-Rheims text did need revision is best evidenced by a series of efforts undertaken by Richard Challoner in the mid-18th century. The text must have seemed deficient, if its revision was officially executed by the Church, whose approach to the translation itself was, as has already been observed, conservative. Moreover, the extent of the revision, which – as has been indicated – deserves to be called a new translation, testifies to the outdated nature of the original Douay-Rheims text in the 18th century.

It is, therefore only fair to assume that the text had been felt to have been in need of a revision for some time before. It is possibly this impulse that inspired Caryll and that must have influenced his translation style – close, but certainly exhibiting more freedom than the Douay-Rheims Bible Psalter. The intended audience must have certainly influenced his translation technique. These are preliminary conclusions which will certainly benefit from a more thorough study of this unique text, especially with the forthcoming publication of its edition.

In sum, King Alfred's and John Caryll's texts stand out from the remaining Psalters for very different reasons. While the verbs *love* and *hate* serve as tests of the translators' consistence, the equivalents of *hope* represent a genuine case study. Having seen that the two translators can be consistent when it comes to equivalents of *diligere* and *odisse/ odire*, the data on *sperare* allowed us to conclude that the consistence is not mechanical. This threw new light on the translation strategy in the case of John Caryll, whose work has not been sufficiently analysed so far. Alfred's translation style has been an object of intense studies, so this study only confirms what has already been established, albeit on the basis of studies undertaken from a different perspective. In this way the consistent choices of the equivalents of *diligere* and *odisse/ odire* and the diverging choices of equivalents of *sperare* offer us an insight into Caryll's work: an insight which – it is hoped – constitutes a starting point in the investigations concerning this undeservedly neglected Psalm translation.

References

Primary Sources

- Bramley, H. R. ed. (1884) *The Psalter, or Psalms of David and Certain Canticles with a Translation and Exposition in English by Richard Rolle of Hampole. Edited from Manuscripts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [online] <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/textidx?c=cme;cc=cme;view=toc;idno=AJF399.0001.001>.
- Bülbring, K. D., ed. (1891) *The Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter together with Eleven Canticles and a Translation of the Athanasian Creed. Edited from the Only Two MSS. in the Libraries of the British Museum and of the Trinity College, Dublin with Preface, Introduction, Notes and Glossary*.
- Caryll, J. (1700) *The Psalmes of David, Translated from the Vulgat*. Saint Germain: W. Weston.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, M. (2013) *Text and Context in Jerome's Psalters: Prose Translations into Old, Middle and Early Modern English*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Douay-Rheims Bible = The Original and Complete 1582–1610 Douai-Rheims Catholic Translation of the Latin Vulgate. [online] <http://www.fatimamovement.com/i-real-douay-rheims.php>.
- 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. [online] <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=cme;cc=cme;view=toc;idno=AFZ9170.0001.001>.
- Stuttgart Bible = Weber, R., ed. (1969) *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt.

Secondary Sources

- Achtemeier, P. J., ed. (1996) *The HarperCollins Bible Dictionary*. Revised edition. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Allen, H. E. (1927) *Writings Ascribed to Richard Rolle, Hermit of Hampole and Materials for his Biography*. New York and London: D.C. Heath.
- Allen, R. S. (1988) *Richard Rolle. The English Writings*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Bassnett, S. (1980) [2002] *Translation Studies*. 3rd Edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bately, J. M. (1982) Lexical evidence for the authorship of the prose psalms in the Paris Psalter. *Anglo-Saxon England* 10, 69–95.
- Black, R. R. and R. C. St-Jacques, eds. (2012) *The Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter*. Parts I and II. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Bobrick, B. (2001) *The Making of the English Bible*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Brown, G. H. (1999) The psalms as the foundation of Anglo-Saxon learning. In N. E. van Deusen (ed.), *The Place of the Psalms in the Intellectual Culture in the Middle Ages*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1–24.

- Bruce, F. F. (1961) [1963] *The English Bible*. 2nd edition. London: Methuen and Co.
- Bruyne, D. de (1930) Le problème du Psautier Romain. *Revue Bénédictine* 42, 101–126.
- Cerquiglioni, B. (1989) [1999] *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology*. Translated by B. Wing. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, M. (2016) The anatomy of two medieval translations of the Psalter. In Ł. Bogucki, B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, and M. Thelen (eds.), *Translation and Meaning. New Series*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1, Frankfurt am Main and New York: Peter Lang, 189–208.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, M. (2017a) To translate is human, to explain – divine. In A. Kijak, A. M. Łęcki, and J. Nykiel (eds.), *Current Developments in English Historical Linguistics. Studies in Honour of Rafał Molencki*, Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 195–213.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, M. (2017b) Handling synonymity in mediaeval translations of the Psalter into English. In A. R. Knapik, K. Buczek, P. P. Chruszczewski, R. L. Lanigan, J. R. Rickford (eds.), *Ways to Religion*. Vol. 1, Wrocław and Washington: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Filologicznej we Wrocławiu, 9–39.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, M. (in prep.) John Caryl's 'The Psalmes of David, Translated from the Vulgat'. An Edition with Commentary.
- Cook, A. S. (1898) *Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers. Edited with the Vulgate and Other Latin Originals, Introduction on Old English Biblical Versions, Index of Biblical Passages, and Index of Principal Words*. London: Macmillan and Co. and New York, NY: Macmillan Company.
- Cooper, W. R. *John Trevisa, the Translator of Wycliffe B: A Consideration of the Evidence*. [online] <http://www.tyndale.org/TSJ/25/cooper.html>.
- Coverdale, M. (1540) *The Psalter or Booke of Psalmes Both in Latyne and Englyshe. Translated into Englyshe out of the Como[n] Texte in Latyne, which Customably is Redde in the Churche*. London: Ricardus Grafton. [online] Early English Books Online.
- Daniell, D. (2003) *The Bible in English. Its History and Influence*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Davies, P. R. and C. E. Thomson (2002) The Wycliffite Bible: an electronic resource. In J. Cook (ed.), *Bible and Computer*, Leiden: Brill, 677–680.
- Deanesly, M. (1920) *The Lollard Bible and Other Medieval Biblical Versions*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Devries, W. (1889) The English Bible. *The Old and New Testament Student* 9 (1), 152–161.
- Dove, M. (2007) *The First English Bible: The Text and Context of the Wycliffite Versions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drabble, M., ed. (1932) [1985] *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. 5th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eadie, J. (1876) *The English Bible: An External and Critical History of the Various English Translations of the Scripture, with Remarks on the Need of Revising the English New Testament*. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Edgar, S. and A. M. Kinney, eds. (2011) *The Vulgate Bible. Volume III: The Poetical Books. Douay-Rheims Translation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Fanous, S. and V. Gillespie, eds. (2011) *Medieval English Mysticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fowler, D. C. (1995) *The Life and Times of John Trevisa, Medieval Scholar*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Greenslade, S. L. (1963) English versions of the Bible A.D. 1526–1611. In S. L. Greenslade (ed.), *Cambridge History of the Bible. Volume 3: The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 141–174.
- Hargreaves, H. (1955) The Latin text of Purvey's Psalter. *Medium Ævum* 24, 73–90.
- Hargreaves, H. (1965) From Bede to Wyclif: medieval English Bible translations. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48, 118–140.
- Harris, S. J. (2012) Happiness and the psalms. In M. Fox and M. Sharma (eds.), *Old English Literature and the Old Testament*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 292–314.
- Jellicoe, S. (1968) *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kenyon, F. G. (1895) [1903] *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts: Being a History of the Text and its Translations*. 4th edition. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode.
- Lavender, J. (2004) The Midland Prose Psalter: A Middle English Transcript Edition of MS. Cambridge, Magdalene, Pepys 2498, FF. 263s.–361s. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Houston, Houston.
- Lawton, D. (1999) Englishing the Bible, 1066–1549. In D. Wallace (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 454–482.
- Lewis, J. (1739) *A Complete History of the Several Translations of the Holy Bible and New Testament, into English, Both in MS. and in Print: and of the Most Remarkable Editions of Them Since the Invention of Printing*. 2nd edition. London: H. Woodfall.
- Linde, C. (2012) [2015] *How to Correct the Sacra Scriptura. Textual Criticism of the Latin Bible between the Twelfth and Fifteenth Century*. Oxford: Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature.
- Metzger, B. M. (2001) *The Bible in Translation. Ancient and English Versions*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Muir, A. L. (1948) Some observations on the early English psalters and the English vocabulary. *Modern Language Quarterly* 9 (3), 273–276.
- Norton, D. (2000) *A History of the English Bible as Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Neill, P. P. (2001) *King Alfred's Old English Prose Translation of the First Fifty Psalms*. Cambridge: Medieval Academy Books.
- Partridge, A. C. (1973) *English Biblical Translation*. London: André Deutsch.
- 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.

- Pollard, A. W. (1911) *Records of the English Bible. The Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525–1611*. London, New York, Toronto, and Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Pratt, D. (2007) *The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pulsiano, P., ed. (2001) *Old English Glossed Psalters. Psalms 1–50*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rebenich, S. (1993) Jerome: the ‘Vir Trilinguis’ and the ‘Hebraica Veritas.’ *Vigiliae Christianae* 47 (1), 50–77.
- Reuter, O. (1938) A study of the French words in the ‘Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter.’ *Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 9 (4), 1–60.
- Sisam, C. and K. Sisam, eds. (1959) *The Salisbury Psalter. Edited from Salisbury Cathedral MS. 150*. London, New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Slater, J. R. (1911) English versions before 1611. *The Biblical World* 37 (4), 232–239.
- Smith, W. (1865) *A Concise Dictionary of the Bible Comprising its Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Natural History: Being a Condensation of the Larger Dictionary*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- St-Jacques, R. C. (1989) Middle English glossed prose psalter and its French source. In J. Beer (ed.), *Medieval Translators and Their Craft*, Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 135–154.
- Sutcliffe, E. F. (1969) Jerome. In G. W. H. Lampe (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible. Volume 2: The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 80–101.
- Thorpe, B., ed. (1835) *Libri Psalmorum Versio Antiqua Latina; cum Paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica, Partim Soluta Oratione, Partim Metrica Composita*. Oxford: E Typographeo Academico.
- Wakelin, D. (2014) *Scribal Correction and Literary Craft. English Manuscripts 1375–1510*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ward, B. (1909) Douay Bible. In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company. [online] <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05140a.htm>.
- Waterland, D. (1724) *A Critical History of the Athanasian Creed. Representing the Opinions of Antients and Moderns Concerning it: with an Account of the Manuscripts, Versions and Comments, and such Other Particulars as Are of Moment for the Determining the Age, and Author, and the Value of it, and the Time of its Reception in the Christian Churches*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Whitaker, W. *Words: Latin-to-English and English-to-Latin Dictionary*. [online] <http://archives.nd.edu/words.html>.
- Wiesenekker-Huizen, E. (2000) Translation procedures in the West Saxon prose psalter. *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur Älteren Germanistik* 53, 41–85.
- Wülker, R. P. (1885) *Grundriss zur Geschichte der Angelsächsischen Literatur mit Einer Übersicht der Angelsächsischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Leipzig: Verlag von Veit and Company.