

MAGDALENA CHARZYŃSKA-WÓJCIK

The John Paul II Catholic University

mcwojcik@kul.pl

## THE PSALTER OVER THE WATER – A MULTIDISCIPLINARY ACCOUNT OF ORIGINALITY\*

The paper deals with a little-known translation of the Vulgate Psalter which was published anonymously in 1700 in Saint-Germain-en-Laye by the printer of the exiled court of King James VII of Scotland and II of England. The paper argues in favour of the originality of the translation in the face of the claim expressed in the literature that it represents a revision of an earlier English rendition made from the Vulgate published in 1610 as part of the Douay-Rheims Bible. The adduced data draw from history, life writing studies and linguistics, thereby offering multidisciplinary evidence in favour of the originality of the rendition.

Keywords: *Psalter, translation, Jacobite court, life-writing studies, linguistics*

### 1. Introduction

The paper is devoted to a little-known translation of the Vulgate Psalter made at the exiled court of the King James VII of Scotland and II of England (1688-1701),<sup>1</sup> with a view to arguing in favour of the originality of the translation in the face of the claim put forward by Scott (2004: 275) that it represents a reworking of an earlier translation of the Book of Psalms printed in the Douay-Rheims Bible in 1610.

The claim concerning the independence of the Jacobite Psalter of the Douay-Rheims Bible Psalter is based on data representing various disciplines: history, life writing studies and linguistics. The confines of the paper allow only an overview

---

\* I would like to thank Professor Edward Corp for patiently answering so many of my questions concerning various aspects of life at the exiled court.

<sup>1</sup> After the Glorious Revolution of 1688, King James II was deposed and fled to France, where he established his court at Saint-Germain-en-Laye; this exile gave rise to the term “the King over the water”.

of the relevant methodology and a sample analysis based on it, but the joint force of the data presented will be sufficient to substantiate the claim put forward.

The translation discussed here was first published in 1700. The publication does not give the translator's name, nor does it reveal the printing house or the place of the publication. However, as early as the late 18th century, the publication began to be associated in the relevant literature with Lord John Caryll. The first mention of the translation I have come across appears in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, where in an entry devoted to John Caryll (vol. IV: 219) it is stated that "in 1700, he published 'The Psalms of David, translated from the Vulgate'".<sup>2</sup> To the best of my knowledge, this claim with respect to Caryll's authorship of the translation has never been challenged, though with time the identity of John Caryll, originally confusion of the uncle (1625-1711, joint secretary of King James II and his second wife, Mary of Modena,) with his nephew (1667-1736, the dedicatee of Alexander Pope's *The Rape of the Lock*),<sup>3</sup> both bearing the same name and surname, was disambiguated and settled firmly on the uncle. However, much later, next to the name of Lord John Caryll as the translator of the 1700 psalms, another name appeared with the suggestion of a collaboration in the authorship of the translation. In particular, Edward Corp (1998, 2004, 2017) points to Sir David Nairne<sup>4</sup> as a co-translator of the Psalter hitherto associated exclusively with Caryll. Much earlier than that, the information concerning Caryll's authorship was supplanted by that of the place of the publication and the printer: "printed at St. Germain's by W. Weston" (Wilson 1845: 265).

In contrast to the authorship, the printing house, and the place of the publication, the source text of the translation has never been subject to conjecture, due to the fact that the title of the 1700 Psalter states that the Psalms are translated "from the Vulgate". There is, however, a claim in the literature which I would like to challenge in this paper concerning the status of this translation. While nobody argues with the Vulgate as being the ultimate source of the 1700

<sup>2</sup> The first edition of *Encyclopædia Britannica* was printed between 1768-71 in three volumes but it did not contain biographical information. *Encyclopædia Britannica* continued to grow in size with successive editions. The second edition was already a 10-volume enterprise and, in contrast to the first, it did contain history and biography articles. It was published in 1777-1784, with the C-volume printed in 1778, which is most probably when John Caryll was first mentioned as the translator of the 1700 Psalter. However, being unable to reach a facsimile of the C-volume from 1778, I rely on the information presented in the third edition from 1797 (all 18 volumes are dated to 1797).

<sup>3</sup> The information originally appears in *Encyclopædia Britannica* in Caryll's entry and is repeated in many other sources, for example Chalmers (1813: 348).

<sup>4</sup> David Nairne was born in 1655 in Scotland and was brought up in the Episcopalian Church of Scotland but later converted to Catholicism. Though he belonged to the exiled court of James II at Saint-Germain, his departure from Scotland was independent of the Glorious Revolution: he left Scotland much earlier – in 1674 – to the United Provinces. From there he travelled to France, where he married a French noblewoman, Marie-Elisabeth de Compigny. His status was therefore that of a voluntary ex-patriate, in contrast to those members of the Jacobite court who followed the King into exile and were therefore, like James II himself, political exiles.

publication, according to Scott (2004: 275) this translation is a reworking of the Douay-Rheims Psalter: “[t]his translation was an updated version of the Psalms found in the Douai Bible of 1609”.<sup>5</sup> One has to bear in mind, however, that the statement concerning the status of the 1700 Psalter as a *revision* of the Douay-Rheims Bible text is not presented by Scott in opposition to any prior claims, nor does it constitute support for an earlier stance. Yet Scott’s claim is explicit and in effect may lead to the acceptance of his stance concerning the status of the 1700 Psalter as a revision.

Being acquainted with both the 1700 Psalter and the Douay-Rheims translation, I immediately doubted the veracity of this claim: the texts are different. My first reaction was, therefore, an attempt to figure out what had prompted this conclusion. The only earlier mention which I managed to identify as a possible source of Scott’s claim is Cotton (1852: 198), who (in addition to the basic information, which agrees with the received view presented above) states that “[b]y the approbations prefixed, it appears that this version was intended to supersede that in the Douay Bible, which was now considered to be too literal, as well as too antiquated for general use”. It seems that Scott may have inadvertently misrepresented this statement.

## **2. Joint forces in defence of the originality hypothesis: history, life writing studies, and linguistics**

Only one translation of the Bible from the Vulgate into English was produced in the modern period under the auspices of the Catholic Church. This was prepared by the English divines who established an English College in Douay in France, in a newly founded Catholic university. These developments occurred in the wake of the reign of Elizabeth I, whose accession to the throne resulted in the restoration of Protestantism in England. Large numbers of Catholics then left England and moved to the Continent, including William Allan, head of the translating team working in Douay. The New Testament prepared under his supervision was published in 1582; and the Old Testament was printed in 1609-1610 in Rheims.<sup>6</sup>

This English translation, the only one authorized by Rome, was a reaction of the Catholic Church to the plethora of English translations of the Bible prepared and printed by the Reformed Church. The latter were not based on the Vulgate but (at least in principle) on the original languages and were widely available. Therefore a speaker of English willing to get acquainted with the Bible was

---

<sup>5</sup> As signalled later in the text, the Old Testament of the Douay-Rheims Bible was printed in two volumes in 1609 and 1610, with the Psalter appearing as the first book of the second volume. Therefore the correct reference to the Psalter of (the first edition of) the Douay-Rheims Bible is to the year 1610.

<sup>6</sup> For details of the history of English biblical translations in the turbulent 16th and 17th centuries, see Daniell (2003).

most likely to get hold of the Protestant text. The Douay-Rheims Bible was, thus more of a countermeasure to the available English Bibles – an approved option for those determined to read the Bible in English – than a translation intended for general circulation. This objective tallies with the low number of print-runs the Douay-Rheims translation went through: three editions of the New Testament, and only one reprint of the whole Bible in the 17th century. The numbers are especially telling when compared with the hundreds of editions of new translations associated with the Reformed Church. The text of the first English Catholic translation of the Bible was not revised until the mid-18th century, when it started to receive more editions.<sup>7</sup> So, in 1700, when Caryll's translation was published, it was the only alternative prose translation of the Book of Psalms in English.<sup>8</sup> The Psalter of the Douay-Rheims Bible was by that time linguistically outdated and not in wide circulation due to the limited number of editions.

It is my claim that it is in this context that one should read Cotton's (1852) comment concerning the relation of the 1700 Psalter to the Douay-Rheims Bible. The 1700 text was "intended to supersede that in the Douay Bible, which was now considered to be too literal, as well as too antiquated for general use" only in the sense of representing a text not suffering from the afore-mentioned drawbacks. Consequently, I want to defend the position that the 1700 text is not, contrary to Scott (2004: 275), a reworking of the Douay-Rheims Psalter but a completely new *translation*.

In addition to the historical context presented above, which clarifies how one should read Cotton's comment, there are two types of argument supporting my stance. First, there is the diary of Sir David Nairne, which he was keeping at the time when the Psalter emerged: he describes the process as *translating* the Psalms, not *revising* them. Secondly, a comparison of the Douay-Rheims Psalter with the 1700 text does not point towards the Jacobite enterprise being a revision

<sup>7</sup> The text was reviewed several times by Richard Challoner. The changes he introduced are so extensive that it seems more correct to call it a new translation (cf. Charzyńska-Wójcik 2013: 92). The revised New Testament was issued in 1749, 1750, 1752, 1764, 1772; the revised Old Testament in 1750 and 1763-64.

<sup>8</sup> Earlier translations of the Psalter which have come down to the Modern period date back to the 14th century. Their language and the fact that they never made it into print exclude the possibility of any circulation in the modern period. There was also one earlier prose translation of the Latin Psalter into English, namely in the Anglo-Saxon times (cf. Charzyńska-Wójcik 2013) but it survives in a single copy from the 11th century.

The 14th-century prose translations of the Psalms in the first half of the century are associated with Richard Rolle, who produced an English Psalter with commentary, and an anonymous translator who rendered into English a glossed Latin Psalter (via a French intermediary). The latter part of the 14th century also brought two English Psalters in prose: these are the Psalters from the first two complete translations of the Bible and are associated with John Wycliffe, the so-called Early and Late Version.

For details of these renditions and for the information concerning the first printed English Psalter, see Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013 and 2014).

of the Douay-Rheims Psalter. Both arguments have their shortcomings but, as will be argued below, they are not insurmountable.

The support for the originality of the 1700 text coming from the diary account, where Nairne describes the whole process of translating the Psalms, could be refuted or at least weakened by a life-writing approach which tackles the question of the truth value<sup>9</sup> of egodocuments.<sup>10</sup> As has been emphasized a number of times, accounts of events presented in diaries and journals cannot by definition be assumed to be historically i.e. factually correct. Moreover, there is the whole issue of gaps and (over)interpretations. There is much which is not said in a diary and has to be understood from the immediate context of the described events, which is not available to us. And there is, in effect, a whole world in between the lines, which decreases or at least affects the reliability of diary accounts. Some details are omitted as too obvious, others as irrelevant, and there is often no way of telling which case we are dealing with, especially since there are degrees of overlap between the two categories of omission. Consequently, if a diarist straightforwardly describes a process as a translation rather than in terms of an opposition between translation and revision, this does not exclude the possibility of (at least) a joint activity. We need to bear in mind that the obvious or the irrelevant may be omitted from the account with no intention (or even awareness) on the part of the diarist that the facts are misrepresented when the account is made available to an uncontextualized reader. This to a great extent boils down to the intentions of the diarist – itself a topic which exceeds the limits of this paper.<sup>11</sup> These shortcomings are so serious that they threaten to invalidate the value of the diary account altogether, but Section 3 will show how we can make the best of the available diary data so that the objections just raised can be dismissed.

When it comes to a linguistic comparison of the Douay-Rheims Psalter with the Jacobite text, the question is how to measure degrees of similarity. I have already indicated that the texts are *different*. But they also show manifold similarities, relating to lexis, grammar, word-order, and clause structure

<sup>9</sup> The issue of truth in egodocuments is discussed by many authors and it is neither necessary nor possible to present an overview of the field. Let me only remark that I do not subscribe to the overall distrust of the truthfulness of diaries demonstrated by a growing number of scholars. As observed by Rodak (2009: 23), while this distrust was originally only addressed at writers' diaries, the approach has been extended to cover all diary types regardless of the provenience of their author. Such an approach assumes that the dominant features of diaries are construction and creation, which are contrasted with truth and truthfulness. Rodak (2009) offers a useful discussion on kinds of truth and their status in diaries.

<sup>10</sup> The term *egodocument* was coined by a Dutch historian Jacques Presser (1899-1970) in 1958 "to identify a broad category comprising several forms of autobiographical texts, including autobiographies, memoirs, diaries, travel journals, and personal letters" (Mascuch, Dekker and Baggerman 2016: 11). In recent years interest in egodocuments has expanded, turning egodocument studies it into a thriving multidisciplinary field.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Cieński (2002) and Szulakiewicz (2013) for an interesting discussion.

more generally. There are fragments which are indeed almost identical, as exemplified by verse 6 in Psalm 1, where the 1610 translation: *Therefore the impious shal not rise againe in iudgement: nor sinners in the counsell of the iust* sounds almost the same as the 1700 text: *Therefore the wicked shall not rise in the Judgement, Nor sinners in the Councill of the Just*. This, however, is only to be expected. Observe that the two Psalters are based on the same source, the *Gallicanum*, and were divided by not much more than one hundred years at a time when the English language was not changing rapidly. These two factors jointly precondition several similarities and we have to face the task of differentiating between natural similarities determined by the above factors, and those supposedly resulting from the Douay-Rheims text being the source for the 1700 Psalter. Section 4 will discuss how to get us out of this predicament.

As has been signalled, the remainder of this paper will focus on these two issues: the reliability of the diary account and linguistic comparison of the 1610 translation with the 1700 text, with a view to determining to what extent the natural limitations and shortcomings of the two types of data which have just been articulated can be overcome, in order for these data to serve as valid arguments for refuting Scott's claim. Naturally, the confines of the paper allow me to present only an outline of the relevant methodologies, rather than detailed results of their application. These, however, together with other findings, will offer sufficient grounds for legitimizing the claim concerning the originality of the 1700 translation.

### 3. The diary data

Nairne's diary was a peculiar production: it was not a business diary *per se*, but was certainly not (exclusively) a record of his private affairs either. Neither was it a description of Nairne's feelings. The omissions are strange, and so is the almost total absence of a record of Nairne's emotional states. To exemplify the former, Nairne does not record the births of his wife's two step-brothers (Corp 2017: 102), though these threatened her – or rather their – anticipated inheritance and potential material situation, an issue which is a constant concern of Nairne's throughout the diary. However, the negotiations over the inheritance after his father-in-law's death are recorded in his diary in sufficient detail for us to be able to reconstruct the whole story. Likewise, the deaths of his children (he lost six of nine) are recorded in the diary simply as facts unaccompanied by any lengthier comments concerning his or his wife Marie-Elisabeth's emotional state. This is not to say that Nairne and his wife did not suffer the losses, or that he did not need to express his feelings. On the contrary, he did.<sup>12</sup> But he

<sup>12</sup> I appreciate Corp's (2017: 49-50) comment on the issue, who observes that "[t]he death of babies and infants in those days was so frequent that it is easy to underestimate the feelings of the bereaved parents, and Nairne's diary contains nothing to indicate any great sense of loss".

outpoured his distress in private letters, which he wrote throughout his life with great frequency. In a letter written to one of his friends from Rome after the death of his daughter, he writes: “I hope you’ll pardon this digression to my excessive grief and ... pray for my wife and me yt wee may make a good use of our Cross” (Corp 2017: 50).<sup>13</sup> He did feel an urge to express his grief, as is clear from this quotation including the apology to his addressee for dwelling on the topic of his grief excessively. But in his diary the account of his grief is limited to one sentence, where he says that he and his wife “received her last breath with an inexpressible affliction” (Corp 2017: 49). Paradoxically, we can almost sense his distress when the diary account is read indirectly: it is the agonizing amount of detail with which he describes his son’s illness, all the medical treatments he was exposed to, and the little boy’s reaction to these medical applications, that lets us into Nairne’s distress. But Nairne himself does not do it.

A typical entry in a diary contains information concerning Nairne’s religious devotions, which he practiced daily, a briefing of his secretarial duties and achievements (often in the form of a list), and an account of important meetings.<sup>14</sup> In effect, Nairne’s diary is best described as a memory prompt. He records what he might be likely to forget: the details, not the general outlines of any situation.

There are several questions that can and should be asked at this point, the most important being the following two: Did he mean the diary to be read by anybody else; and did he envisage a potential reader?<sup>15</sup> The answer to the first question seems negative: the account of his life is incomplete, many crucial pieces of information are taken for granted and as such are omitted and unrecoverable. For example, Nairne’s diary does not mention the names of two of his three brothers or what he studied in the United Provinces – clearly not an accidental oversight in a text intended for an external reader. Moreover,

<sup>13</sup> I quote Nairne’s letters verbatim after Corp (2017), with the retention of all conventions he introduces, though they differ from the ones I use in representing Nairne’s diary. One example is that I expand abbreviations and mark the expansions by italics, while Corp does not. This is particularly visible in the case of *y<sup>e</sup>*, which Corp presents as *ye*, and I expand as *the*.

<sup>14</sup> It is irresistible at this stage to quote Lejeune (2009: 51), who observes that “[t]he diary, like writing itself, was born of the needs of commerce and administration”, hence an invention answering a natural need to support one’s memory. Lejeune observes that making dated records has always served two basic functions: internal (to keep track of things and affairs) and external (to be used as evidence in a potential dispute).

<sup>15</sup> It is necessary at this point to comment upon the term *potential reader* and its relationship to Eco’s *model reader*, as used in Eco et al. (1992). While for the model reader textual devices are critical (i.e. how reader is *preselected* and *designed* by the text itself, for example, by emulating or doing away with literary conventions), a potential reader would be an anticipated empirical reader, one sociologically and historically immersed: an actual person or a circle of persons for whom the information provided in and by text is intelligible enough, thus allowing the author to reduce explanations and assume (at least a certain degree of) mutual knowledge.

Nairne's use of abbreviations seems to support the claim that the diary was not meant for an external readership.

As any diarist of this age, he uses abbreviations. It was a natural practice not only for speeding up the process of writing and but also for saving space. Anybody familiar with Nairne's diary understands that the latter advantage was of particular value to him: the ever-shrinking handwriting with which Nairne recorded his daily affairs testifies to his trying to squeeze in as much as possible in as little space as sustained legibility permitted.

Nairne's abbreviations fall into two types: abbreviations which are general enough to be recoverable even by a modern reader (for example: *w<sup>ch</sup>* for *which*, *y<sup>t</sup>* for *that*, *y<sup>e</sup>* for *the*, *w<sup>th</sup>* for *with*, *acc<sup>t</sup>* for *account*, *rec<sup>d</sup>* for *received*, *testam<sup>t</sup>* for *testament*, *lré* for *letter*<sup>16</sup> etc.) at least some of which must have been in circulation amongst people around him.<sup>17</sup> The use of these abbreviations cannot be considered an argument against an external reader. The other type of abbreviation very common in Nairne's diary are personal names. Here Nairne is neither explicit nor consistent, clearly making notes that were meant to be recoverable but most likely only by himself. For example, he refers to John Caryll as: Mr Caryll, Mr Caryl, Mr Car., Mr C. The variety might suggest different individuals, unless it is clear to the reader (especially if he coincides with the author) that there is no other person with a similar surname.<sup>18</sup>

Bearing in mind that Nairne's diary seems not to have been intended for an external reader, his notes concerning the translation of the Psalms should not be interpreted as a way of *creating* a reality for the sake of enhancing his reputation but as a record (even if only for himself) of his involvement in the process. This explanation for recording his daily tasks seems the most likely motivation throughout his diary. He writes down a detailed account of his manifold engagements which he could rely on if need be. What transpires from his pages is that Nairne executed his tasks conscientiously and was a well-organized man, part of this being this detailed record he kept of when a letter was drafted, when a fair copy was made, when it was dispatched, how many copies of what document were prepared, or how much an item was paid for. He was also entrusted with private finances of several people. All these details were stored in his diary, just like the detailed account of the translation process in which he was involved.<sup>19</sup>

Being employed as a clerk at the court,<sup>20</sup> he was obviously aware that written records (including a diary) tended to be read by people not intended

<sup>16</sup> The exact visual representation of these abbreviations differs slightly from these presented here in the standardized spelling but that is the closest one can get to the idiosyncrasies of Nairne's handwritten abbreviations.

<sup>17</sup> He also uses these abbreviations in his letters.

<sup>18</sup> He frequently writes *m. w.* as an abbreviation of *my wife*, though not consistently so.

<sup>19</sup> While it is clear that he was involved in the process, the exact nature of his contribution is not discussed in the diary.

<sup>20</sup> For a detailed description of Nairne's manifold duties performed at the exiled courts of James II and his son, see Corp (2017).

as their addressees. He might, therefore, be expected to consciously include some information on account of a possible – even if unwanted – reader. The information could of course be either true, in which case we would be dealing with a conscious *selection* of the presented information, or false, in which case Nairne would be producing fraud. While the former cannot, in principle, be excluded (a diary is always a selection, the question is who is the selection meant for and for what purpose), the latter seems highly unlikely, considering the overall impeccable course of his career. Moreover, there would be no reasonable justification for fabricating information which was immediately falsifiable and which would undermine his credibility. If the text was a *revision*, as claimed by Scott (2004), an account of a *translation* would discredit both Nairne and his master, Lord John Caryll, whom he held in high esteem. Moreover, Nairne being Caryll's undersecretary, his respect for Caryll naturally went hand in hand with the financial security of the Nairne family.

To conclude, paleographical evidence available in the diary points to the account of Nairne's life as being intended as a personal memory prompt, even if very much professionally centred. If he envisaged an unwanted reader, there is no reason to suspect that he misrepresented the revision process as a translation, since this would entail embroiling Lord Caryll, on whose high opinion (of Nairne) the financial security of his family rested.

This purely logical argument in favour of Nairne's diaristic truthfulness, which abstracts away from Nairne's personality does not, however, do the man justice, but it has the advantage of being impartial and therefore more convincing than an account referring to Nairne's character. It is necessary, however, to note that Nairne was a paragon of virtue: hard-working, loyal, caring, and law-abiding; and this is not a picture emerging exclusively from the pages of his diary, in which case it would be a worthless brag. What we find in the diary only supplements other historical sources meticulously presented in a portrait of an unusual man by Corp (2017).

#### 4. Linguistic comparison

As has already been said, the 1610 and 1700 Psalters are *different* from one another. However, as can be expected, there are also plenty of similarities to be observed between the two Psalters, as shown in (1) below.

(1)

1.1

1610: Blessed is the man, that hath not gone in the counsel of the impious, & hath not stooode in the way of sinners, and hath not sitte in the chayre of pestilence:

1700: BLESSED is the man who has not walked in the Counsel of the Impious, Nor has stood in the Way of sinners, Nor has sat down in the chaire of Infection.<sup>21</sup>

1704: BLESSED is the man who has not walked in the Counsel of the Impious, Nor has stood in the Way of sinners, Nor has sat down in the chaire of Infection.

Given the problems hinted at in Section 2 above of distinguishing between those similarities between the 1610 and 1700 Psalters which represent natural choices and those which would result from the 1700 text being a reworking of the 1610 translation, it seems best to focus instead on the *differences* between the 1610 and the 1700 Psalters. There is one more piece of data which is of special relevance in this respect and which will, it is hoped, conclusively clarify the issue of the independence of the 1700 translation of the Douay-Rheims Bible Psalter. In particular, the 1700 text was revised by Caryl and Nairne and printed again in 1704. If it can be shown that the 1704 text converges with the 1610 text in important methodological respects, while diverging from the first edition, it can be concluded that the Douay-Rheims text was not the basis of the 1700 publication. Importantly, not all instances of such removed differences will be equally valid for the argument to hold, as will be shown in the discussion below.

I have therefore traced the differences in Psalms 1-50<sup>22</sup> between the 1700 and 1704 editions and compared them with the Douay-Rheims text. The total number of verses in the examined material is 861. Corrections of various types have been observed in 137 of them.<sup>23</sup> As far as individual psalms are concerned, only 11 psalms have been left unchanged, while in the remaining 39 psalms the proportion of verses affected by revision ranges from 2% to 71.4%. The average ratio of reviewed verses per psalm is 15.9%.

Even a cursory examination is sufficient to illustrate the independent origin of the 1700 Psalter from the 1610 text. Some illustrative data are presented in (2) below:

<sup>21</sup> All texts are quoted from their original editions with the retention of all spelling and editing conventions, even if they contrast with these obtaining nowadays.

<sup>22</sup> I have prepared a parallel edition of Psalms 1-50 of the 1700 and 1704 text and all my further work is based on this portion of material. The limitation of the edition and examination to the first 50 psalms is motivated pragmatically and historically. First of all, the text of 50 psalms constitutes a sufficient sample for linguistic examinations of various types. Importantly, it also represents the first of the “three fifties” – a historical division of long standing, going back to the fourth century, argued for by Hilary of Poitiers (cf. Daley 2004: 199), Augustin (cf. his commentary to Psalm 150, as shown in Schaff, p. 1356), and Cassiodorus (Gillingham 2012). An alternative fivefold division was advocated by Gregory of Nyssa and Jerome. The “three fifties” is usually associated with Irish devotion, but it had some other European parallels (cf. Jeffrey 2000).

<sup>23</sup> Some verses contain more than one correction and as far as classifications of these corrections are concerned, they sometimes overlap.

(2)

1.2

*Gallicanum*: Sed in lege domini voluntas eius: & in lege eius meditabitur die ac nocte.<sup>24</sup>

1610: But his **wil** is the **way** of **our Lord**, and in **his law** he **wil meditate** day and night.

1700: But his delight is in the law of **God**, And **he meditates on it** day and night.

1704: But his delight is in the law of **our Lord**; and **on his law** he **will meditate** day and night.

As is clear, in (2) above the 1704 text reverts to choices closer to the 1610 text. Not all points, however, are of equal importance. Let us discuss them as they come in the text. First, *Dominus* is translated as *God* in 1700 but the 1704 revision complies with the 1610 text in selecting *our Lord*. This choice, however, is not crucial in any way: it is only a lexical equivalent, even if *Dominus* is normally translated as *Lord*, with *God* being a slip here, it is certainly easily accountable for and definitely cannot be viewed as a mistake. What comes next is more important: *meditabitur*, which represents a future 3 SG indicative form, is correctly (in the strict sense) rendered as future: *wil meditate* in 1610, but the 1700 text goes for a present tense. The choice is corrected to the future only in the revised 1704 version. This would not be the case if the Douay-Rheims text was the basis for the 1700 publication, as we are not dealing with a stylistic decision or a choice of an equivalent, but a grammatical issue, which is not a matter of taste but closeness of the translation and therefore represents one of the key tenets of the translation protocol.

A similar relationship obtains in the case of *in lege eius*. The 1700 text departs from the Latin original in resorting to a pronoun, which in turn induces a postverbal placement, with the result that it diverges from Latin in two respects. The effect sounds natural but departs from the Latin original, despite the declaration in the Preface that the Psalms are to be rendered “as clear and intelligible in our language, as the letter of the *Texte* will *permitt*: for in every Translation of scripture *ther* is an obligation of sticking close to the Letter when ever it can be done without losing the sense of the Text”.<sup>25</sup> The revised version brings the text closer to Latin and the resulting rendition resembles the Douay-Rheims translation. If the 1700 text had been a revision the 1610 translation, or *modelled* on the 1610 text, the choices would naturally agree with this “original”. But this was clearly not the case.

<sup>24</sup> The Latin text of the Psalter is quoted here after the standard edition of Weber (1969).

<sup>25</sup> This quotation presents the original spelling from the 1700 edition. The Preface from the 1704 edition shows only three minor spelling differences with respect to the text quoted above. In particular the words italicized in the text above for the convenience of the reader are spelt in 1704 as: *Text*, *permit*, *there*.

There are more instances of this kind of practice in the text. Especially telling are instances where grammatical inconsistencies<sup>26</sup> emerge in the 1700 text, in contrast to the 1610 Psalter, and are then corrected again in the 1704 edition. This happens in 10.22, where *tribulatione*, which is singular, is translated as such in 1610: *tribulation* but the 1700 text has the plural *tribulations*, which is corrected to the singular in 1704. Likewise, in 10.23, the passive: *incenditur pauper* is translated as passive in 1610: *the pore man is brent* and 1704: *the Poor man is burnt* but not in 1700: *the poor just man burnes*. While it is not a mistake to translate passives as actives with the proper retention of the semantic roles, clearly the task of the translator was to stick as close to the letter as possible “without losing the sense of the Text”. The reversal in the 1704 edition shows that this was considered out of line.

To be sure, there are plenty of instances of changes in the other direction, i.e. where the 1610 and 1700 texts converge, while the 1704 edition shows a difference. These fall into two types which are relevant for us here. The first type is represented by cases like 10.24, where *laudatur peccator* is rendered in 1610 as: *the sinner is prayed*, while the 1700 text shows: *the sinner is applauded*, and the 1704 edition has: *the sinner applauds himself*. Note, however, that the revision of the 1704 text seems to be an improvement in terms of sense at the cost of convergence of structure – and the Preface gives priority to sense in such instances, as it declares strictness “without losing the sense of the Text”. The second type of changes as between 1700 and 1704 which may look like “undoing” 1610 influence are instances where the 1610 text contains an obvious mistake which is replicated in the 1700 Psalter and one may be tempted to offer them as proof that the 1610 text was indeed used as a model. 13.6 provides as illustrative example. There *veloces pedes eorum ad effundendum sanguinem* is translated in 1610 as *their feete swift to sheed bloud*. The copula verb, optional in Latin but obligatory in English at all stages, is missing here and the mistake is replicated in the 1700 Psalter: *Their feet swift towards the shedding of blood*. The 1704 text rectifies the mistake: *Their feet are swift towards the shedding of blood*. It is certainly tempting to interpret such cases as proof, or at least a strong indication, that the 1610 translation was a model for the 1700 text. For such data to be valid, however, they cannot constitute the sole argument in favour of the derivative character of the 1700 text. They need to be weighed against the abundance of lexical dissimilarities between the two texts (which transpire from all examples quoted here), stylistic differences between them, and instances of grammatical inconsistency, such as those illustrated in 1.2 and 10.22. discussed above.

<sup>26</sup> What I mean by grammatical inconsistencies are instances where the English text shows a different grammatical category than the Latin one and, importantly, the relevant grammatical categories are available both in the target and in the source language. An instance of such inconsistency is a wrong choice of tense, as was the case in (1) above, or the rendering of a plural noun by a singular noun.

What has been said above is not tantamount to claiming that the 1704 revision was actually *done* on the basis of the 1610 text, but the data in (2) and similar examples *exclude* the possibility that the 1700 text was a revision of the 1610 Psalter. The convergence of the 1704 corrections with the Douay-Rheims text may imply that the Douay-Rheims text was consulted in the revision process (not in the translation itself) but the passages where the 1700 text is revised in a way that departs from the 1610 text are much more numerous than those in which the corrections converge. The convergences then are best taken as instances of natural choices than influences – so similarities which do not reveal a common English source but stem from the common Latin source text. Consider the example in (3) below, which intentionally completes the haphazard presentation of similarities and differences in (1)-(3), presenting 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 respectively.

(3)

1.3

*Gallicanum*: Et erit tamquam lignum quod plantatum est secus decursus aquarum: quod fructum suum dabit in tempore suo.

1610: And he shal be as a tree, **that is planted nigh to the streames of waters, which shal geue his fruite in his time:**

1700: And he shall be like the tree planted **upon the banks of a running stream,** That will not faile to bear fruit in **the** season.

1704: And he shall be like the tree planted **near running waters,** that will not faile to bear fruit in **its** season.

## 5. Conclusion

It has been shown in the course of this paper that Scott's claim concerning the derivative character of the 1700 Psalter with respect to the 1610 text cannot be sustained. The arguments adduced draw from the historical context of biblical translations into English; the diary information left to us by David Nairne, a secretary at the Jacobite court, where the translation was carried out; and a linguistic comparison of the two allegedly related texts. The combined weight of the above data proves the independence of the 1700 translation from the 1610 text.

One more issue, however, needs to be raised here. Throughout the paper I have been manoeuvring around the 1700 text so as to avoid as much as possible naming the translator. This is because while the involvement of Lord John Caryll in the translation is beyond doubt, Corp's (1998, 2004, 2017) claim that David Nairne was a co-translator does not seem to follow *directly* from the diary records, though we have both worked with the same diary. While it is clear that Nairne did write out the whole text, and was involved in the whole process from the very beginning to the final corrections, it is not immediately obvious to

me how far his involvement went beyond purely secretarial duties.<sup>27</sup> I attempt to resolve the issue in Charzyńska-Wójcik (in prep.).

## References

### Primary Sources:

- Caryll, J. 1700. *The Psalmes of David, Translated from the Vulgat*. Saint-Germain: W. Weston.
- Caryll, J. 1704. *The Psalmes<sup>28</sup> of David, T[r]anslated from the Vulgat*. Saint-Germain: W. Weston.
- 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>.
- Nairne, D. *Journal. I Tome*. National Library of Scotland: MS 14266.
- Schaff, Ph., ed. *Saint Augustine: Expositions on the Book of Psalms. By St Augustin, Bishop of Hippo. Edited, with Brief Annotations, and Condensed form the Six Volumes of the Oxford Translation, by A. Cleveland Coxe*. Grand Rapids (MI): WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. [online] <https://archive.org/details/SaintAugustineExpositionOnPsalms/page/n1>
- Weber, R., ed. 1969. *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt.

### Secondary Sources:

- Chalmers, A. 1813. *The general biographical dictionary: containing an historical and critical account of the lives and writings of the most eminent persons in every nation; particularly the British and Irish; from the earliest accounts to the present times. A new edition: revised and enlarged*. Vol. VIII. Nichols, Son and Bentley: London. [online] <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=wu.89072313547;view=1up;seq=10>
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, M. 2013. *Text and context in Jerome's psalters: prose translations into Old, Middle and Early Modern English*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, M. 2014. The secrets of a sixteenth-century psalter: in praise of circumstances. *Language and Literary Studies of Warsaw* 4: 135-158.

<sup>27</sup> These naturally included “drafting, copying, translating and filing” (Corp 2017: 1) but at times clerks were allowed varying degrees of independence in preparing the drafts, taking over some correspondence as their sole responsibility, formulating opinions, giving advice, etc. Nairne’s status was much higher than that of an ordinary secretary: he and Caryll developed a friendship based on mutual respect, appreciation, and loyalty but while Nairne’s position (and his extraordinary abilities) did not preclude his creative involvement in Caryll’s enterprise, it is still no more than a possibility so the matter needs to be examined in detail before any definitive conclusion can be drawn.

<sup>28</sup> The two editions show a different spelling of the word *psalms*. Moreover, the title page of the 1704 edition does contain a mistake in the word *translated*.

- Charzyńska-Wójcik, M. in prep. *John Caryll's 'The psalmes of David, translated from the Vulgat'. An edition with commentary.*
- Cieński, A. 2002. *Z dziejów pamiętników w Polsce.* Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Corp, E.T. 1998. Musical manuscripts of „Copiste Z”: David Nairne, François Couperin, and the Stuart Court at Saint-Germain-en-Laye. *Revue de Musicologie* 84: 37-62.
- Corp, E.T. 2004. *A court in exile: the Stuarts in France, 1689-1718.* With contributions by Edward Gregg, Howard Erskine-Hill and Geoffrey Scott. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Corp, E.T. 2017. *Sir David Nairne: The life of a Scottish Jacobite at the court of the exiled Stuarts.* Oxford, Bern and Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Cotton, H. 1852. *Editions of the Bible and parts thereof in English, from the year MDV. to MDCCCL. With an appendix containing specimens of translations, and bibliographical descriptions.* 2nd edition. Oxford: University Press.
- Daley, B. 2004. Finding the right key: the aims and strategies of early Christian interpretation of the psalms. In H.W. Attridge and M.E. Fassler (eds.), *Psalms in community. Jewish and Christian textual, liturgical, and artistic traditions*, 189-206. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Daniell, D. 2003. *The Bible in English. Its history and influence.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Eco, U., R. Rorty, J. Culler and Ch. Brooke-Rose 1992. *Interpretation and overinterpretation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Encyclopædia Britannica, or, a dictionary of arts, sciences, and miscellaneous literature: constructed on a plan, by which the different sciences and arts are digested into the form of distinct treatises or systems, comprehending the history, theory, and practice of each, according to the latest discoveries and improvements...* (3rd edition in 18 vols. 1797) edited by Colin MacFarquhar and George Gleig; illustrated by Andrew Bell. Edinburgh: Printed for A. Bell and C. Macfarquhar. [online] [https://archive.org/details/gri\\_33125011196322/page/n227](https://archive.org/details/gri_33125011196322/page/n227)
- Gillingham, S.E. 2012. A ninth-century Irish Bog Psalter and reading the psalms as ‘Three Fifties’. In G. Khan and D. Lipton (eds.), *Studies on the text and versions of the Hebrew Bible in honour of Robert Gordon*, 373-385. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Jeffrey, P. 2000. Eastern and western elements in monastic prayer. In M.A. Fassler and R.A. Baltzer (eds.), *The divine office in the Latin Middle Ages: methodology and source studies regional developments, hagiography*, 99-143. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lejeune, Ph. 2009. *On diary.* Edited by J.D. Popkin and J. Rak, translated by K. Durinin. Baltimore, Maryland (US): University of Hawai’i Press.
- Mascuch, M., R.M. Dekker and J.A. Baggerman 2016. Egodocuments and history: a short account of the Longue Durée. *Historian* 78: 11-56. doi:10.1111/hisn.12080
- Rodak, P. 2009. Prawda w dzienniku osobistym. *Teksty drugie* 4: 23-38. [online] [http://rcin.org.pl/Content/50234/WA248\\_66374\\_P-I-2524\\_rodak-prawda.pdf](http://rcin.org.pl/Content/50234/WA248_66374_P-I-2524_rodak-prawda.pdf)

- Scott, G. 2004. James III's preceptor: John Betham. In E.T. Corp (ed.), *A court in exile: the Stuarts in France, 1689-1718*. With Contributions by Edward Gregg, Howard Erskine-Hill, and Geoffrey Scott, 265-279. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Szulakiewicz, W. 2013. Ego-dokumenty i ich znaczenie w badaniach naukowych. *Rocznik* 1.16: 65-84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/PBE.2013.006>
- Wilson, L. 1845. *Bibles, testaments, psalms and other books of the holy scriptures in English in the collection of Lea Wilson*. London: C. Whittingham. [online] <https://books.google.pl/books?id=Cp9VAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA265&lpg=PA265&dq=Psalms+of+David+review%27d+and+corrected&source=bl&ots=pmsjj5Ky--&sig=810-MzqVIuSgc-txN1VXuBOMf4k&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKewjtsrSSisfeAhWMCiwKHW0BSwQ6AEwBXoECAYQAQ#v=onepage&q=Psalms%20of%20David%20review'd%20and%20corrected&f=false>