

# ***‘The Simplest and Most Proper’ English of the 14th-Century Richard Rolle’s Psalter Rendition\****

Kinga Lis

## **Abstract**

The paper investigates the claim pertaining to the 14th-century Richard Rolle’s Psalter rendition which asserts that the translator of the text in question adhered to vocabulary of native origin unless an item necessary in the context was not available in the English language. In particular, the study focuses on the nominal equivalent selection strategy in instances where a single Latin lemma corresponds to more than one English noun and the competing items differ with respect to their etymologies. The issue is of considerable interest in the context of Rolle’s predominant consistency in this respect reflected in his general observance of a one-to-one correspondence between Latin nouns and their English equivalents.

**Keywords:** *Biblical translation, equivalent selection strategy, etymology, Psalter, Richard Rolle*

## **1. Introduction**

The objective of the paper is to examine the nominal choices in the first fifty Psalms of Richard Rolle’s Psalter rendition from the perspective of equivalent selection. Since, as shall become apparent in the course of the study, Rolle was predominantly consistent in this respect and opted for a one-to-one correspondence between Latin and English nouns, special attention will be devoted to the cases which contravene this tendency in order to establish whether there is a guiding principle behind variant translator’s decisions in particular contexts and whether there is evidence that etymological considerations influenced these choices. For this purpose I will analyse Rolle’s Psalter while juxtaposing it with the Latin source text which constituted the basis for the translation, focusing on those Latin nouns which are rendered into English by means of more than one equivalent, differing in their languages of origin.

The issue is of particular interest in the light of the assertion formulated by Partridge (1973: 21) in the following manner:

Rolle adhered with fidelity to the Latin original, using the simplest and most proper English wherever possible, except when his native language failed him, and he was compelled to latinize.

As postulated in Lis (*in prep.*), the claim cited above makes a number of assumptions which all prompt the modern reader to believe that Richard Rolle was a proponent of a form of *linguistic purism*, which manifested itself in adherence to vocabulary of native origin. Having

---

\* I would like to thank Professor Magdalena Charzyńska-Wójcik for all her comments on this paper.

investigated the issue, I established that the etymological make-up of Rolle's rendition does not differ substantially from the other contemporary prose Psalter translations in this respect. However, it is Rolle's Psalter that employs the greatest number of borrowings in the contexts where the other texts use their native equivalents (*Lis in prep.*), i.e. in the context where Rolle was *not* 'compelled to latinize' (Partridge 1973: 21).

The present paper is, therefore, a continuation of an investigation into the correctness of Partridge's (1973: 21) claim, endeavouring to establish whether the *appropriateness* of Rolle's English could possibly manifest itself in a disciplined manner of equivalent selection, in which etymological preferences would be visible. For this reason I have decided to concentrate primarily on those Latin items whose competing English renderings are pairs of items with different etymologies: native as opposed to foreign, i.e. Romance or Old Norse (ON) (cf. Section 4). Adopting such a perspective will allow me to determine whether the variation is context-governed and whether it accommodates, at least to some extent, Rolle's etymological '(dis)likes'.

In the course of the study I will refer to the context-governed equivalent selection strategy by using the term *dynamic equivalent selection strategy*, as understood in Charzyńska-Wójcik and Wójcik (2013) and Charzyńska-Wójcik and Charzyński (2014), for whom the term refers to exactly those situations where 'the item receives different equivalents depending on the context' (Charzyńska-Wójcik and Charzyński 2014).

In order to present the data from the Psalter in the relevant context, I commence by providing some information concerning the original Latin text, its English rendition and the contemporary attitude to biblical translation (Section 2). Then, a sketch of the linguistic circumstances obtaining in medieval England is given in Section 3, where I also endeavour to expound upon the influence one may predict these circumstances exerted upon the shape of the rendition. Section 4 describes the methodological procedures which led to the creation of the database used in this study and provides working definitions of certain concepts I employ in the course of the research, all of which are indispensable for the proper understanding of the data presented in Section 5. Section 6 aims at formulating some conclusions as regards the principles guiding the equivalent selection in Richard Rolle's Psalter and tries to situate the findings in relation to Partridge's (1973: 21) claim and the results obtained in *Lis (in prep.)*.

## 2. The text and its place in the context of the contemporary attitude to biblical translation

Richard Rolle's Psalter (henceforth RRP) is an early 14th-century *prose* translation from Latin into Middle English. As there is no doubt as to Richard Rolle's authorship of the rendition, researchers are able to establish an approximate date for the translation, which is the first half of the 14th century, most probably the 1330's or 1340's (St-Jacques 1989: 136).<sup>1</sup> The fact that the authorship is certain, significantly facilitates the comprehension of the text as, with the ample information available concerning Richard Rolle of Hampole, one is able to understand

---

<sup>1</sup> For biographical information on Richard Rolle, consult for instance Bramley (1884), Horstman (1896) and Heaton (1913).

the motives and ideology which inspired the translation and determined its shape. Although the rendition had its addressee in the person of a Dame Margaret Kirby (Bramley 1884: ix),<sup>2</sup> it becomes evident on reading Richard Rolle's prologue to the rendition, that he was well aware of the fact that she would not be the only reader of his translation:

In expounynge. i. fologh haly doctours. for it may come in some enuyous man hand that knawes noght what he sould say, that will say that. i. wist noght what. i. sayd. and swa doe harme til hym. and til othere. if he disprise the werke that is profytable for hym and othere.

(Bramley 1884: 5)

As is readily noticeable, Rolle was anxious that both his work and its purpose should not be either misunderstood or used for purposes that did not concur with his religious convictions. He undoubtedly did everything that was within his means to ensure that the translation did not stray from the original and that the prospective reader understood the intended meaning of each verse. His preoccupation with these issues is distinctly reflected in the very structure of Rolle's Psalter, which first provides the Latin verse,<sup>3</sup> then its *literal* English translation and finally a commentary on the meaning of the passage.<sup>4</sup> This is illustrated below:

**Confitemini domino in cythara: in psalterio decem cordarum psallite illi.** ¶<sup>5</sup> Shrifis til lord in the harpe: in psautery of ten cordis syngis til hym. ¶ In the harpe thai shrif that louys god whether wele or wa fall on thaim: and syngis til him in psautery of ten cordis, that is, stire ȝou to serue til charite, in the whilke ten comaundmentis is fulfild.

(Psalm 32, verse 2 from Bramley 1884: 114)

The English rendition provided in Bramley (1884) is based on Manuscript 64 from the Library of University College, Oxford. Where this manuscript lacks leaves, twelve in total, the text of other manuscripts was followed, namely that of Manuscript 56 from the same library and the manuscript from the Bodleian Library, which was also the source of the Metrical Preface

<sup>2</sup> Dame Margaret Kirby was one of the recluses, 'persons in need of ghostly comfort, and those who suffered in mind and body from the attacks of evil spirits', who sought Rolle's assistance.

<sup>3</sup> The Latin text of the Psalter presented in Bramley (1884) was transliterated from Sidney Sussex College Manuscript 89 and represents almost exclusively the text of the *Gallicanum*, the second of Jerome's revisions of the Latin Psalter. In fact, as stated in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013: 41) '[t]he only admixtures which are recorded in the Gallican Psalter contained in Richard Rolle's Psalter [...] are from the Roman Psalter, i.e. Jerome's first revision of the Old Latin Psalter, *Vetus Latina*'.

<sup>4</sup> The commentary provided by Richard Rolle, is 'a close prose translation of Petrus Lombardus' *Commentarium in Psalmos*' (Wells 1916: 401-402). Wells (1916: 401-402) suggests that it is possible that Richard Rolle does not acknowledge Peter Lombardus's original and 'gives the impression that his writing was made up from passages from the Fathers' due to the fact that 'Peter [Lombard]'s work was frowned on'. This, however, cannot be the explanation since, as asserted in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013: 74-75), the controversy surrounding Peter Lombard had already been quenched at the beginning of the 13th century, with the Lateran Council of 1215 officially declaring Lombard to have been faithful to the Credo.

<sup>5</sup> The special marker presented here, separating the English translation from the Latin text and the commentary, is an early form of pilcrow, i.e. paragraph mark, as used in the manuscripts containing Rolle's Psalter. As explained in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013: 672) '[t]he marker is a development of the capital letter C for *capitulum*, 'chapter', which came to be equipped with a vertical bar by the rubricators (as were other *litterae notabiliores*). With time, the resultant bowl was filled in and with some further visual adjustments naturally following from frequent use, ¶ or ¶ became the familiar pilcrow ¶.'

preceding Richard Rolle's Prologue. The text of the Psalms was then collated with the Sidney Sussex Manuscript (Bramley 1884: v-xvii).

The Oxford Manuscript of the Psalter was hardly an accidental choice since, as Everett (1922: 222) contends, out of all 35 manuscripts of RRP<sup>6</sup> this manuscript along with two other ones, best preserves the Northern dialect of the original rendition. Furthermore, the decision to mainly focus on this manuscript might also have been facilitated by the fact that the text of the commentary which follows each verse in this manuscript is Richard Rolle's original one, whereas the majority of the extant manuscripts contain Wycliffite insertions in the commentary and these differ from manuscript to manuscript in their extent.

When it comes to the shape of Rolle's rendition, it is representative of the general contemporary approach towards the Bible and its translations and can be fully comprehended and appreciated only in this context. The vital feature of this approach is an extremely cautious attitude to any attempts at rendering the Scriptures into the vernacular. Any such translations would be considered, almost by definition, futile and of absolutely no merit when juxtaposed with the Latin text, even though the Bible in Latin itself was also a rendition, from Hebrew and Greek.<sup>7</sup> The efforts to translate the Scriptures defied in a way the contemporary conviction that only Latin could be an adequate means of transmitting God's sacred words.

The dominant theory of Biblical translation, based on Jerome's discussion of this specialized task rather than on his consideration of translation in general, accepted the principle that every word of the text was sacred: even the order of the words is a mystery, and this mystery must be preserved in translation.

(Hargreaves 1965: 123)

The situation was even more complex in the case of the English language due to the Norman Conquest and the profound changes in the linguistic landscape of England it brought in its wake:

[f]or many centuries, a medieval counterpart of a modern educated person would have counted English as one of the highly unsatisfactory mediums. The vernacular appeared simply and totally inadequate. Its use, it would seem, could end only in a complete enfeeblement of meaning and a general abasement of values.<sup>8</sup>

(Shepherd [1969] 2008: 366)

<sup>6</sup> Black and St-Jacques (2012) after Kuczynski (1999) state that there are as many as 39 manuscripts of RRP. This need not indicate that one of the estimates is incorrect since it might simply be the case that in the course of approximately eight decades separating the works of Everett (1922) and Kuczynski (1999) another four extant manuscripts were discovered.

<sup>7</sup> Daniell (2003: 63) supposes that 'at this time in Britain almost no one is likely to have known that the Latin was a late and imperfect version of the original Greek and Hebrew'. A similar supposition about the unfamiliarity 'with the translation process involved in producing the Vulgate' is also made by Pahta and Nurmi (2011: 230).

<sup>8</sup> This view was challenged only in the 16<sup>th</sup> century mostly thanks to William Tyndale's translation of the Bible, which brought a 'revolution' in the perception of the English language. Delisle and Woodsworth (1995: 33) state that 'Tyndale translated into the language people spoke, not the way the scholars wrote'. In this way, as noted by Howard (1994: 16), quoted by Delisle and Woodsworth (1995), '[h]e introduced the revolutionary notion that the common English spoken by the man in the street is as good as Latin or French or any other 'learned' language for expressing profound or poetic thought'.

Despite all these circumstances, which were certainly unfavourable for the process of translating, the rendition was needed for those ‘*that* knowes noght latyn’ (Bramley 1884: 4). This must have been evident for Rolle, which is why he attempted to provide a translation that, being as faithful to the original as possible, would at the same time ensure that the intended message was carefully transmitted:

In this werke .i. seke na straunge ynglis, bot lyghtest and comonest. and swilk that is mast lyke til the latyn. swa that thai that knowes noght latyn. by the ynglis may com til mony latyn wordis. In the translacioun .i. folow the lettere als mykyll as .i. may. And thare. i. fynd na propire ynglis. i. folow the wit of the worde, swa that thai that sall red it thaim thare noght dred erryng.

(Bramley 1884: 4-5)

In other words, Richard Rolle did not even make an attempt at a translation in the present sense of the word and his work should be regarded, as Norton (2000: 5) perceives it to be, as ‘a guide, first to the meaning of the Latin, second, through a commentary, to the meaning of the Psalms’. Hargreaves (1965: 126) also notes that Rolle’s ‘Psalter translation was designed not to stand alone but to follow the Latin verse by verse and to be accompanied by a commentary elucidating its spiritual meaning’.

A slightly different reflection on the place of Rolle’s rendition in medieval England is offered by Alford (1995: 48), who sees it ‘as an example of the continuing vitality of *lectio divina*<sup>9</sup> in the later Middle Ages’ and considers the shape of the translation and the commentary on the Psalms to be an aid for those willing to embark upon this sort of religious practice:

Clearly Rolle’s English version of the Psalter cannot be read, and probably was not intended to be read, as a stand-alone translation. Repeatedly one is forced back to the original text. Reading of this sort is not a linear process but a constant up-and-down movement, a stitching together of Latin and English. This oscillation between text and gloss is characteristic of *lectio divina*.

(Alford 1995: 54)

The text of the Psalms analysed in this study is that presented in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013) after Bramley (1884).

### 3. Linguistic background

The linguistic background is the other factor, alongside the contemporary attitude to biblical translation, that inevitably shaped Rolle’s translation to a considerable extent. Since it differs drastically from the 21st-century linguistic situation obtaining in Western Europe, it is important to outline some of its major features with respect to the etymological make-up of the lexicon as it is relevant for the purposes of the present study.

The Middle English period was exceptional in the history of English from the point of view of the number of borrowings it absorbed over its course, and, as shall become apparent,

---

<sup>9</sup> Alford (1995) defines it as ‘the monastic form of reading’ consisting of three activities: reading aloud or murmuring the text, meditation upon the text and committing it to memory.

the attitude to them. The major sources of these loanwords were Old Norse, Latin and (Anglo-)French. As regards the loanwords of Scandinavian origin, their number cannot be given exactly, one of the many reasons for this being the time lag between the date of their first recorded usage and the period of the most intense contact between the speakers of ON and OE (Björkman 1900; Burnley 1992; Kastovsky 1992).<sup>10</sup> The pattern of their geographical distribution shows that the greatest number of items with this etymology appear in texts originating in the north (Freeborn 1998: 156; Burnley 1992: 421-422; Ringe and Eska 2013: 74), i.e. in the part of England where RRP was compiled.

In contrast, borrowings from Latin and French<sup>11</sup> are for the most part recorded in southern writings (Burnley 1992: 431; Freeborn 1998: 156), and it is estimated that ca. 10,000 lexical items of Romance provenance enriched the English lexicon in the pertinent period (Baugh and Cable 1978: 176; Katamba 1994: 208 and van Gelderen 2006: 99). The loanwords from Latin and French are usually treated disjointly in the literature but in fact, when one takes into account the interlinguistic relations between these languages viewed both diachronically and synchronically, the possible obstacles to distinguishing between them become apparent. The difficulty arises primarily from the close relatedness of French to Latin. Due to this affinity items borrowed from French are in the majority of cases inevitably of Latin origin. Thus, one cannot refute with certainty the claim that a particular item was borrowed from Latin and not from French or discard the possibility of indirect borrowing, i.e. borrowing from Latin via the mediation of the French language, since, as postulated by Burnley (1992: 433), it would not be 'especially surprising when for generations Latin had been taught in England through the medium of French'. Moreover, the processes of phonological and morphological adaptation which operate on borrowings rendered the differences between Latin and French loanwords in English even less perceptible. Additionally, as if to complicate the situation even more, once Latin, (Anglo-)French and (Middle) English started to co-exist on English soil, the boundaries between them, at least with respect to the vocabulary, started to blur to such an extent that determining the language of origin of a particular lexical item frequently borders on the impossible (Rothwell 2000: 51). For these reasons, I have decided not to differentiate between words of Latin and French origin but to assign them to a broad category of Romance loanwords, even if the very term *loanword* or *borrowing* is, as postulated by Rothwell (2000: 51), inappropriate 'for this very large-scale process of immersion and absorption that must have extended nation-wide over many decades'.

It would be unrealistic to expect that the linguistic circumstances of medieval England outlined above did not leave an indelible imprint upon the works created in the period. On the contrary, we would expect them to have found an expression in a medieval English text, such as RRP, in the following respects. Firstly, RRP, as a work of northern origin, should contain

<sup>10</sup> For comprehensive studies of loanwords from Old Norse and Anglo-Norse language contact, see also Townend (2002) and Dance (2003).

<sup>11</sup> I use the term *French* here to refer collectively to borrowings from all varieties of French distinguished in the dictionaries employed for the purposes of the study, the *Middle English Dictionary* and the *Oxford English Dictionary* (cf. Section 4), i.e. Old French, Central French, Old Northern French (known also as Old Norman) and Anglo-French, since based on the information provided in them one cannot assign a given vocabulary item to a particular form of French.

a high proportion of words with Scandinavian etymologies. Secondly, the number of loanwords from broadly understood Romance languages should be quite substantial in RRP since their percentage participation in all ME texts is considerable. Thirdly, vocabulary of native and foreign origin may be predicted to be employed indiscriminately if the three languages in use in medieval England were in fact ‘so imbricated as to be distinguishable only at the cost of some artificiality’ (Rothwell 2000: 51). The first two tendencies entirely concur with the findings in Lis (*in prep.*). The last prediction is investigated in detail in the present study. It is, however, irreconcilable with Partridge’s (1973: 21) claim concerning Rolle’s lexical preferences.

#### 4. Methodology

As explained in the Introduction, the study is based on the first fifty Psalms of RRP and examines the text of the English translation in juxtaposition with the Latin original. To ensure that only the corresponding items were compared, it was necessary to treat the Latin source text as a starting point and commence by extracting all the nouns (2865 items),<sup>12</sup> annotating each with the Psalm and verse number. The items were sorted alphabetically and occurrences of the same Latin lemma, i.e. the citation form as presented in Whitaker’s *Words: Latin-to-English and English-to-Latin Dictionary*, were grouped together. Then English equivalents for each Latin nominal item were supplied, together with etymological information and the date of the first recorded attestation with the relevant meaning as provided in the *Middle English Dictionary* and the *Oxford English Dictionary* (hereafter the MED and the OED respectively). The next step was to exclude from the data all the occurrences of Latin nouns whose corresponding lexical items were not classified as nouns in the relevant dictionaries, e.g. ME *ōutcasting(e)* (ger.) rendering Latin *abjectio*, *abjectionis* ‘dejection; a casting down/out; outcast’, ME *dērne* (adj.) employed to translate Latin *absconditum*, *absconditi* ‘hidden/secret/concealed place/thing; secret’, or were whole phrases rather than nouns, e.g. ME *right hōnd(e)* for Latin *dextera*, *dexteræ* ‘right hand; right-hand side’ or ME *heigh thing* used to render Latin *excelsum*, *excelsi* ‘height, high place/ground/altitude; eminence; high position/rank/station; altar, temple (pl.); citidel’, which narrowed down the number of occurrences to 2627 and the number of headwords to 458.

Subsequently, the data were divided into two groups depending on whether the English renderings of particular Latin lemmata exhibited variation. The nouns which displayed diversity in this respect were then further subcategorised with respect to the etymology of their English equivalents in order to investigate whether the cases of etymological oppositions between native items<sup>13</sup> and loanwords employed to render the same Latin lemma were context-sensitive, i.e. whether they were congruent with the dynamic equivalent selection strategy. Additionally, those

---

<sup>12</sup> The total number of the nominal items would in fact surge to 2907 if proper nouns were taken into consideration.

<sup>13</sup> The term *native* adopted in the study has been broadened to encompass not only items of *purely* OE origin but also those with mixed OE-ON and OE-Romance etymology on the premise that the early loans (which already functioned in the English lexicon in the OE period alongside the truly native items and underwent the same morpho-phonological processes) may indeed be regarded as native in the language.

Latin lemmata whose number of occurrences did not exceed two had to be excluded as one cannot draw any conclusions or speak of distribution patterns in such cases.

## 5. The data

The primary aim of the present section is to provide and analyse the data gathered from RRP and to determine whether the *appropriateness* of Rolle's English, postulated by Partridge (1973: 21), could possibly manifest itself in a disciplined, context-governed, manner of equivalent selection in the instances of those Latin lemmata whose English renderings exhibit variation. In other words, it will be investigated whether in such cases one can speak of dynamic equivalent selection or whether, based on the available data, it is difficult to speak of any distribution patterns.

As mentioned in Section 4, the database employed for the purposes of this study consists of 2627 occurrences of Latin nouns, grouped under 458 distinct lemmata, and the corresponding lexical items from the English rendition. However, only 32 lemmata (with a total of 732 occurrences) exhibit variation in the English translations. They are introduced and commented upon in Section 5.1. Section 5.2, on the other hand, focuses exclusively on those cases in which the competing English equivalents exhibit etymological oppositions of the native versus foreign type.

### 5.1. All the cases of divergent equivalent choices

The fact that the number of Latin lemmata whose English renderings differ between particular occurrences is so small appears to indicate that Rolle's equivalent selection is predominantly stable, i.e. Rolle adheres to his choices as regards English equivalents of particular Latin nouns. In fact, the 32 lemmata in question constitute only 6.99% of all the Latin headwords. The perception of the extent of variation could be skewed by the fact that the percentage participation of the relevant occurrences (732) equals 27.86% of all the analysed occurrences, when in fact it is markedly misleading, as shall become evident in the light of the data presented in Table 1 below.

The structure of the table is the following. The second column from the left provides Latin lemmata, with the number of their occurrences in the data analysed in this study given in parentheses. The tripartite column with the 'Middle English equivalents' heading presents all of the ME nominal equivalents of the Latin lemmata from the first fifty Psalms of RRP scrutinised in the course of the research, together with concise information concerning their etymology and number of occurrences. Finally, the rightmost column, supplies information about the status of the lemma with respect to further analysis, explaining why particular items had to be excluded from the study (cf. Section 4).<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup> As explained in Section 4, I exclude from further analysis all the Latin lemmata whose number of occurrences is smaller than three and those whose English renderings do not exhibit etymological oppositions of the native item vs. loanword type.



Table 1. *Latin lemmata and their English equivalents which exhibit variation*

N°	Latin	Middle English equivalents			Status
		1.	2.	3.	
1.	<b>absconditum, absconditi</b> (3)	<b>hīdel(s)</b> - OE (1)	<b>hīd(e)</b> - OE (2)	---	too few occurrences both of OE origin
2.	<b>aequitas, aequitatis</b> (4)	<b>ēvenhēde</b> - OE (2)	<b>ēvennesse</b> - OE (2)	---	both of OE origin
3.	<b>afflictio, afflictionis</b> (2)	<b>tormēt</b> - Romance (1)	<b>afflicciōun</b> - Romance (1)	---	too few occurrences both of Romance origin
4.	<b>alienus, alieni</b> (2)	<b>ōther</b> - OE (1)	<b>āliēn</b> - Romance (1)	---	too few occurrences
5.	<b>armum, armi</b> (2)	<b>wēpen</b> - OE (1)	<b>armes</b> - Romance (1)	---	too few occurrences
6.	<b>confusio, confusionis</b> (3)	<b>shāme</b> - OE (2)	<b>confūsiōun</b> - Romance (1)	---	<b>fulfils all criteria</b>
7.	<b>consilium, consili(i)</b> (12)	<b>cōunseil</b> - Romance (11)	<b>rēd</b> - OE (1)	---	<b>fulfils all criteria</b>
8.	<b>delictum, delicti</b> (6)	<b>trespās</b> - Romance (5)	<b>sinne</b> - OE (1)	---	<b>fulfils all criteria</b>
9.	<b>Deus, Dei</b> (147)	<b>God, god</b> - OE (146)	<b>lōrd</b> - OE (1)	---	both of OE origin
10.	<b>dolor, doloris</b> (12)	<b>sorwe</b> - OE (11)	<b>wāne</b> - OE (1)	---	both of OE origin
11.	<b>dominus, domini</b> (315)	<b>lōrd</b> - OE (308)	<b>God, god</b> - OE (7)	---	both of OE origin
12.	<b>inimicus, inimici</b> (45)	<b>enemī</b> - Romance (36)	<b>fō</b> - OE (9)	---	<b>fulfils all criteria</b>
13.	<b>innocentia, innocentiae</b> (5)	<b>unnoiandnes</b> - Romance (4)	<b>innoianndnes</b> - Romance (1)	---	both of Romance origin
14.	<b>insipientia, insipientiae</b> (2)	<b>unwisdōm</b> - OE (1)	<b>unwit</b> - OE (1)	---	too few occurrences both of OE origin
15.	<b>ira, irae</b> (14)	<b>wratthe</b> - OE (7)	<b>īre</b> - Romance (7)	---	<b>fulfils all criteria</b>
16.	<b>iter, itineris</b> (2)	<b>gāte</b> - ON (1)	<b>wei</b> - OE (1)	---	too few occurrences
17.	<b>laetitia, laetitiae</b> (8)	<b>joi(e)</b> - Romance (4)	<b>fainnesse</b> - OE (3)	<b>gladnes(se)</b> - OE (1)	<b>fulfils all criteria</b>
18.	<b>loc[us/um], loci</b>	<b>stēde</b> - OE (7)	<b>rōum + stēde</b> - OE (1)	---	both of OE origin
19.	<b>multitudo, multitudinis</b> (9)	<b>muchelnes(se)</b> - OE <sup>15</sup> (6)	<b>multitūde</b> - Romance (3)	---	<b>fulfils all criteria</b>
20.	<b>murus, muri</b> (2)	<b>wal</b> - OE (1)	<b>wough</b> - OE (1)	---	both of OE origin
21.	<b>oratio, orationis</b> (8)	<b>preiēr(e)</b> - Romance (7)	<b>bēd(e)</b> - OE (1)	---	<b>fulfils all criteria</b>
22.	<b>progenies, progeniei</b> <sup>16</sup>	<b>kin</b> - OE (2) <sup>***</sup>	<b>kīnde</b> - OE (1)	<b>prōgenī(e)</b> - Romance (1)	too few occurrences
23.	<b>sacrificium, sacrifici(i)</b> (10)	<b>sacrifice</b> - Romance (9)	<b>offrende</b> - Romance (1)	---	both of Romance origin

<sup>15</sup> Despite the fact that the MED considers the item to be of mixed OE-ON origin, it is regarded as a native noun in accordance with the methodology adopted in the study concerning the treatment of the early loans (cf. Section 4).

<sup>16</sup> Although, admittedly, in this case one deals with more than three occurrences of a Latin noun, it was decided that the analysis of this lemma would be groundless as the two instances of the ME *kin* are attested in a single verse where they render the phrase in which the Latin lemma is repeated for emphasis:

Tabernacula eorum in **progenie & progenie**: voca|uerunt nomina sua in terris suis.

Tabernakils of thaim in **kyn and kyn**\*. [S in kynreden & kynredyne.]; tha cald thaire names in thaire erthis\*. [S. londes, londe.].

(Psalm 48, verse 11 after Charzyńska-Wójcik 2013: 638)

24.	<b>sanitas, sanitatis</b> (2)	<b>heilnesse</b> - ON (1)	<b>hēle</b> - OE (1)	---	too few occurrences
25.	<b>semita, semitae</b> (7)	<b>strēt(e)</b> - OE (6)	<b>wei</b> - OE (1)	---	both of OE origin
26.	<b>sepulc(h)rum, sepulc(h)ri</b> (3)	<b>grāve</b> - OE (2)	<b>sepulcre</b> - OE or mixed OE-Romance (1) <sup>17</sup>	---	both of OE origin
27.	<b>species, speciei</b> (3)	<b>shāp(e)</b> - OE (2)	<b>fairhēde</b> - OE (1)	---	both of OE origin
28.	<b>spiritus, spiritus</b> (11)	<b>gōst</b> - OE (10)	<b>spirit</b> - Romance (1)	---	<b>fulfils all criteria</b>
29.	<b>terra, terrae</b> (57)	<b>ērthe</b> - OE (49)	<b>lōnd</b> - OE (5)	<b>world</b> - OE (3)	all of OE origin
30.	<b>testamentum, testamenti</b> (5)	<b>testāment</b> - Romance (4)	<b>wit-word</b> - OE (1)	---	<b>fulfils all criteria</b>
31.	<b>tribulatio, tribulationis</b> (17)	<b>tribulāciōun</b> - Romance (16)	<b>angwisshe</b> - Romance (1)	---	both of Romance origin
32.	<b>voluptas, voluptatis</b> (2)	<b>lust</b> - OE (1)	<b>wil(le)</b> - OE (1)	---	too few occurrences both of OE origin

It is immediately apparent from the data given above, that the number of occurrences affected by the divergences in the selection of English equivalents for Latin lemmata is not in fact indicative of the degree of the variation. Latin *Deus, Dei*, with its 147 occurrences, and *dominus, domini*, appearing 315 times, considerably distort the picture, whereas the extent of the variation within their occurrences is itself extremely limited. The relevant figures for headwords and occurrences after the exclusion of *Deus, Dei* and *dominus, domini* from the group of items displaying the variation are 30 (6.55% of all headwords) and 270 (10.28% of the occurrences) respectively. Undeniably, the data exhibit immense stability as regards equivalent choices in the shape of the general observance of a one-to-one correspondence between Latin and English nouns. What this predominant adherence to a selected item of vocabulary indicates is that Rolle's vocabulary choice is disciplined and would prompt one to expect that the attested divergences as regards equivalent selection should be governed by some principles, i.e. they should incorporate themselves into the deliberately dynamic equivalent selection strategy.

It is also evident from the information given in Table 1 that there are only 10 Latin lemmata, with a total of 121 occurrences, whose English equivalents can undergo further analysis. It is on the basis of these lexical items that I will attempt to determine whether the variation in noun selection in the rendition with respect to the same Latin lemma is motivated by the context in which the word is employed, i.e. whether it is a case of dynamic equivalence, and stems from the semantic contents of each competing lexical item, or whether the choice does not seem to have been conditioned by such considerations.

## 5.2. The cases of divergent equivalent choices displaying etymological oppositions

Taking into account the fact there are only 10 lemmata which fulfil all the criteria established for the purposes of the present research, I will attempt to consider each of them separately to the extent possible within the space available.

<sup>17</sup> Despite the fact that the MED considers the item to be of mixed OE-Romance origin, it is treated as a native noun in accordance with the methodology adopted in the study concerning the treatment of the early loans (cf. Section 4).

Table 2 below presents all the relevant nouns together with information concerning the Psalms and verses in which they appear.

Table 2. *Latin lemmata whose English equivalents display etymological oppositions*

N°	Latin	Verses	Middle English equivalents
1.	<b>confusio, confusionis</b> (3)	34.30, 39.21 43.17	<b>shāme</b> - OE (2) <b>confūsiōun</b> - Romance (1)
2.	<b>consilium, consili(i)</b> (12)	1.1, 1.6, 9.23, 12.2, 13.10, 19.4, 21.16, 25.4, 32.10 (x2), 32.11 20.11	<b>cōunseil</b> - Romance (11) <b>rēd</b> - OE (1)
3.	<b>delictum, delicti</b> (6)	18.13, 18.14, 24.7, 24.19, 31.5 21.1	<b>trespās</b> - Romance (5) <b>sinne</b> - OE (1)
4.	<b>inimicus, inimici</b> (45)	5.9, 6.7, 6.10, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 8.3 (x2), 9.3, 9.6, 9.13, 9.27, 12.3, 12.4, 16.11, 16.14, 17.4, 17.41, 17.44, 17.51, 20.8, 26.4, 26.17, 29.1, 30.10, 36.21, 40.2, 40.5, 40.8, 40.12, 41.13, 42.2, 43.7, 43.12, 43.18, 44.7 17.20, 24.2, 24.20, 26.10, 30.14, 30.19, 37.17, 37.20, 41.14	<b>enemī</b> - Romance (36) <b>fō</b> - OE (9)
5.	<b>ira, irae</b> (14)	2.5, 17.10, 17.18, 20.9, 26.14, 29.5, 36.8, 37.3 2.13, 6.1, 7.6, 9.25, 30.11, 37.1	<b>wratthe</b> - OE (7) <b>īre</b> - Romance (7)
6.	<b>laetitia, laetitiae</b> (8)	15.11, 44.9, 44.17, 50.13 4.7, 29.6, 50.9 29.14	<b>joi(e)</b> - Romance (4) <b>fainnesse</b> - OE (3) <b>gladnes(se)</b> - OE (1)
7.	<b>multitudo, multitudinis</b> (9)	5.7, 5.12, 9.25, 36.11, 43.14, 50.2 30.23, 32.16, 48.6	<b>muchelnes(se)</b> - OE or mixed OE-ON (6) <b>multitūde</b> - Romance (3)
8.	<b>oratio, orationis</b> (8)	4.2, 5.2, 6.9, 30.29, 34.16, 38.16, 41.12 16.2	<b>preiēr(e)</b> - Romance (7) <b>bēd(e)</b> - OE (1)
9.	<b>spiritus, spiritus</b> (11)	10.7, 30.6, 31.2, 32.6, 33.18, 47.6, 50.11, 50.12, 50.13, 50.18 17.18	<b>gōst</b> - OE (10) <b>spirit</b> - Romance (1)
10.	<b>testamentum, testamenti</b> (5)	24.15, 43.19, 49.6, 49.17 24.11	<b>testāment</b> - Romance (4) <b>wit-word</b> - OE (1)

### 5.2.1. Equivalent selection strategy for *confusio, confusionis*

The first of the Latin nouns listed in Table 2, *confusio, confusionis* ‘mingling/mixture/union; confusion/confounding/disorder; trouble; blushing/shame’, is rendered into English twice by means of the native *shāme* and once by *confūsiōun*, which is a Romance borrowing. Analysing the contexts in which the word is employed, I established that the ME equivalents chosen by Rolle are used with the following senses, as defined by the MED:<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> All the meanings supplied for the nouns under analysis in the paper are presented in the shape provided by the MED, with the numbers in parentheses being the ones employed to refer to the relevant meanings in the dictionary itself.

- (1) *shâme*: '[t]he state of being in disgrace; ignominy, humiliation; the disgrace of physical harm or injury; the disgrace of sin or punishment in hell; destruction, ruin; also, physical damage' [3a],
- (2) *confûsiðun*: '[h]umiliation, disgrace, shame, or an instance of it' [2a].

Clearly, the denotations of the two items overlap to such an extent that one cannot speak of a semantic motivation behind the different choices Rolle made. Moreover, on examining the actual passages in which the Latin noun is attested (3–4 below) it becomes apparent that the variation in the equivalent selection is not context-dependent:

- (3) 34.30  
*Induantur **confusione** & reuerentia <[reverentia]>: qui magna\*.<sup>19</sup> {S maligna. U mala. S & U grete.} loquuntur super me.*  
*Cled be thai in **shame** and drede: that grete spekis on me.*  
 [34.26 cont.] 'May they be dressed in confusion and awe who speak great against me.'<sup>20</sup>
- (4) 43.17  
*Tota die verecundia mea contra me est: & **confusio** faciei mee cooperuit me.*  
*All day my shame agayns me is: and **confusion** of my face hild me.<sup>21</sup>*  
 [43.16] 'All day my shame is against me. My face's confusion overwhelms me'.

It seems, however, that Rolle's decision to employ *confûsiðun* in verse 43.17 (cf. 4 above) could have been conditioned, at least to some extent, by the fact that the noun *shâme* appears in the relevant verse as a rendering of a different Latin lemma—*verecundia*, *verecundiae* 'shame; respect; modest'. Thus, in the case of this item, it appears that Rolle's variant equivalent selection might have been prompted by stylistic considerations related to the Latin original, which avoids repetition by resorting to a synonym instead. It is, however, impossible to claim on the basis of only three occurrences of the Latin *confusio*, *confusionis* that the translator's preference lay with *shâme* or to try to draw any conclusions as regards his etymological '(dis)likes'. The choice, furthermore, cannot be claimed to have been governed by the dynamic equivalent selection strategy. The strategy, as explained, assumes consistent lexical choices in analogous syntactic and semantic contexts, whereas variation is predicted to be observed exclusively in cases where change is observed in either of the above components. In effect, different semantic or syntactic properties are required of the lexical items which are to be employed to render the same source language, in this case Latin, item. The latter is not, however, the case with the renderings of *confusio*, *confusionis*. It means that the variation observed here might be *style*- but definitely not *context*-sensitive.

<sup>19</sup> The marker \* as used in Bramley's (1884) edition and preserved in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013) serves as a means of indicating those lexical items or whole phrases whose readings differ between the extant manuscripts of RRP, with the variant readings provided in curly brackets.

<sup>20</sup> The translations provided for this and all the following verses quoted in the paper come from Cunyus's (2009) rendition of the Psalter (from the Latin Vulgate) as presented in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013). Since the verse numbering system offered in Cunyus (2009) at times diverges from the one adopted in RRP, wherever necessary I provide the information about the former in square brackets preceding the translation. For information about this translation and its textual basis, see Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013).

<sup>21</sup> These and all the remaining quotations are provided here after Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013).

### 5.2.2. Equivalent selection strategy for *consilium*, *consili(i)*

Latin *consilium*, *consili(i)*,<sup>22</sup> whose twelve attestations in the first fifty Psalms are analysed in this study, is translated predominantly as *cōunseil*, a borrowing from Romance languages. If Rolle, as claimed by Partridge (1973: 21), adhered to native vocabulary unless a proper term could not be found in English, then the semantic contents of this item should differ considerably from its native counterpart, *rēd*, which is only employed once to render the same Latin lemma.

The meanings with which the relevant ME nouns appear in RRP are the following:

- (5) *cōunseil*: '[a] meeting, conference, council' [1a], '[c]ounsel, advice, instruction' [5a], '[a] decision; a plan, scheme' [6a] and '[a] secret, private matter(s, a secret plan' [8a],
- (6) *rēd*: '[p]lot, conspiracy; [...] private thoughts' [3b.a and b].

As was the case with the English equivalents of *confusio*, *confusionis*, here the semantic components of the English renderings also seem to overlap, which becomes even more evident when one compares the following verses from RRP:

- (7) 9.23  
*Dum superbit impius incenditur pauper: compre|henduntur in consilijs quibus cogitant.*  
*I whils the wickid prides kyndeld is the pore; takyn thai ere in counsailes in whilk thai thynke.*  
 'As long as the lawless are proud, the poor one will be burned. Yet they will be captured in the counsels which they follow.'
- (8) 20.11  
*Quoniam declinauerunt in te mala: cogitauerunt con|silia que non potuerunt stabilire.*  
*ffor thai heldid illes in the; thai thocht redis the whilke thai myght noght stabile.*  
 [20.12] '[B]ecause they turned away from You. They plotted harmful counsel, which they weren't able to bring about'.

The conclusion that can be drawn on the basis of all the data pertaining to the renditions of Latin *consilium*, *consili(i)* is that the divergent equivalent selection does not represent a strategy that guided the decision behind the employment of *rēd* to render the item otherwise consistently translated as the Romance-derived *cōunseil*.

What is also interesting in this context is the fact that, despite the synonymy of the items in question—except for the meaning [1a] of *cōunseil* given in (4) above, all the other senses of *rēd* are recorded throughout the ME period – it is the borrowing that is the preferred rendering, which should not be the case in the light of Partridge's (1973: 21) assertion. It seems that at least these occurrences of *consilium*, *consili(i)* which are employed in the contexts necessitating the use of *cōunseil* with the meanings [6a] and [8a] should have been rendered by *rēd* if etymological factors had had any bearing on noun selection.

<sup>22</sup> It is a highly polysemous noun, with the following meanings listed in its entry in Whitaker's dictionary: 'debate/discussion/deliberation/consultation; advice/counsel/suggestion; adviser decision/resolution; intention/purpose/policy/plan/action; diplomacy/strategy; deliberative/advisory body; state council, senate; jury; board of assessors; intelligence, sense, capacity for judgment/invention; mental ability; choice'.

### 5.2.3. Equivalent selection strategy for *delictum, delicti*

The case of Latin *delictum, delicti* 'fault/offense/misdeed/crime/transgression; sin; act short of standard; defect' is analogical to that of *consilium, consili(i)* in that the dominant ME translation of the noun is of Romance provenance, *trespâs* (five occurrences), whereas the native noun *sinne* is employed only once to render the Latin lemma. The semantic contents of both English lexical items also overlap almost perfectly for this Latin lemma:

- (9) *trespâs*: '[t]ransgression of or opposition to divine law, religious precepts, Christian moral teaching, etc., sinful behavior, wickedness, iniquity, perversity; immoral living, the practice of vice' [2a],
- (10) *sinne*: '[o]pposition to God's will, moral obliquity; moral evil, understood as offensive to God' [1a].

Both nouns can refer to the concepts listed above (9–10) either generically or to denote individual instances of these, which precludes any semantic deliberations influencing the change in the noun equivalent selection pattern. Interestingly, one other 14th-century English Psalter (12)<sup>23</sup> uses *trespâs* to render the Latin *delictum, delicti* in the very verse RRP abstains from employing it (cf. 11), which is further proof of the lack of semantic motivation behind the divergent choices.

- (11) 21.1  
*DEUS, deus meus, respice in me, quare me dereliquisti: longe a salute mea verba delictorum meorum.*  
*God my god loke in me; whi has thou me forsakyn; fere fra my hele the wordis of my synnys.*  
 [21.2] 'God, my God, look at me! Why have You abandoned me? My offenses' words are far away from health'.
- (12) 21.2<sup>24</sup>  
*God\*. [Lord R.], my God, biholde thou on me, whi hast thou forsake me? the wordis of my trespassis ben fer fro myn helthe.*

### 5.2.4. Equivalent selection strategy for *inimicus, inimici*

Latin *inimicus, inimici* 'enemy (personal), foe' is a noun used with significant frequency in the Psalter. In this study, 45 of its occurrences are recorded and analysed. In 80% (36 occurrences) of these instances it is rendered by means of a Romance loanword – *enemî*; in the remaining 20% (9 occurrences) it is its synonym of OE origin, *fô*, which translates the Latin lemma. Such figures may prompt one to expect that the equivalent selection was not random in this case as there are nine instances in which an alternative to the default choice is employed.

The meanings with which the relevant nouns are used in the text are as follows:

- (13) *enemî*: '[o]ne who, as an individual, hates or seeks to injure (someone)' [1a], 'an adversary of God, an unbeliever or heathen; one who is opposed to (or fails to observe) a Christian doctrine or virtue' [1b] and '[a] member of a hostile armed body in war, civil strife, or private feud' [2],

<sup>23</sup> The Psalter in question is contained in the Late Version of the Wycliffite Bible, whose text is also provided in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013).

<sup>24</sup> The verse numbering system is different in the text of the Wycliffite Bible.

- (14) *fō*: '[o]ne who, as an individual, hates or seeks to injure someone; enemy' [1a] and '[a] member of a hostile armed body in war, civil strife, or tournament' [2].

It is easily noticeable that, two of the senses (1a and 2 in both cases) in which the ME nouns are employed to translate the relevant Latin lemma overlap to an extent which renders futile any efforts to uncover the principles guiding the selection. The use of *fō* with a meaning corresponding to sense [1b] listed for *enemī* is, however, not attested in the analysed data. This may lead one to suspect that it is a reflection of a conscious decision to abstain from employing native *fō* in such contexts, which would classify this case as an instance of dynamic equivalent selection strategy. What is particularly important to note at this point is the fact that the meaning corresponding to sense [1b] listed for *enemī* was readily available for *fō*, despite being unattested in the analysed corpus.

Nevertheless, all the data provided thus far seem to indicate that semantic considerations were not a factor in the contexts where Rolle alternated between two or more equivalents for different occurrences of the same Latin lemma. Therefore, it might well be the case that the absence of *fō*, used in the sense of 'an adversary of God', does not represent a deliberate choice on the part of Rolle. In other words, it does not need to mean that the translator avoided employing *fō* in such contexts, which, it is worth mentioning, are quite rare in any event (only four out of 45 occurrences). In fact, it appears reasonable to suppose, in the light of the flexibility with which Rolle applied both *enemī* and *fō* interchangeably in the circumstances necessitating using them with the other meanings listed above, that the lack of such a usage among the occurrences analysed here is not context-driven. This context-independent interpretation might also be corroborated by the exclusive use of *enemī* to render all the instances of *inimicus*, *inimici* in the other 14th-century *prose* Psalter renditions.<sup>25</sup> Such an absence does not need to imply that *fō* in sense [1b] is unattested in Psalms 51–150.

Two alternative interpretations of the fact that *fō* in the sense of 'an adversary of God' is not to be found in the first fifty Psalms are therefore available and it cannot be determined on the basis of the analysed data whether the choice was context-sensitive. Nevertheless, taking into consideration the etymologies of the competing items, it is clear that as far as the equivalent selection for the Latin *inimicus*, *inimici* is concerned, one cannot speak here of a preference for the vocabulary of native provenance.

### 5.2.5. Equivalent selection strategy for *ira*, *irae*

In the case of Latin *ira*, *irae* 'anger; resentment; rage; wrath', the competing English equivalents, i.e. native *wratthe* and Romance-derived *îre*, are used equally frequently to render the lemma, i.e. seven times each. It seems impossible to pinpoint any semantic factors that could possibly motivate the interchangeable use of both items as in this respect the two nouns seem to exhibit almost perfect synonymy:

<sup>25</sup> The translations in question are: the *Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter*, the Psalter of the Early Version of the Wycliffite Bible and the already mentioned Psalter of its Late Version. All of the texts are available in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013).

- (15) *wratthe*: '[a]nger, rage, fury; hostility, animosity; an instance, a state, or a feeling of anger or hostility, a fit of rage; also, the deadly sin of wrath' [1a] and '[t]he wrath or hostility of God, a pagan deity, etc.; divine retribution' [2a],
- (16) *ire*: '[a]nger, wrath; the deadly sin of wrath; also, the faculty of the soul enabling it to hate and repel evil and sin' [1a] and 'the wrath of God, Christ, or a pagan deity; also, vengeance' [1c].

All this information points to the conclusion that Rolle's decisions as regards these lexical choices could not possibly have been influenced by the semantic contents of the ME nouns in question. What is more, taking into account the equal number of occurrences of *ira*, *irae* rendered by each of the equivalents, they appear not to have been conditioned by etymological factors either. It becomes clear that noun selection strategy, if one can speak of a *strategy* in such circumstances, was not context-dependent.

### 5.2.6. Equivalent selection strategy for *laetitia*, *laetitiae*

The case of *laetitia*, *laetitiae* 'joy/happiness; source of joy/delight; fertility; fruitfulness; floridity' is exceptional in that there are not two but three competing English equivalents employed to render the Latin noun in its different occurrences, with the Romance-derived *joy(e)* being used most frequently (in four out of eight instances) and native *gladnes(se)* being the least frequently chosen noun (one occurrence). The remaining three occurrences of *laetitia*, *laetitiae* are rendered by another item of native origin – *fainnesse*.

As regards the meanings with which the items are employed in the translation, these are the following:

- (17) *joy(e)*: '[a] feeling of happiness or pleasure; a state of happiness or well-being' [1a],
- (18) *fainnesse*: '[g]ladness, joy' [a],
- (19) *gladnes(se)*: '[j]oy, bliss; cheerfulness, gladness; mirth, merrymaking; rejoicing' [1a].

The definitions from the MED provided above indicate that the three nouns are close synonyms. Additionally, they are employed predominantly, with the exception of verses 29.6, 44.9 and 44.17 (cf. 22, 24 and 25 below respectively) in very similar contexts, namely in structures of the type sb gives/fulfils sb (with) *joye/fainnesse/gladness*:

- (20) 4.7  
*Signatum est super nos lumen vultus tui domine deus <[ ]>: dedisti leticiam <lae[ae]titiam> in corde meo.*  
*Takynd is on vs the lyght of thi face lord; thou has gifen faynes in my hert.*  
*'Your face's light is a sign over us. Lord, You have given joy in my heart'.*
- (21) 15.11  
*Notas michi <[mih]i> fecisti vias vite <vitae[ae]>: adimplebis me leticia <lae[ae]titia> cum vultu tuo, delectaciones <delectationes> [delectatio] in dextera tua vsque <[usque]> in finem.*  
*Knawyn thou maked til me the wayes of life; thou sall fulfill me of ioy with thi face, deliteyngis in thi right hand in till the end.*  
*[15.10 cont.] 'You notice me. You made life's ways. You will fill me with joy with Your appearance. Delight is in Your right hand, even to the end.'*



- (22) 29.6  
*Ad vesperum demorabitur fletus: & ad matutinum leticia <[læae]titia>.*  
*At euenyngre sall gretynge duell; and at the mornynge faynes.*  
 [29.6 cont.] 'Weeping will linger at evening, yet joy breaks through toward morning.'
- (23) 29.14  
*Conuertisti <[Convertisti]> planctum meum in gaudium michi <[mihi]>: con|cidisti <[conscidisti]> saccum meum & circumdedisti me leticia <[læ[ae]titia>.*  
*Thou turnyd my sorowynge in ioy til me; thou share down my sek, and thou vmgaf me with gladnes.*  
 [29.12] 'You converted my lament into joy for me. You tore my sackcloth to pieces, and surrounded me with happiness'.
- (24) 44.9  
*Dilexisti iusticiam <[iustitiam]> & odisti iniquitatem: propterea vnxit <[unxit]> te deus, deus tuus, oleo leticie <[læ[ae]titiae]> pre <[præ]> consortibus tuis.*  
*Thou lufid rightwisnes and thou hatid wickidnes: therfor enoynt the god thi god with the oile of ioy bifor thi felaghis.*  
 [44.8] 'You delighted in fairness and hated treachery. Because of this, God, Your God anointed You with gladness's oil, before Your consorts.'
- (25) 44.17  
*Afferentur [adferentur] in leticia <[læ[ae]titia]> & exultacione <[exultatione]>: adducentur in templum regis*  
*Thai sall be broght in ioy and gladnes: thai sall be led in til the tempile of the kynge.*  
 [44.16] 'They will be brought in joy and exultation. They will be brought into the King's temple.'
- (26) 50.9  
*Auditui meo dabis gaudium & leticiam <[læ[ae]titiam]>: & [ ] exultabunt ossa humiliata.*  
*Til my herynge thou sall gif ioy and faynes; and glade sall banes mekid.*  
 [50.10] 'You will give joy to what I hear. My humiliated bones will exult with joy.'
- (27) 50.13  
*Redde michi <[mihi]> leticiam <[læ[ae]titiam]> salutaris tui: & spiritu principi|pali confirma me.*  
*ȝelde me the ioy of thi hele; and with the\*. [S thi.] principall gast conferme me.*  
 [50.14] 'Give me back Your security's joy! By the principal Spirit encourage me!'

On the basis of these considerations, it also appears safe to conclude that in the case of the English renderings of *laetitia*, *laetitiae* one is forced to admit that no guiding principle as regards equivalent selection strategy motivated the divergent choices.

### 5.2.7. Equivalent selection strategy for *multitudo*, *multitudinis*

In the database gathered for the purposes of the present study Latin *multitudo*, *multitudinis* 'multitude, great number; crowd; rabble, mob' is attested nine times. In six out of the nine instances it is translated by means of *muchelnes*(se). Despite the diverging etymologies provided in the MED and the OED, it is here considered to be a native noun for reasons concerning the treatment of the early loans, expounded upon in Section 4. Its competing

Romance-derived equivalent is *multitūde*, which renders the remaining three occurrences of *multitudo*, *multitudinis*.

Not surprisingly, for these nouns, too, it is difficult to speak of any clear semantic motivation behind the different choices, although the information from the MED can in fact mislead the reader into making the deduction that the distribution of *multitūde* would be limited due to the fact that it does not seem to convey spiritual or religious overtones:

- (28) *muchelnes(se*: 'spiritual magnitude; abundance, efficacy, or immensity of God's compassion, greatness, mercy, power, etc.; depths or profundity of joy or of peace' [1b] and 'great size or strength; large amount, quantity, or number (of sth.)' [2b],

- (29) *multitūde*: 'a large amount, abundance, greatness; mass' [b].

As a matter of fact, *multitūde* is used in almost exactly the same contexts as *muchelnes(se* and it seems that it is only the dictionary entry that does not cover *multitūde* with the same degree of detail as is offered *muchelnes(se*. Below I quote verse 30.23, in which *multitūde* is employed in the sense that would correspond exactly to that listed as [1b] for *muchelnes(se*:

- (30) *How gret the multitude of thi swetnes lord; the whilke thou has hid til the\*. [S to the. U om.] dredand the.*  
[30.20] 'How great is Your sweetness's multitude, Lord, which You have hidden for those fearing You'.

It is also worth noting that *multitūde* is a less frequently used equivalent, at least in the body of the first fifty Psalms, which prohibits an exhaustive analysis of its semantic layer. The conclusion that can be drawn on the basis of the limited data that were obtained from the texts used in the research concurs with the findings for the five lemmata analysed above (six if one opts for the context-independent interpretation in Section 5.2.4), which means that the variation observed in the noun selection between *muchelnes(se* and *multitūde* is not context-governed.

### 5.2.8. Equivalent selection strategy for *oratio*, *orationis*

The English equivalents employed to render Latin *oratio*, *orationis* 'speech, oration; eloquence; prayer' are the native *bēd(e* and *preiēr(e*, a noun of Romance origin, with the former used in only one out of a total of eight instances. The meanings with which the two nouns are employed in the text, as one might predict for such lexical items in the context of the Psalter, are almost exactly the same:

- (31) *preiēr(e*: '[a] prayer, supplication; an intercession with God' [2a.a],

- (32) *bēd(e*: '[a] prayer' [2a.a].

The information from the MED provided above proves that semantics did not exert any influence on the noun selection pattern in this case either. One additional piece of evidence in favour of the context-independent interpretation of the variation in the equivalent choice as

regards *oratio*, *orationis* that can be mentioned is that both nouns are employed in identical syntactic structures:

(33) 4.2

*Miserere mei: & exaudi oracionem meam.*

*Haſ mercy of me; and here my prayere.*

[4.2 cont.] ‘Have mercy on me, and hear my prayer!’

(34) 16.2

*Auribus percipe oracionem meam: non in labijs dolosis.*

*With eren here my bede; noght in swikil lippes.*

[16.1 cont.] ‘Perceive my prayer with Your ears – not offered from deceitful lips!’

Undeniably, Rolle’s lexical choices that are presented here are not congruent with the principles of dynamic equivalent selection. Neither does Partridge’s (1973: 21) assertion find any corroboration in the data analysed in this section.

### 5.2.9. Equivalent selection strategy for *spiritus*, *spiritus*<sup>26</sup>

Latin *spiritus*, *spiritus* ‘breath, breathing, air, soul, life’ is attested eleven times in the first fifty Psalms. However, only once is the lemma rendered by means of the Romance-derived noun *spirit*, a descendant of the Latin item in question. The remaining ten occurrences are translated with a noun of OE origin – *gōst*.

The case of this Latin lemma is highly exceptional when set against the background of the nouns discussed thus far as the contexts in which its English equivalents are employed differ significantly, which is reflected in the meanings the nouns appear to be used with:

(35) *gōst*: ‘the Holy Ghost’ [1b], ‘[t]he soul of man, spiritual nature; the soul as distinguished from mind, the emotional nature; the life principle in man’ [3a], ‘[a] spiritual force or insight, a gift of prophecy; [...] the spirit of God, a spiritual gift from God’ [4] and ‘[a] breathing, blowing, wind’ [5],

(36) *spirit*: ‘the essential nature (of wisdom, servitude, etc.); the essential quality (of confidence)’ [10b].

It is evident that there is no overlap between the senses with which the nouns *spirit* and *gōst* are recorded in RRP and the consistent use of *gōst* to render *spiritus*, *spiritus* in all the contexts where the Latin noun does not denote ‘the essential nature’ or ‘quality’ of something (cf. 37) seems to be indicative of a disciplined, context-motivated manner of equivalent selection in the case of this Latin lemma. It appears, therefore, to be safe to postulate that one is dealing with the dynamic equivalence strategy as far Rolle’s renderings of *spiritus*, *spiritus* are concerned.

<sup>26</sup> I do not attempt an ideological, philosophical or theological discussion at this point, since these issues fall beyond the scope of this paper. I concentrate exclusively on the equivalent selection strategy in the Psalter in question, formulating conclusions based entirely on the data obtained in the course of the research.

(37) 17.18

*Ab increpacione tua domine: ab inspiracione spiritus ire tue.**Of thi blamyng lorde; of the inspiracioun\*. [S inspiraunce.] of the spirit of thi\*. [S. U the.] wreth.*

[17.16 cont.] '[A]t Your rebuke, O Lord – by the breathing in Your anger's breath.'

Nevertheless, one must not overlook one important factor that could be responsible for such a distribution. According to the MED, *spirit* was a fresh borrowing at the time of RRP's compilation and seems to have gained wider currency only in the latter half of the 14th century, which is not to say that it was unattested with the relevant meanings at the time. That a diachronic change in the status of this noun took place in the course of the 14th century appears to be reflected in the distribution pattern of the instances in which *spiritus*, *spiritus* is translated by means of *spirit* in the other 14th-century prose Psalter renditions. The translations in question are those enumerated in Section 5.2.4: the *Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter* and the Psalters of the Early and Late Versions of the Wycliffite Bible. The first of these Psalters is nearly contemporaneous with RRP, i.e. its compilation took place in the first half of the 14th century, and the latter two are dated to the second half of the 14th century. The *Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter* employs *spirit* twice to render *spiritus*, *spiritus*—once in the very context RRP does, verse 17.18 (cf. 38), with the other instance being verse 32.6, in which the noun is also employed in a distinct sense (cf. 39).<sup>27</sup> Both Wycliffite Psalters, on the other hand, use this Romance-derived borrowing indiscriminately for all eleven occurrences of *spiritus*, *spiritus*.

(38) 17.18

*For þy blamyng & for þe inspiracioun of þe spiriȝt of þyne ire.\*. [Fram þe blame of þe Lord & fram þe i.]*

[17.16 cont.] '[A]t Your rebuke, O Lord – by the breathing in Your anger's breath.'

(39) 32.6

*Þe heuens ben fastened þurwe þe worde of our Lord, and alle her uertue is of spiriȝt of ys mouþe.*

'By the Lord's Word skies were founded, and all their strength by His mouth's Spirit'.

In other words, what can be observed in the case of the opposition between *gōst* and *spirit* is a change in progress. Although it clouds the picture emerging from the data to some extent, I would still venture to postulate that the distribution pattern of English equivalents of *spiritus*, *spiritus* does inscribe itself into the dynamic equivalent selection strategy. Whether one can claim that Partridge's (1973: 21) assertion pertaining to Rolle's adherence to native vocabulary would find a modicum of evidence in these findings could in fact be a contentious issue, as the choice seems to have been dictated by the fact that *gōst*, being such a vital concept in the religious context, was closer to the heart of contemporary society, rather than by etymological considerations of any sort.

<sup>27</sup> In one passage, i.e. in verse 47.6, neither of the relevant nouns appears in this Psalter. This is due to the presence of characteristic glosses in the body of both the Latin text and its English rendition, which frequently replace the original reading of the Psalms and that is exactly what one encounters in this verse.

### 5.2.10. Equivalent selection strategy for *testamentum*, *testamenti*

The last of the lemmata to be discussed in this section is *testamentum*, *testamenti* ‘will, testament; covenant’ rendered by means of a loanword from Romance languages, *testāment*, in four out of a total of five occurrences. Only once is the Latin noun translated as *wit-word*, i.e. an item of OE extraction. However, as was the case with eight (or seven, depending on the treatment of the nouns presented in Section 5.2.4) out of the nine Latin lemmata analysed thus far, semantic considerations do not seem to have had any bearing on the equivalent selection in the case of the renderings of *testamentum*, *testamenti*:

(40) *testāment*: ‘[a] covenant between God and humankind; a binding commitment between Christ and humankind’ [1a],

(41) *wit-word*: ‘chiefly *Bibl.* the divine covenant with the faithful’ [b].

Clearly, the semantic components with which each of the two nouns is used in the analysed contexts overlap completely. Moreover, since this is a noun of Romance provenance that is being used more frequently, Partridge’s (1973: 21) claim is once again refuted. Interestingly, according to the quotations provided in the MED, *testāment*, similarly to *spirit*, was also a new borrowing in the first half of the 14th century. It is, nevertheless, the only noun employed to render all of the occurrences of *testamentum*, *testamenti* in all of the other 14th-century prose Psalter renditions referred to in Sections 5.2.4 and 5.2.9, which points to a different status of the two nouns. *Wit-word*, in contrast to *gōst*, seems not to have been a strong competitor and apparently did not enjoy the same currency as *gōst* had.

## 6. Conclusion

At this point it is worth emphasising once again that the nouns analysed in this paper constitute only a small portion of all the data gathered in the course of the study and they should always be considered in relation to all of the data. To be precise, the ten Latin lemmata scrutinised here make up 2.19% of all the lemmata and their 121 occurrences constitute exactly 4.61% of the occurrences gathered in the database. With respect to those Latin nouns whose English renderings exhibit any kind of variation, i.e. those given in Table 1 in Section 5.1, the figures are 31.25% of headwords and 16.53% of occurrences respectively. What this means is that RRP as a whole appears to be consistent as regards nominal equivalent choices since only 32 lemmata (out of 458) show variation in this respect. Furthermore, only ten of the 32 lemmata provide a context for a simultaneous investigation into both the equivalent selection strategy and the influence of Rolle’s etymological ‘(dis)likes’. Thus, the conclusions that can be drawn from the present study are strikingly thought-provoking as, set against the background of what seems to be a predominantly careful observance of one-to-one correspondence between Latin and English nouns, one would expect any variation to be context-governed.

The picture that emerges from the ten separate cases analysed in Section 5. 2 might not be completely consistent but it conclusively points in one direction. For ease of reference I present all the findings obtained for each of the Latin lemmata in a simplified manner in Table 3 below.

Table 3. *Conclusions*

N°	Latin	Middle English equivalents	Evidence for	
			dynamic equivalent selection strategy	Partridge's (1973: 21) claim
1.	<b>confusio, confusionis</b>	<b>shāme vs confūsiōun</b>	no	no
2.	<b>consilium, consili(i)</b>	<b>cōunseil vs rēd</b>	no	no
3.	<b>delictum, delicti</b>	<b>trespās vs sinne</b>	no	no
4.	<b>inimicus, inimici</b>	<b>enemī vs fō</b>	<b>not certain</b>	no
5.	<b>ira, irae</b>	<b>wratthe vs īre</b>	no	no
6.	<b>laetitia, laetitiae</b>	<b>joi(e vs fainnesse vs gladnes(se</b>	no	no
7.	<b>multitudo, multitudinis</b>	<b>muchelnes(se vs multitūde</b>	no	no
8.	<b>oratio, orationis</b>	<b>preiēr(e vs bēd(e</b>	no	no
9.	<b>spiritus, spiritus</b>	<b>gōst vs spirit</b>	<b>yes</b>	<b>not certain</b>
10.	<b>testamentum, testamenti</b>	<b>testāment vs wit-word</b>	no	no

What transpires from the data analysed in the paper with respect to the equivalent selection strategy is that it could be claimed to be anything but dynamic in the sense of Charzyńska-Wójcik and Wójcik (2013) and Charzyńska-Wójcik and Charzyński (2014). The findings that spring from eight out of the ten analysed lemmata indicate in fact that there is no guiding principle whatsoever behind the divergent lexical choices. The only two Latin nouns whose English equivalents present distribution patterns that may seem to coincide with the dynamic equivalent selection strategy are *inimicus, inimici* and *spiritus, spiritus*. It appears that the exceptional status they enjoy among the remaining nouns analysed in Section 5.2 can be accounted for in the following manner. Both relevant items are long-established words of considerable frequency denoting concepts of great significance for medieval Christian society. This means that it would be much more difficult for a loanword to either undermine their position or replace them<sup>28</sup> and such a process could only take place gradually and in the context of significant influence exerted by a source language and most probably by a more prestigious one. Therefore, what the 14th-century English Psalter renditions, RRP and the other three Psalters I referred to in these two instances (cf. Section 5.2.4 and 5.2.9), seem to reflect in their nominal equivalent choices is this very process of change in the *denotata* and frequency of use, or *popularity*, of the items in question.

As regards Partridge's (1973: 21) assertion concerning Rolle's adherence to native vocabulary, there remains no doubt that it is unfounded. Synonymous lexical items with native and foreign etymologies are used indiscriminately in the rendition and no etymological '(dis)likes' can be identified. Neither should they be since loanwords were as much a part of the ME lexicon as items of OE provenance. The findings of this study alone, and in particular in conjunction with those presented in Lis (*in prep.*), are completely congruent with what one would expect to encounter vocabulary-wise in a medieval English text and perfectly illustrate

<sup>28</sup> It is a generally accepted view that certain items of vocabulary, the most basic ones in a language, exhibit considerable resistance to borrowing (Trask [2007] 1996: 27; Crowley 1992: 153-154; Hock and Joseph 2009: 245). While *fō* and *gōst* could be argued not to belong to the very core of the lexicon, they were undeniably indispensable at the time due to the concepts they conveyed.

the interlinguistic relations obtaining in contemporary England as outlined in Section 3, providing evidence to corroborate all the predictions enumerated there.

## References

- Alford, John A. 1995. Rolle's English Psalter and *Lectio Divina*. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 77, 47-59.
- Baugh, Albert C., and Thomas Cable. 1978. *A History of the English Language*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Björkman, Erik. 1900. *Scandinavian Loan-words in Middle English. Part I*. Halle: Ehrhardt Karras.
- Black, Robert R., and Raymond C. St-Jacques. 2012. *The Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter. Parts 1 and 2*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Bramley, Henry R. 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.
- Burnley, David. 1992. Lexis and semantics. In *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume II: 1066-1476*, edited by Norman Blake, 409-499. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, Magdalena. 2013. *Text and Context in Jerome's Psalters: Prose Translations into Old, Middle and Early Modern English*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, Magdalena, and Jerzy Wójcik. 2013. Principles of equivalent selection in English prose translations of Jerome's Psalters: a study based on *exaudire* and *videre*. *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 61 (5), 27-45.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, Magdalena, and Rafał Charzyński. 2014. Listen to the text-on translation strategies in two historical Italian Psalters. In *Language Change: Faces and Facets*, edited by Magdalena Charzyńska-Wójcik, Jerzy Wójcik, and Anna Bloch-Rozmej, 77-97. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Crowley, Terry. 1992. *An Introduction to Historical Linguistics*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Cunyus, John G. 2009. *The Audacity of Prayer: A Fresh Translation of the Book of Psalms (Latin-English Edition)*. Glen Rose: Searchlight Press.
- Dance, Richard. 2003. *Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English: Studies in the Vocabulary of the South-West Midland Texts*. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.
- Daniell, David. 2003. *The Bible in English. Its History and Influence*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Delisle, Jean, and Judith Woodsworth. 1995. *Translators through History*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Everett, Dorothy. 1922. The Middle English prose psalter of Richard Rolle of Hampole. *The Modern Language Review* 17 (3), 217-227.
- Freeborn, Dennis. 1998. *From Old English to Standard English: A Course Book in Language Variation across Time*. Basingstoke and London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Gelderen, Elly van. 2006. *A History of the English Language*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hargreaves, Henry. 1965. From Bede to Wyclif: medieval English Bible translations. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48, 118-140.
- Heaton, William J. 1913. *Our own English Bible. Its Translators and their Work. The Manuscript Period*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. London: Francis Griffiths.
- Hock, Hans Henrich, and Brian Daniel Joseph. 2009. *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship. An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Horstman, Carl. 1896. *Yorkshire Writers: Richard Rolle of Hampole and his Followers, Volume II*. London: Swan Sonnenschein, and Co. and New York: Macmillan and Co.
- Howard, Philip. 1994. Tyndale's language of the common man is the bedrock of English literature today. *The Times*, April 29.

- Kastovsky, Dieter. 1992. Semantics and vocabulary. In *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume I: The Beginnings to 1066*, edited by Richard M. Hogg, 290-408. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Katamba, Francis. 1994. *English Words*. London: Routledge.
- Kuczynski, Michael P. 1999. The psalms and social action in late medieval England. In *The Place of the Psalms in the Intellectual Culture of the Middle Ages*, edited by Nancy van Deusen, 191-214. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lis, Kinga. in prep. Richard Rolle's Psalter rendition-the work of a language purist?
- MED = Kurath, Hans, Sherman McAllister Kuhn, John Reidy, Robert E. Lewis et al. 1952-2001. *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/MED/>.
- Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter = Büllbring, Karl Daniel. 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. Part I: Preface and Text*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.
- Norton, David. 2000. *A History of the English Bible as Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- OED = Simpson, John, and Edmund Weiner. 1989. *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pahta, Päivi, and Arja Nurmi. 2011. Multilingual discourse in the domain of religion in medieval and early modern England: A corpus approach to research on historical code-switching. In *Code-Switching in Early English*, edited by Herbert Schendl, and Laura Wright, 219-251. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Partridge, Astley C. 1973. *English Biblical Translation*. London: André Deutsch.
- Psalter of the Early and Late Versions of the Wycliffite Bible = Forshall, Josiah, and Frederic Madden. 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: Oxford University Press.
- Ringe, Don, and Joseph F. Eska. 2013. *Historical Linguistics. Toward a Twenty-First Century Reintegration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rothwell, William. 2000. Anglo-French and Middle English vocabulary. *Femina Nova. Medium Aevum* 69, 34-58.
- RRP = Bramley, Henry Ramsden. 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.
- Shepherd, Geoffrey. 1969. English versions of the Scriptures before Wyclif. In *The Cambridge History of the Bible, Volume 2: The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*, edited by Geoffrey W. H. Lampe, 362-387. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- St-Jacques, Raymond C. 1989. Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter and its French source. In *Medieval Translators and their Craft*, edited by Jeanette Beer, 135-154. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications.
- Townend, Matthew. 2002. *Language and History in Viking Age England. Linguistic Relations between Speakers of Old Norse and Old English*. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers.
- Trask, Robert L. 1996. *Historical Linguistics*. London: Arnold.
- Wells, John Edwin. 1916. *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English. 1050-1400*. London: Oxford University Press and New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Whitaker, William. *WORDS: Latin-to-English and English-to-Latin Dictionary*. <http://ablemedia.com/ctcweb/showcase/wordsonline.html>.