

edited by  
Aleksandra R. Knapik  
Katarzyna Buczek  
Piotr P. Chruszczewski  
Richard L. Lanigan  
John R. Rickford

# Ways to Religion

vol. 1

Wrocław – Washington, D.C. 2017



WYDAWNICTWO  
WYŻSZEJ SZKOŁY FILOLOGICZNEJ  
WE WROCŁAWIU



book series: Languages in Contact. Vol. 7

**editor-in-chief**

Piotr P. Chruszczewski (Wrocław)

**honorary editors**

Richard L. Lanigan (Washington, D.C., USA)

John R. Rickford (Stanford, USA)

**editors**

Katarzyna Buczek (Opole)

Aleksandra R. Knapik (Wrocław)

**reviewer**

prof. dr hab. Piotr Cap

University of Łódź

**proofreading:** English Prep – Biuro Językowe

**editorial reading:** Barbara Woldan

**cover design:** Konstancja Czarny

**DTP:** Marta Łuczak

© Copyright by Wyższa Szkoła Filologiczna we Wrocławiu, Polska Akademia Nauk,  
Oddział we Wrocławiu & International Communicology Institute, Wrocław 2017

978-83-60097-86-1 (paperback)

978-83-60097-87-8 (hardback)

978-83-60097-88-5 (pdf)

Liczba arkuszy wydawniczych: 13,24

This publication is financed by Philological School of Higher Education in Wrocław.



WYDAWNICTWO WYŻSZEJ SZKOŁY FILOLOGICZNEJ WE WROCŁAWIU

50-335 Wrocław, ul. Sienkiewicza 32

tel. (+48 71) 328 14 14, fax (+48 71) 322 10 06

<http://www.wsf.edu.pl>, e-mail: [wsf@wsf.edu.pl](mailto:wsf@wsf.edu.pl)



Komisja Nauk Filologicznych PAN, Oddział we Wrocławiu

50-449 Wrocław, ul. Podwale 75

[www.pan.wroc.pl](http://www.pan.wroc.pl)



International Communicology Institute

Capitol Hill Tower – APT. PH06

1000 New Jersey Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003-3377

[communicology.org](http://communicology.org)

Kinga Lis

John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin

## Tracing Anglo-Norman Influence in French and English Medieval Psalter Translations

**ABSTRACT.** The objective of the paper is to trace the alleged influence of an early 12th-century Anglo-Norman Psalter rendition (the Montebourg Psalter) on a 14th-century Middle English Psalter translation known as *The Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter*, as has been suggested in the literature devoted to Anglo-Norman Psalters. The issue of relatedness between the two texts will be addressed from the perspective of lexical choices as regards nouns. However, due to the complex translation history of the Middle English text, a Middle French Glossed Psalter, which has been proven to have influenced the Middle English translation, will also be juxtaposed with the Anglo-Norman rendition in order to establish the number of lexical choices that can probably be ascribed to the latter source. Additionally, the study takes into consideration the shape of the Latin text, whose lexical make-up is bound to have played a role in the process of noun selection and can thus be responsible for some of the choices which are, at the same time, convergent with the choices in the two French texts. The analysis based on the first 50 Psalms will provide a tentative answer as to the veracity of the claim of the dependence of the Middle English text on the Anglo-Norman Psalter translation tradition and will at the same time shed some light on the issue of the relationship between the Middle English and Middle French Psalters analysed here.

**KEYWORDS:** Middle English Psalter, Middle French Psalter, translation, Anglo-Norman rendition, Latin.

### Introduction

The aim of the paper is to investigate the relationship between three medieval Psalter translations at the lexical level in order to (in)validate what the relevant literature has to say about the interdependencies between

them. The three texts I analyze in the study are: *The Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter* (first half of the 14th century), the Middle French Glossed Psalter (the only extant manuscript dated to the 15th century)<sup>1</sup> and the Montebourg Psalter (1110–1115), which is an Anglo-Norman text. This is a peculiar choice of texts, one could say, and in fact it does seem slightly odd, but there are reasons behind this choice and there is a context which renders the suggested connections probable enough to delve into the issue.

The incentive to investigate the issue came from, as is suggested above, claims present in the literature pertaining to *The Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter* (hereafter MEGPP) and the Anglo-Norman Psalters. In particular, the MEGPP is considered to have been influenced by the Middle French Glossed Psalter (henceforth MFGP), and similarities between the two renditions are undeniable as far as both syntax and lexis are concerned (St-Jacques 1989; Black, St-Jacques 2012).<sup>2</sup> However, the more one reads, the more puzzling the picture becomes, and Rector (2010: 25), upon the authority of St-Jacques (1989), states that it was not the Latin Gallican Psalter but rather the Oxford Psalter that “served as the base for *The Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter*.” Interestingly, I cannot find any statement explicitly to this effect in St-Jacques’ (1989) work. There are, nevertheless, some grounds for the claim. Both the texts and the issue of the relationship between them are discussed in section 1.

Since it is impossible to compare the three texts in detail within the confines of this paper, the study concentrates on the nominal layer of the first 50 Psalms of the renditions and aims to establish how much of the gathered data is in agreement between the texts. In order to ascertain that the convergences are not accidental, another ME Psalter rendition from the early 14th century was juxtaposed with the Middle French and Anglo-Norman texts as well. Thus, first the degree of convergence between the Middle French and Anglo-Norman renditions is measured and then the two are juxtaposed with the MEGPP and the control group. The results are presented in section 3, with section 2 providing methodological information regarding the study. The conclusions that can be

1 As is evident in light of the discussion in Sutherland (2015: 120–135), another copy of the text, this time in Anglo-Norman, dated to the third quarter of the 14th century, is preserved in the British Library (MS Additional 44949).

2 For some information on the text, see section 1.

drawn on the basis of the analysis of the data are discussed in the final part of this paper.

## 1. The texts and their cultural background

Among Middle English prose psalter renditions, the MEGPP is one that anyone, given the chance to juxtapose all of them, would point to as *peculiar*. The Psalter is known under a variety of names,<sup>3</sup> one of them being *The Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter* (MEGPP), the label that is adhered to also in this paper. Its peculiarity in comparison with the remaining Middle English prose psalters stems from its being anything but a standard psalter rendition. *Standard* biblical translations were *literal* and strove to preserve as much of the underlying Latin text as possible, even when it came to the syntax, because the biblical text was recognized as sacred, *i.e.* both the words and their order (Hargreaves 1965: 123). This sanctity could not be interfered with, whereas such interference is precisely what one encounters in the MEGPP, which not only employs a predominantly English word order but the translation is far from literal as it even substitutes glosses for the original lemmata.<sup>4</sup> The author of this early 14th-century rendition is unknown and only four manuscript copies of the text have been preserved, two of which (the Dublin<sup>5</sup> and the London<sup>6</sup> manuscripts) are analyzed in this study. Furthermore, both manuscripts are only copies of an archetypal manuscript, with other, un-preserved copies of the text intervening (Black, St-Jacques 2012: lv–lvi, part I). The French text, the MFGP, was derived from Latin at an even earlier date, although its extant copy studied here (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fonds français 6260) might be more distant from the Latin archetype than the MEGPP (Black, St-Jacques 2012: lv,

3 See Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013 and in prep.) and Lis (in prep.) for an overview of these.

4 One of the characteristics of this Middle English rendition is the presence of glosses in the Latin verses of the Psalter whose function is to paraphrase the text, thus providing a ready interpretation. In the course of the translation the glosses were predominantly substituted for the original reading of the text. For information on glossing, see Dodson (1932) and Black and St-Jacques (2012).

5 MS 69 preserved in Dublin, Trinity College, referred to henceforth as the MEGPP D.

6 MS Additional 17376 kept in the British Library in London, which will be referred to as the MEGPP L.

part I). Opinions concerning the extent of the MEGPP's indebtedness to the MFGP differ – from those perceiving it to have been translated from French (Deanesly 1920: 143) to those acknowledging the influence of the French source but emphasizing the MEGPP's independence at certain points (Reuter 1938; St-Jacques 1989).

With respect to the claim concerning the influence of the Montebourg Psalter<sup>7</sup> on the MEGPP, the issue is even less straightforward and stems from a variety of factors, all of which combined to create an environment conducive to the production of the texts under discussion here. First, it should be emphasized that English can boast “one of the longest continuous traditions of biblical translation of any of the modern Western languages” (Marsden 2011: 272), and yet this vibrant biblical translation culture came to a halt because of the Norman Conquest and the subsequent change in the status of the English language. The language which once was fit to transmit the *Word of God* was now perceived as an inappropriate medium for such purposes, and this opinion continued to be valid into the first quarter of the 16th century, when William Tyndale's work came into existence (Delisle, Woodsworth 1995: 32–35). However, a different language appeared in England in the 11th century whose status seemed sufficient to serve as the *transmitter* for the biblical texts; a language that back on the Continent was overshadowed by the prestigious Latin (Thomas 2003) – French, and, more precisely, its Anglo-Norman variety. It would have been unthinkable in 12th-century France to employ this vernacular for such purposes, but in England, where a different vernacular, OE, set the precedence for such use of a language different than Latin and where the status of Anglo-Norman was unparalleled to its status on the Continent and with respect to the English language, the necessary conditions arose for the use of Anglo-Norman as a language of the Bible (Rector 2009 and 2010). It was only after the first Anglo-Norman renditions of parts of the Bible appeared that continental French began to serve such purposes. And yet, as reported in Berger (1884), the first Anglo-Norman translation of any part of the Bible, *i.e.* the Montebourg Psalter, found its place in the *Bible du treizième siècle* and then remained the translation of the Psalter (in different shapes) in all French biblical renditions until the 16th century. There were, certainly, some translations that can be considered independent of

7 The Montebourg Psalter is also frequently referred to as the Oxford Psalter.

the Montebourg Psalter<sup>8</sup> but, on the whole, one can safely assume, after Berger (1884) and Black and St-Jacques (2012), that even if the MFGP was not immediately based on the Montebourg Psalter, some influence of the latter should be present in it. Therefore, to refer back to Rector's (2010) claim, elements of the Montebourg Psalter need to be detectable, to some extent, in the MFGP and, by extension, in the MEGPP *inspired* by this Middle French rendition. To quote Rector (2009: 206), “[w]e could thus see the Oxford Psalms as an accomodation of the vibrant culture of the Anglo-Saxon Psalter to the new sociolinguistic dynamics of post-Conquest life.” However, independence from Latin – the manuscript does not contain the Latin source text<sup>9</sup> – is a radical innovation and, since the Psalter lacks “illumination, a colophon or any distinctive markings by which we could firmly locate its production,” it can only be hypothesized, as is done for instance in Hunt (2008: 372), that the place where it came into existence was the Canterbury Cathedral Priory.

---

8 The texts in question are the following, listed here after Rector (2010):

1. the Orne Psalter (Paris, Archives nationales, AB XIX, 1734): considered less conservative than the Oxford Psalter as regards style and grammar: “although laid out interlinearly, is actually a freer and much more literary rendering of the Gallican Psalter” (Rector 2009: 202);
  2. the Arundel Psalter (London, British Library, MS Arundel 230): dated to the second half of the 12th century and regarded as “a largely word-by-word translation of the Psalms presented inter-linearly with a Latin text” (Rector 2009: 201); Berger (1884: 16–17) considers it to be a faithful copy of the Montebourg Psalter, though one which differs with respect to syntax, as this is required due to the gloss-nature of this Psalter translation;
  3. Psalms quoted in the translation of Gratian's *Decretals* (Decretum Gratiani) which are based on some earlier translation;
  4. a psalter contained within the body of the Romanz Psalter commentary produced for Laurette d'Alsace (1165): the first 50 Psalms received interlinear translations, whereas the remaining 100 Psalms can be regarded as a *loose translation*; the manuscript (Durham Cathedral Library, A II 11–13) is dated to ca. 1165; the translation is independent, although “echoes of the Oxford Psalter have long been observed” (Rector 2010: 16);
  5. Psalter in MS Harley 1770: the Latin and French texts are set in two columns facing each other; the text is not as pure as the one in the Oxford Psalter but the vocabulary used there is modernized with respect to the former; the text is dated to the 14th century (Berger 1884: 17–18).
- 9 It should be emphasized that the manuscripts of the MEGPP contain the glossed Latin text they render but the text has never been edited in its entirety.

## 2. Methodological issues

An analysis of the nominal layer of the texts from the perspective of lexical convergence between them is to be performed on a database consisting of exclusively corresponding lexical items from all of the renditions. This was achieved by means of using the common Latin source text, *i.e.* the Gallicanum (the second of Jerome's revisions), as the point of reference for the translations. Due to the fact that the original Latin text underlying the MEGPP has not been edited so far and the Latin source texts of the MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter are not known, the text employed here was actually a collation of four Gallican Psalters edited in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013) which, however, exhibit only minor divergences. Corresponding lexical items for all nouns from the first 50 Psalms of this Latin text (with the exclusion of proper nouns) were sought out and juxtaposed with the Latin lemmata. However, since not all of the contexts could be subject to further analysis because of some methodological inconsistencies, the number of sets of nouns actually compared equals 1969. Contexts which did qualify for the study were those in which both the MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter employed items labeled as nouns in dictionaries which provided the lemmata, *i.e.* *Dictionnaire du Moyen Français* and the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, respectively.<sup>10</sup> Lexical items which were thus excluded were those which were not labeled as members of this grammatical category or consisted of noun phrases made up of something more than a noun, preceded or not by an article. Also, some erroneous forms which could not be lemmatized to nouns appropriate in the given contexts, or translations of glosses rather than lemmata in the case of the MFGP, were not further analyzed.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, items translating the following Latin lemmata –

---

10 The dictionaries employed for Latin and Middle English were, respectively, Whitaker's *Words: Latin-to-English and English-to-Latin Dictionary* and the *Middle English Dictionary*.

11 For information on the presence of glosses in given Latin verses, I relied on the only source that provides the relevant information, *i.e.* Black and St-Jacques (2012), who edited, alongside the Middle English and Middle French translations, the glossed parts of the Latin Psalter. However, in places where the Middle French rendition appears to provide items which do not correspond to the Latin lemmata and they seem to be rather renderings of glosses, it was also decided to exclude them from further analysis.

*Deus, Dei, dius, dii* and *dominus, domini* – were excluded, as these do not introduce much information as regards convergence between the texts, and divergences in their renderings would rather reflect some minor differences in the actual underlying Latin text to which I had no access. This is highly probably, as the Gallican Psalters collated in Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013) differ in this respect, thus suggesting possible variation in other copies of the Gallicanum.

The complete database was analyzed from the perspective of convergences between the MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter; the results of which are presented in section 3.1. Then the groups of convergent and divergent nouns were juxtaposed with data from the MEGPP (section 3.2); the number of convergences with the MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter were established independently. Affinity between the Latin and French/English data was also taken into consideration to determine how many of the nouns employed in the renditions could actually be ascribed to the influence of the Anglo-Norman tradition. Additionally, as was mentioned above, another translation, *i.e.* Richard Rolle's Psalter, was used as a control group to establish how many similar choices between the MEGPP and the French texts might have occurred even if the texts were not interconnected in the manner described in section 1. The results of this analysis are presented in section 3.3. Rolle's Psalter (henceforth RRP) appears to be the most suitable of the available Middle English translations for this purpose as it is the closest to the MEGPP as far as the approximate date of translation is concerned, but also, and most importantly, because the text of this rendition has never been regarded as overly Latinized, in contrast to what has usually been stated with respect to the late 14th-century Wycliffite Bibles (*e.g.* Slater 1911: 233; Hargreaves 1969: 399; Bruce 1984; Norton 2000: 7; Lambert 2002: 263).<sup>12</sup> Additionally, no affinity between the RRP and the MFGP can be suspected and, therefore, convergences as regards noun choices between this text and the French translations will be indicative of the established status of these borrowings within the English language *or* of the influence of the underlying Latin text.

---

12 For a discussion on all of these Middle English Psalter renditions, see Charzyńska-Wójcik (2013).

### 3. The study proper

#### 3.1. Con-/divergences between the French Psalters

The MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter should not be expected to be extremely divergent as there are many nouns in the Psalms, such as *manus*, *manus* ‘hand,’ which are necessarily rendered by the same items in both texts, both being in French. However, the number of convergent items might be surprising. Of the 1969 analyzed contexts, 1512 (77%) agree between the MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter, which means that only 23% (457) of all the cases differ. Nevertheless, not all of these instances of convergences need to be indicative of an interdependency between the texts. In fact, only 259 (17% of 1512 cases) of these convergent pairs diverge from the Latin lemmata they render in the sense that they are not items derived from the nouns employed in the Latin Psalter. Therefore, it may well be that the extent of convergence between the MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter is predominantly a reflection of the influence of the underlying *Latin* text.

However, it has to be noted that there are other aspects that will need to be taken into account in the further stages of the study conducted here to conclusively determine the actual extent of the probable influence of the Anglo-Norman tradition on the lexical choices in the MFGP. First, the type of nouns exhibiting convergences (and divergences) will be closely analyzed. On the one hand, there are nouns such as *os*, *oris* ‘mouth’ whose default rendition is always *bouche* ‘mouth,’ just as it is *mouth* in the English translations, and thus convergences at these points are not very telling. All such nouns will be separated from contexts which, on the other hand, can actually be meaningful in relation to the study of this type, e.g. *abjectio*, *abjectionis* ‘dejection,’ which could be rendered by both *abjection* <*abjeccioun*><sup>13</sup> and *dejettement* <*degetement*> or *afflictio*, *afflictionis* ‘affliction,’ which is translated by means of *torment* [m] <*turment*> and *affliction* <*afflictium*>. Additionally, the results obtained in this manner will need to be subjected to statistical analysis in order to determine whether the values are in fact statistically significant.

At this stage, all that can be tentatively inferred from the data is that there appears to be a great extent of correlation between the nominal

---

<sup>13</sup> The Anglo-Norman lemmata are given in pointy brackets.

choices of the MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter which may or may not stem from the Anglo-Norman Psalter translation tradition.

### 3.2. Con-/divergences between the MEGPP and the French Psalters

Having analyzed the extent of convergence in the nominal choices between the MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter, I will now juxtapose these tentative findings with data from the MEGPP to establish whether Rector's (2010: 25) claim regarding the connection between the MEGPP and the Montebourg Psalter can be corroborated with reference to lexical choices. The data concerning the number of both convergent and divergent occurrences between the MEGPP and the two French Psalters are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. MEGPP vs. MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter

Nº	Type of convergence		MEGPP L	MEGPP D
1.	nouns convergent between three texts		391 (26%) vs. 1121 (74%)	352 (23%) vs. 1160 (77%)
2.	nouns convergent with the MFGP	nouns convergent only with this text	109 (24%) vs. 348 (76%)	106 (23%) vs. 351 (77%)
3.		all nouns convergent with the text	500 (25%) vs. 1469 (75%)	458 (23%) vs. 1511 (77%)
4.	nouns convergent with the Montebourg Psalter	nouns convergent only with this text	13 (3%) vs. 444 (97%)	9 (2%) vs. 448 (98%)
5.		all nouns convergent with the text	404 (21%) vs. 1565 (79%)	361 (18%) vs. 1608 (82%)

It has to be noted at this point that in order to maintain the same number of analyzed cases with respect to the MEGPP, the MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter, cases in the MEGPP (and in section 3.3 in the RRP) that were not congruent with the methodological considerations presented in section 2 were simply treated as instances of divergent cases. Also, it needs to be emphasized that due to the divergences between the two manuscripts of the MEGPP, an analysis for each of them had to be conducted independently and the results are thus presented separately for each manuscript.

The table with the data was constructed in the following manner: the first of the rows provides information concerning the number of convergent vs. divergent cases between the MEGPP, the MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter, *i.e.* it gives the number of items, from among the 1512 presented in section 3.1, which are also attested in the Middle English text; the percentage data being given in parentheses. Rows (2) and (3) provide data concerning convergences between the MEGPP and the MFGP. Row (2) presents the number of items attested in the MEGPP which find a related noun in the MFGP but not in the Montebourg Psalter. These are nouns from the group of 457 cases that are divergent between the French texts. Also here, the percentage data concerning their participation in this group is given in brackets. Row (3), on the other hand, sums up the number of convergent cases presented in rows (1) and (2), providing the total number of convergences between the MEGPP and the MFGP, the percentage value being given here with reference to the total number of analyzed cases – 1969. Finally, rows (4) and (5) provide the same information as rows (2) and (3), but with respect to the Montebourg Psalter.

What transpires from the data presented in Table 1 is that the convergent noun choices between the MEGPP and the MFGP constitute approximately a quarter of all the analyzed cases, and the percentage participation of convergent choices does not correspond to the convergences between the MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter. There is, however, a striking correlation between the convergences between the two French texts and the convergences between the MEGPP and the Anglo-Norman text since, when the group of items divergent between the Middle French and Anglo-Norman renditions is analyzed, the number of convergences between the latter and the Middle English translation drops dramatically – to 3% in the case of the MEGPP L and 2% with respect to the MEGPP D. Therefore, Rector's (2010: 25) statement does not appear to find much support as far as nominal lexical choices are concerned.

One remark which is relevant in this context is that the number of items that are convergent between the three texts but diverge with respect to Latin is 45 (3% of the 1512 analyzed cases, 12% of the convergent nouns from row (1)) for the MEGPP L and 34 (2% and 10%, respectively) in the case of the MEGPP D. As regards analogous data for items convergent between the MEGPP and the MFGP but divergent

with respect to the Montebourg Psalter and the reversal thereof, these are as follows: among the nouns convergent between the MEGPP and the MFGP, both the MEGPP L and the MEGPP D employ 79 items which are not related to nouns employed in the Latin source text. These constitute 16% of all 457 cases of nouns divergent between the French Psalters and, respectively, 72% and 75% of such convergent nouns from row (2). On the whole, nouns in the MEGPP that are convergent with the MFGP but such that cannot be ascribed to the influence of the Latin source text constitute 25% of nouns convergent between the two renditions for both the MEGPP L (124 in total) and the MEGPP D (113 in total).

As regards the convergences between the MEGPP and the Montebourg Psalter, their total number equals 53 for the London MS and 41 for its Dublin counterpart, thus constituting, respectively, 13% and 11% of all nouns convergent between these texts. When it comes to the number of such items among those convergent between the MEGPP and the Montebourg Psalter but not attested in the respective verses in the MFGP, these are 8 nouns for the MEGPP L (62%) and 7 in the case of the MEGPP D (78%).

All of these findings clearly indicate that the majority of attested congruencies between the Middle English translation and the French Psalters can be ascribed to more than one source, *i.e.* it could have been the influence of the Latin source text, of the MFGP or, as Rector (2010: 25) suggests, of the Anglo-Norman tradition. The picture is far less vague when it comes to the cases of nouns that differ between the MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter, as then not only the number of convergences is indicative of the actual interdependencies but also the fact that many among these nouns cannot be suspected of having been a suggestion to the Middle English translator through their presence in the Latin base text. However, caution is necessary as the two aspects mentioned in section 3.1 still need to be taken into consideration before definitive conclusions can be drawn. As these data are not available yet, I analyzed, as was mentioned earlier, a control group in order to determine how far the results obtained so far can be taken to be valid.

### 3.3. Con-/divergences between the RRP (*control group*) and the French Psalters

In order to determine the number of lexical choices convergent between the RRP and the MFGP/Montebourg Psalter, the same methodological procedures were applied as those described for the previous analyses. The numerical and percentage data concerning this text are provided in Table 2 in a manner analogous to Table 1.

Table 2. RRP vs. MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter

N <sup>o</sup>	Type of convergence		RRP
1.	nouns convergent between three texts		333 (22%) vs. 1179 (78%)
2.	nouns convergent with the MFGP	nouns convergent only with this text	76 (17%) vs. 381 (83%)
3.		all nouns convergent with the text	409 (21%) vs. 1560 (79%)
4.	nouns convergent with the Montebourg Psalter	nouns convergent only with this text	15 (3%) vs. 442 (97%)
5.		all nouns convergent with the text	348 (18%) vs. 1621 (82%)

It might be surprising to notice the extent of correspondence between the data presented in Table 1 and that given here. The number of nouns convergent between the RRP and the two French translations (333) is strikingly similar to the number of such items, especially in the Dublin MS of the MEGPP (352). Also, the number of items convergent between the RRP and the Montebourg Psalter is in close correlation to the data obtained in this respect for the MEGPP. Thus the total number of correspondences between the RRP and the Anglo-Norman translation (348) neatly correlates with that resulting from the analysis performed for the MEGPP D (361), constituting 18% of all the analyzed nouns in both texts. The only substantial differences that can be observed between the data for the RRP and the MEGPP relate to convergences between these texts and the MFGP. The lexical choices in the RRP resemble those attested in the MFGP but not in the Montebourg Psalter in 76 cases (17%) and, on the whole, the two texts exhibit similarities with respect to 409 noun choices (21%), whereas the relevant numbers for the MEGPP were higher and convergent choices constituted 25% in the MEGPP L

and 23% in the MEGPP D. The number might be lower but the extent of convergence between the RRP and the MFGP as regards over 20% of the analyzed cases clearly points to the fact that nouns of Romance origin were felt to be legitimate parts of the Middle English lexicon since no connection between the MFGP and RRP can be argued for.

Interestingly, there is also a neat correlation between the MEGPP and the RRP as regards the number of items convergent with the French text(s) that cannot be ascribed to the influence of Latin. These are 22 nouns among those convergent between the RRP, MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter (1% of 1512 nouns shared by the MFGP and the Anglo-Norman rendition and 66% of those are also convergent with the RRP, *i.e.* 333 items), 56 convergent only with the MFGP (12% of all nouns divergent between the French translations and 74% of those which converge only between the RRP and the MFGP) and 8 converging exclusively with the Anglo-Norman translation (2% of nouns divergent between the MFGP and the Montebourg Psalter and 53% of those among them which agree between the RRP and the latter of the texts). In total, such nouns constitute, for the RRP, 19% of items convergent with the MFGP (78 such cases) and 9% of those related to nouns attested in the Montebourg Psalter.

## Conclusions

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study at its present stage clearly point to some correspondences between the lexical choices in the MEGPP and the MFGP that do not appear to be clearly accidental. The data does not, however, seem to indicate a similar correlation with respect to the Montebourg Psalter and the Middle English translation since all lexical correspondences between the MEGPP and the Anglo-Norman Psalter at points where the latter diverges from the MFGP are extremely sparse. Certainly, a conclusive answer as to the presence and extent of the influence of the Anglo-Norman Psalter tradition on the MEGPP should be withheld until the remaining stages of the research have been completed, *i.e.* the type/s of vocabulary most frequently exhibiting convergences has/have been established and the statistical significance of the con-/divergences has been determined. The conclusions proposed here are thus only tentative and may prove to be questionable.

Additionally, the fact that the incentive for employing a particular noun of Romance origin might equally have stemmed from the presence of the item in question in the Latin source text rather than its being attested in the MFGP or being sanctioned by the Anglo-Norman tradition should also be borne in mind.

An additional piece of evidence whose objective is to aid the interpretation of the data obtained for the MEGPP has been offered in the shape of the analogous analysis of another early 14th-century, thus nearly contemporaneous, psalter whose translator has never been claimed to have been influenced by French psalter renditions. In fact, Richard Rolle has never been regarded as susceptible to the influence of Romance borrowings, in which Middle English abounded, and some scholars would see his translation as making recourse to borrowings only when necessary (Partridge 1973: 21).<sup>14</sup> Therefore, the fact that the multiple choices between the RRP and the two French renditions converge may point to the nouns in question as already being rooted in the Middle English lexicon and thus constituting what appeared to be natural choices in the relevant contexts. Most importantly, however, the results obtained with respect to the RRP seem to support the conclusions drawn above – the noun choices convergent between the MEGPP and the Montebourg Psalter can be accidental, whereas its correlation with the MFGP does not appear to be questionable.

## References

- Berger, Samuel (1884) *La Bible française au moyen age: étude sur les plus anciennes versions de la Bible écrites en prose de langue d’Oïl*. Paris: l’imprimerie nationale.
- Black, Robert R., Raymond C. St-Jacques (eds.) (2012) *The Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- 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 (in prep.) “Handling Synonymity in Mediaeval Translations of the Psalter into English.”
- Deanesly, Margaret (1920) *The Lollard Bible and Other Medieval Biblical Versions*. Cambridge: University Press.

<sup>14</sup> However, the claim has not been corroborated, in Lis (2015 and in press).

- Delisle, Jean, Judith Woodsworth (eds.) (1995) *Translators through History*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Dodson, Sarah C. (1932) "The Glosses in 'The Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter.'" [In:] *Studies in English* 12; 5–26.
- Hargreaves, Henry (1965) "From Bede to Wyclif: Medieval English Bible Translations." [In:] *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48; 118–140.
- Hargreaves, Henry (1969) "The Wycliffite's Versions." [In:] Geoffrey W. H. Lampe (ed.) *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Vol. 2: *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 387–415.
- Hunt, Tony (2008) "The Anglo-Norman Book." – Section I of Tony Hunt, Julia Boffey, Anthony Stockwell Garfield Edwards, Daniel Huws, "Vernacular Literature and Its Readership." [In:] Lotte Hellinga, Joseph Burney Trapp (eds.) *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*. Vol. 2: 1100-1400. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 367–396.
- Lambert, Malcolm D. (2002) *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lis, Kinga (2015) "'The Simplest and Most Proper' English of the 14th-Century Richard Rolle's Psalter Rendition." [In:] Anna Bondaruk et al. (eds.) *Young Minds vs. Old Questions in Linguistics. Proceedings of the Fourth Central European Conference in Linguistics for Postgraduate Students*. Lublin: The Institute of East-Central Europe and the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin; 98–121.
- Lis, Kinga (in prep.) "The Etymology of Nouns in Middle English Prose Psalter renditions."
- Lis, Kinga (in press) "Richard Rolle's Psalter Rendition – the Work of a Language Purist?" [To appear in:] *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*.
- Marsden, Richard (2011) "The Bible in English in the Middle Ages." [In:] Susan Boynton, Diane J. Reilly (eds.) *The Practice of the Bible in the Middle Ages: Production, Reception and Performance in Western Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press; 272–295.
- Norton, David (2000) *A History of the English Bible as Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Partridge, Astley C. (1973) *English Biblical Translation*. London: André Deutsch.
- Rector, Geoff (2009) "An Illustrious Vernacular: The Psalter *en Romanz* in Twelfth-Century England." [In:] Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al. (eds.) *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain. The French of England c.1100-c.1500*. York: York Medieval Press; 198–206.

- Rector, Geoff (2010) "The *Romanz* Psalter in England and Northern France in the Twelfth Century: Production, Mise-en-Page, and Circulation." [In:] *Journal of the Early Book Society* 13; 1–38.
- Reuter, Ole (1938) "A Study of the French Words in the 'Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter.'" [In:] *Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 9 (4).
- Slater, John R. (1911) "English Versions Before 1611." [In:] *The Biblical World* 37 (4); 232–239.
- St-Jacques, Raymond C. (1989) "Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter and Its French Source." [In:] Jeanette Beer (ed.) *Medieval Translators and Their Craft*. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications; 135–154.
- Sutherland, Annie (2015) *English Psalms in the Middle Ages, 1300-1450*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, Hugh M. (2003) *The English and the Normans. Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation, and Identity 1066-c.1220*. New York: Oxford University Press.

### Online sources

- Anglo-Norman Dictionary* = Trotter, David A., William Rothwell, Geert de Wilde, Heather Pagan (eds.) *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Available at: <http://www.anglo-norman.net/> [ED 16.10.2014].
- Bruce, Frederick F. (1984) "John Wycliffe and the English Bible." [In:] *Churchman* 98 (4). Available at: <http://www.churchsociety.org/churchman/articles.asp?fvol=98&fyear=&fauthor=Bruce&ftitle=>, [ED 8.03.2013].
- Dictionnaire du Moyen Français*, version 2012 (DMF 2012). ATILF - CNRS & Université de Lorraine. Available at: <http://www.atilf.fr/dmf>
- Middle English Dictionary* = Kurath, Hans, Sherman McAllister Kuhn, John Reidy, Robert E. Lewis *et al.* (eds.) (1952–2001) *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Available at: <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>
- Middle French Glossed Psalter = *Histoire de la Bible, Psautier et Apocalypse*. 1401-1500. MS Bibliothèque Nationale Fonds Française 6260. Available at: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b9060447r.r=6260+psautier.langEN>
- Montebourg Psalter = Michel, Francisque (1876) *The Oxford Anglo-Norman Psalter [MS Bodleian Douce 320]*. Available at: <http://www.anglo-norman.net/sources/?session=SNWK32162T1441569310>, [ED 5.09.2015].
- Whitaker, William. *Words: Latin-to-English and English-to-Latin Dictionary*. Available at: <http://ablemedia.com/ctcweb/showcase/wordsonline.html>