



HAL
open science

The Musical Instruments in the Early Vernacular Translations of the Psalms (4)

Alessia Chapel, Fabienne Toupin, Vladimir Agrigoroaei

► **To cite this version:**

Alessia Chapel, Fabienne Toupin, Vladimir Agrigoroaei. The Musical Instruments in the Early Vernacular Translations of the Psalms (4). *museIKON A Journal of Religious Art and Culture*, 2022, 6, pp.211-221. halshs-03923915

HAL Id: halshs-03923915

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-03923915v1>

Submitted on 5 Jan 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



The Musical Instruments in the Early Vernacular Translations of the Psalms (4)

Collective Research

Contributors	Sigla
Alessia Chapel	AC
Fabienne Toupin	FT
Vladimir Agrigoroaei	VA

This paper represents a continuation of previous publications: “The Musical Instruments in the Early Vernacular Translations of the Psalms. Collective Research” (*Museikon*, 3, 2019, p. 67-140—hereafter abbreviated as *Musical Instruments* 2019); “The Musical Instruments in the Early Vernacular Translations of the Psalms (2): Collective Research” (*Museikon*, 4, 2020, p. 257-302—hereafter abbreviated as *Musical Instruments* 2020); and “The Musical Instruments in the Early Vernacular Translations of the Psalms (4): Collective Research” (*Museikon*, 5, 2019, p. 91-107—hereafter abbreviated as *Musical Instruments* 2021). The current paper represents the finalisation of this group of articles.

Old English Section (continued) (FT)

PARIS PSALTER DISCUSSION:

Indeed, the assumption that these choices were made first and foremost for prosodic reasons is indeed safe, and all the safer as we consider the Paris Psalter as a whole as best described by the notion of dynamic equivalence (Nida 1964). Alfred’s prose translation and the metrical translation that follows are audience-oriented – Alfred’s prose was meant to educate, and the verse was meant to be listened to. Dynamic equivalence, therefore, must have been sought for in both parts of the Paris Psalter, so as to produce the same effect on the audience as the original text had on its own audience, and it cannot possibly account for odd compounds or translation choices appearing only in the second (metrical) part of the Old English text.

TIBERIUS PSALTER DISCUSSION:

It was pointed out that *crwth* came up in some later Middle English translations as the Surtees Psalter, and in the same vein I would like to stress that the word does not occur at all in the Old English translations of the Vitellius, Stowe, and Tiberius Psalters I studied. Old English *hearpe* is the high-frequency item with the generic meaning of ‘a stringed instrument’ (corresponding to Latin *cithara*) that we find in those texts.

Crwth has a number of spelling variants: Middle English *croupe*, *crouth(e)*, *rowth* or, showing no interidental consonant, Middle English *croud(e)*, *crowd(e)*, *croudde*, *kroude*. This is originally a Welsh form also encountered in the other Celtic languages with two related senses (‘harp, violin’, and ‘hump, hunch’). The *Middle English Dictionary* distinguishes two senses of *croud*, viz. 1. A stringed instrument of the Celtic peoples, the crowd; 2. (a) A stringed instrument of the Near East. Etymologically, Middle English *croud* is akin to late Latin *crota*, but not to

classical Latin *chorus* (OED, s.v. *crowd* n.1); the link established between *croud* and *chorus* is apparently due in sense 2.(a) above to an erroneous rendering of biblical Latin *chorus* ‘a circular dance to song or instrumental music, music accompanied by dancing’ (MED, s.v. *croud* n.(2)), but in a note found in the same entry the dictionary suggests that ‘chorus’ is not necessarily a Middle Eastern instrument, since in Latham MLBS [*Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, eds. R. E. Latham et al. (1975-)], ‘chorus’ is taken as ‘crowd’ (musical instrument)).

In conclusion, although Middle English *croud* (a loan word from Welsh) and Latin *chorus* are not cognates, it could be contended that the generic meaning of biblical Latin *chorus* and its erroneous rendering at some point as Middle English *croud* might have favoured or even triggered a semantic process of extension in the English word, resulting in *croud* too eventually taking over the generic meaning of ‘musical instrument’. If this hypothesis is valid, this process of extension cannot be described as an internal development of the English language, since contact with Latin was key in it.

GENERAL CONCLUSION DISCUSSION:

I was specifically invited to compare the rendering of the Latin phrase meaning ‘in the midst of young female players on the tambourine’ (Ps 67:26) in the Tiberius and in the Eadwine Psalters. In the Eadwine Psalter the Latin sequence in *medio iuuenum timpanistiarum* corresponds to *on midle gingra gliewmedene plegiendra mid timpanan*. Formal equivalence being sought for in that text, this is

◀ *Shepherd playing a rather long pipe in the scene of the Nativity in the Church of Saint John Chrysostom, settlement of Geraki (Laconia, Greece), turn of the 14th century.*

Credits: Vladimir Agrigoroaei.

a clear and precise translation, but it is also longish and for that reason rather awkward. It can be thus parsed: *on midle gingra* ADJECTIVE-GENITIVE PLURAL *gliwmedene* NOUN-GENITIVE PLURAL. *plegiendra* PRESENT PARTICIPLE-GENITIVE.PLURAL *mid timpanan* NOUN-DATIVE SINGULAR (‘in the midst of young female instrumentalists playing with the tambourine’). From a syntactic point of view, the sequence involves a participial clause, *plegiendra mid timpanan*, which to a large extent accounts for the length of the English sequence. By contrast, in the Tiberius Psalter the Latin sequence in *medio iuuencularum tympanistriarum* is rendered by a simpler – but also vaguer – sequence, *on middele gliwmædena*, which can be thus parsed: *on middele gliwmædena* COMPOUND NOUN-GENITIVE PLURAL (‘in the midst of young female instrumentalists’).

Therefore, we can observe no morphosyntactic simplification in the sequence in the Eadwine Psalter compared with that in the Tiberius Psalter, quite the opposite indeed. Surprisingly, it even looks as if the limited space available to the copyists in the Eadwine interlinear gloss played

no part in restricting the relative length and complexity of the English passage. To be frank, the only segment where, in my opinion, an elaborate and almost tautological repetition of words can be observed is in the Vitellius Psalter, which has *on midlene gingrena timpana hearpigendra plegendra*. The segment can be thus parsed: *on midlene gingrena* NOUN-GENITIVE PLURAL *timpana* NOUN-ACCUSATIVE PLURAL *hearpigendra* PRESENT PARTICIPLE-GENITIVE.PLURAL *plegendra* PRESENT PARTICIPLE-GENITIVE.PLURAL (lit. ‘in the midst of young people playing on the harp playing the tambourine’). The accumulation of participles here (*hearpigendra* and *plegendra*) is not quite tautological since the Old English verb *hearpian* means ‘to harp, to play on the harp’, and not a more generic ‘to play an instrument’; it results in a semantic clash between playing the harp and playing the tambourine. This observation can only reinforce my former conclusion, based on different items, that the scribe who translated the Latin text in the Vitellius Psalter had only superficial knowledge of Latin.

Translation Resilience: The First Draft of a Theory (AC, VA)

There are many ways one can draw the conclusion(s) of this lengthy article. Several conclusions have already been drawn at the end of each section or during the debates which followed many of them. Another conclusion can be drawn with a forthcoming article concerning one of the translation clusters from our common research: Vladimir Agrigoroaei, Ileana Sasu, Kateřina Voleková, Andrea Svobodová, Katarzyna Jasińska, Ágnes Korondi, Mădălina Ungureanu, Ana Maria Ginsac, “A pan-European translation cluster? Synonymic variations in the vernacular translation choices for *τυμπανιστριαί / tympanistriae* (Ps 67:26),” in *Translation Automatism in the Vernacular Texts of the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period*, eds. Vladimir Agrigoroaei, Ileana Sasu, Turnhout, Brepols, 2023 (forthcoming). Last but not least, the current demonstration concerning “translation resilience” can be considered to be the third and last conclusion.

The case study presented in the following pages tries to establish the context in which certain features of a text, lost in the process of translation, can reappear in its rewritings or translations of the second-degree text. For lack of a better term, it was defined as “translation resilience” and identified as having linguistic and aesthetic trigger mechanisms, the latter being the subject of the current presentation. We will dwell chiefly on the specific case of translation choices present in the vernacular renderings of verse Ps 97:6 (KJV “with trumpets and sound of cornet make a joyful noise before the Lord, the King”). Medieval vernacular versions raise several specific issues in the translation of this passage due to: (1) linguistic choices, (2) stylistic or aesthetic reasons, and (3) exegetical grounds. It is not a simple issue of philology vs translation studies, nor of translation strategies (formal/functional vs. dynamic). A cross-section look at the texts analysed in the previous instalments of this article revealed that the issue of aesthetic coherence (or stability) vs. incoherence (or instability) is of uttermost relevance. It should not come as a surprise that French translations seem to be the most useful examples in the current discussion. Due to their variable aesthetic choices and lack of unitary translation strategy, these French texts present all the possible degrees of stability and instability in comparison to translations in other languages.

To sum up the issue, the Masoretic text of Ps 97:6 dis-

tinguishes between *ḥāṣōserāh* (‘hammered metal trumpet’) and *šōḡar* (‘horn made trumpet’), making use of two different terms. The Old Greek version uses a single word in its translation (*σάλπιγξ*), but needs to differentiate between the two different instruments. In order to achieve this differentiation, the Septuagint used two different adjectives (cf. *Musical Instruments* 2019, p. 69): *σάλπιγξ κερατίνη* ‘trumpet made of horn’ (rendering *šōḡar*) and *σάλπιγξ ἑλατή* ‘trumpet of hammered (metal)’ (rendering *ḥāṣōserāh*). This is the starting point of the present problem, since the overwhelming majority of (allegedly stable) versions, either based on or derived from the Greek source, make use of similar pairs of adjectives, but there are several exceptions which testify to a different logic and witness different dynamics of biblical rewritings. In this wide category of allegedly stable versions, Church Slavonic texts slavishly follow the Greek and render *σάλπιγξ* as *трѣба* (*trōba*) followed by two attributes (cf. *трѣбахъ ѡкованахъ и гласомъ трѣбы рожаны*). Much in the same manner, the distinction is preserved in the Latin versions of Gallicanum and Romanum, also based on the Greek source, which prefer a generic word *tuba* defined as *ductilis* (the metal one) and *cornea* (the one made out of horn). The problem is that similar translation choices occur in various vernacular texts, since they are either based on the Gallicanum or the Church Slavonic texts, but one can also notice the existence of a parallel (and composite) group of translations which belong to the same family, but which mention two different musical instruments instead of a single instrument followed by two adjectives. It looks as if they could be linked to the Masoretic text or saint Jerome’s Hebraicum, yet these connections are impossible to support. The main question is how could this happen and why?

From the above, it is evident that the distinction based on adjectives does not occur in Hebraicum. As this version was based on Hebrew, it fits the pattern set by the Masoretic text in a different manner. Hebraicum uses *tuba* in place of the metallic instrument and *buccina* in place of the horn instrument. This choice is perfectly explainable when one draws a parallel to the commentary of saint Jerome to the book of Hosea, where he specifies that: *In Gabaa itaque et in Rama clara buccina et tuba personate;*

quorum *buccina* pastoralis est, et cornu recurvo efficitur: unde et proprie Hebraice *sophar* [...], Graece *κεραρίνη* appellatur. *Tuba* autem de aere efficitur, vel argento, qua in bellis et solemnitatibus concrepabant (PL 25:861C-D). This explanation proves that *buccina* renders, at least in the specific context of the Hebraicum translation, a shepherd instrument, curved and made of horn; while *tuba* refers to a straight instrument made of metal (either brass or silver), used on solemn occasions or during wartime. This was probably the intention of saint Jerome's translation *ad sensum*. It tried to convey the message of the Masoretic text not in an archaeological approach, but in a manner more adapted to literary texts, thus the use of "adaptation." Hebraicum enforces the translation technique known as "adaptation," whereby a cultureme (or cultural element) from the source text is replaced with another element from the target culture (Molina, Hurtado Albir 2002, p. 509-511: "to change *baseball* for *fútbol* in a translation into Spanish"; cf. 'adaptation' in Vinay, Darbelnet 1958; or 'cultural equivalent' in Margot 1979).

This does not mean that the Hieronymian use of the two terms in the Hebraicum text was obvious to its readers. Even though saint Jerome had in mind an instrument made of horn, readers could imagine a different *buccina* as a result of the confusions generated by (1) the semantic evolution of the terms *buccina*, *cornu*, and *tuba* at the end of Antiquity and during the Early Middle Ages (cf. Meucci 1987, p. 267). This explains the confusions in the translation of the two terms. However, this is not the only impediment that we need to consider. Further complications arise due to (2) aesthetic choices overlapping the issue of these realia and (3) the rare use of Hebraicum as a source text for vernacular translations, since this was not a liturgical text. In other words, when a pair of musical instruments reappeared in a given vernacular translation in place of the same instrument mentioned twice (and followed by two different adjectives), these coincidences would not always be dictated by a common textual origin (i.e., in connection to a specific source text). With rare exceptions when Hebraicum was indeed the source of the vernacular translation, no discernible links can be established with Hebraicum and vernacular developments seem to be spontaneous.

Add to this the fact that such developments are the result of a parallel phenomenon of synonymy which already exists at basic linguistic levels. Already by the time of saint Jerome, Latin terms such as *buccina*, *cornu*, and *tuba* were used in an interchangeable manner, even though their etymon was related to a certain material (horn, seashell, metal) and even though their use in Latin had been traditionally related to the shape of the instrument (curved or straight). In the presence of this blurring effect created by basic synonymy, the biblical or ancient realia to which a translator referred to could not be fully understood by future translators (or by the immediate readers). What those readers and translators were left with was a simple pair of synonyms, the differentiation of which was made either on aesthetic grounds (for the sake of identifying two instruments and testifying to a sort of diversity) or based on realia-glosses (describing two different instruments with explicative attributes, which is more of a gloss than an actual translation). This translation by gloss, a sort of amplification where "amplification" is meant as a translation technique, is evident in the choice of rendering the pair by a single instrument followed by two attributes. For the sake of clarity, we repeat that this is the case of the Greek text, of the Church Slavonic one, and of the Latin Gallicanum and

Romanum (*tubae ductiles* vs. *tubae corneae*), but also that of the vernacular texts which are usually based on them. We will also point out once more that this was not the only available manner of translating. Either way, vernacular authors could at any time switch from the option of the realia-glosses to the one of the Hebraicum during a retranslation process. In other words, it matters less that the basis of the translators' text was Gallicanum or Romanum, where the differentiation was based on realia-glosses originating in a Greek translation source. Translators could revert to an aesthetic choice and use the name of two different instruments, thereby witnessing what we came to call "translation resilience."

Ps 46:6 Gallicanum: *Ascendit Deus in iubilo, et Dominus in uoce tubae.* / Romanum: *ascendit deus in iubilatione dominus in uoce tube* / Hebraicum: *Ascendit Deus in iubilo, Dominus in uoce bucinæ.*

Ps 80:4 Gallicanum: *Buccinate in neomenia tuba, in insigni die solemnitatis uestrae;* / Romanum: *canite in initio mensis tuba in die insignis sollempnitatis uestre* / Hebraicum: *Clangite in neomenia bucina, et in medio mense die solemnitatis nostrae.*

Ps 97:6 Gallicanum: *in tubis ductilibus, et uoce tubae corneae. Iubilate in conspectu regis Domini;* / Romanum: *in tubis ductilibus et uoce tubae corneae iubilate in conspectu regis domino* / Hebraicum: *In tubis et clangore bucinæ iubilate coram rege Domino.*

Ps 150:3 Gallicanum: *Laudate eum in sono tubae; laudate eum in psalterio et cithara.* / Romanum: *laudate eum in sono tubae laudate eum in psalterio et cythara* / Hebraicum: *Laudate eum in clangore bucinæ: laudate eum in psalterio et cithara.*

Before delving further into the issue of this matter, we need to establish the manner in which synonymic pairs of this type operate. When comparing Ps 97:6 with the other three Psalm verses (Ps 46:6, Ps 80:4, and Ps 150:3) where wind instruments are mentioned, another type of pattern is manifest. Translators "crystallise" their translation choices focusing on specific terms, such as *tuba*, found in all Latin versions, or *buisine*, which is given preferential status in the majority of Old French texts. In other words, Gallicanum and Romanum crystallise their choices in the form of a signifier *tuba* that they further enrich via adjectival extension (such as in the case of Ps 97:6) whenever they refer to two different signified terms. During the translation process, French scribes and authors mirror this Latin crystallisation by using the one and the same signifier: *buisine* for *tuba*. These two choices become generic signifiers in Latin and Old French. As a result, the fluidity of the translation process, where synonymy can be used in various ways, becomes solid and stable through the choice of a generic and ubiquitous signifier. Yet this is by no means a definitive process, since the translation can revert to its previous fluid state, witnessing various degrees of instability. For us, this crystallisation defines the change from a fluid (synonymous) state of certain terms that gain stability as a result of the preferential or reiterated choice of certain words. A reverse crystallisation occurs even in saint Jerome's Hebraicum, where *buccina* takes the place of *tuba* and translates *šofar*.

Some examples are in order. As already mentioned in *Musical Instruments* 2021, p. 94, the crystallised term used by Old English texts as a designation of a wind instrument was *byme*. In the Vitellius Psalter, based on Gallicanum (contrary to most Old English Psalm glosses which are based on Romanum), the distinction of a realia-gloss type is evident. In *tubis ductilibus et uoce tube corneae* was

rendered as *on bymum gelædendlicum 7 stefne byman hyrnenre*. The same happens in the Stowe Psalter (*in tubis ductilibus et uoce tubae corneae > on byman aslagenum 7 stemne byman hyrnenre*); or in the Eadwine Psalter (*in tubis ductilibus & uoce tube cornee > on bymæn geleddon 7 stefne byme horn*). If we were to draw a hasty conclusion, we would say that this stable use of the term *byme* could be determined by the formal or functional type of translation strategy, close to the Latin source.

When we move into the corpus of Middle English texts, we recognise a similar type of crystallised translation choice in the form of the *trump(is/ys)*. Richard Rolle calques the Latin text of his source (*in tubis ductilibus & uoce tubae corneae > in trumpys ductils and in uoice of trumpe corne*). This happens as well in the Early and Late Versions of the Wycliffite Bible (*in trumpis beten out, and in uois of the hornene trump vs. in trumpis betun out with hamer, and in uois of a trumpe of horn*). The interesting thing about the second example is the manner in which the realia-gloss expands from a simple reference such as *beten out* (Early Version) to a more elaborate one such as *betun out with hamer* (Late Version). It is as if the translator acknowledges the exegetic character of the two Latin attributes and feels the need to expand on one of them, in order to enhance comprehension. This is by no means the situation in the Middle English Glossed Psalter, which reads *in trumpis ledande and uoice of trumpe of horne*, but this could be linked to a reading from its French source (probably not the manuscript identified by the editors, which reads here something else: *en esemes meuables et en uoix d'eseme*).

Just like Middle English texts, Italian translations generalise *tromba* (or *trombetta*) but sometimes introduce odd changes to the text of the source. For instance, in the precise case of the Venetian Psalter's translation of Ps 97:6, the reading *in la tromba et in la uoce de tromba de corno* follow the specific distinction of the Latin text only in the case of the second term, the instrument made of horn (*de corno*). Perhaps the first term was already perceived as being made of metal, as a general attribute of the word *tromba*, based on a Germanic etymon. This etymon also appears in later French texts (cf. *DEAFÉL trompe* based on the Old Franconian *trumba*), probably as a result of the wider use of an instrument with this name, across languages. And the same etymon is perhaps at the origin of Church Slavonic *mp̃x̃ba* (*tr̃ba*) which becomes the crystallised translation choice in Old Czech texts, which always use the word *tr̃ba* and keep the adjectival distinction of the Gallicanum text (their probable source) for the phrase of Ps 97:6: *v tr̃bách l̃tých a hlasem tr̃by rohové* (Wittenberg Psalter); *v tr̃bách povodných a hlasem tr̃by rohové* (Clementinum Psalter); *v tr̃bách v litých a v hlasě tr̃by rohové* (Chapter Psalter); *v tr̃bách dutých a hlasem tr̃by rohové* (Poděbrady Psalter); *a v tr̃bách dutých a v hlasu tr̃by rohové* (Boskovice Bible); *v tr̃bách dutých a v hlasu tr̃by rohové* (Padeřov Bible); *a na trouby duté a hlasem tr̃by rohové* (First Printed Psalter).

This choice of *tr̃ba* needs to be understood in light of the use of the verb *trubte* in the Czech translations of Ps 80:4. The crystallisation of this term is probably the crystallisation of the etymon itself. This is equally evident in the case of Old French *buisine* and Old Romanian *buci(n)-*, in turn related to the use of the verb *buisiner* and *a buci(n)ra*, as shall become evident in the next segment of our demonstration. For the time being, it is safe to assume that variations in the use of the verb occur for aesthetic reasons, trying to avoid the repetition of an etymon in the same statement. In the Old Czech Clementinum Psalter,

for instance, Ps 80:4 is translated differently in comparison to other Czech versions. The verb *vzvūcte* takes the place of *trubte*. According to Andrea Svobodová and Hana Kreisingerová, whom we thank for this information, *vzvūcte* could be interpreted as a poetic translation choice, similar to many other ones in the Clementinum Psalter. This provides us with a glimpse into the aesthetic origin of similar variations and with the relevance of aesthetics in the translation process, as a general rule.

Before pursuing the connected issue of the verbs *bucinare*, *canere*, and *clangere* and their corresponding nouns, it is worth dwelling a little bit longer on generic translation choices and the manner in which they crystallise. In the same passage, most Hungarian versions use the word *kürt* for *tuba*, and the verb *kürtölni* (same etymon) for *bucinare*: *visselő kürtökben és szarukürtnek* (Döbrensei Codex); *viselő kürtbe és szaru csinált kürtbe* (Codex of Keszthely); and *viselem kürtbe és szaru csinált kürtbe* (Kulcsár Codex). Apur Codex reads *trombita* twice (*vert trombitákkal és szaru trombitának*), probably an Italianism (cf. *Musical Instruments* 2019, p. 117), if not an odd choice of the translator, influenced by the existence of similar terms in Italian, French, Czech, etc., based on the already mentioned Germanic etymon. This game of synonymy is further substantiated by the use of an attribute following the first mention of *trombita* in Apur Codex, namely *vert* (past participle of *verni* 'to beat') instead of *viselő* (present participle of the verb *viselni* 'to bear, to wear, to carry'), which is used by the previous three versions. We thank Ágnes Korondi for this information. It helps establish that variations such as these are synonymic, not aesthetic, and they do not lead the Hungarian translator of the Apur Codex to mention two specific instruments, opposed to one another, similar to the Latin Hebraicum. He preserves the differentiation of Gallicanum.

The only time when we do encounter the name of two instruments in the form of a pair, as in Hebraicum, is in the three Hungarian translations of the sixteenth century. The use of two different words by István Benczédi Székely (*trombitával és kürtszóval*), Gáspár Károli (*trombitákkal és kürtnek*), and Gáspár Heltai (*síppal és trombitaszóval*) is probably the result of an awareness of the Hebrew text or at least of saint Jerome's Hebraicum. Like the Hebrew text, these three later Hungarian versions use two terms which seem to refer to two different instruments: on the one hand, *kürt* and *trombita*; on the other hand, *síppal* (perhaps linked to the Hebrew word *šōṣar*?) and *trombita*. The use of *kürt* and *trombita* in the earlier Hungarian translations already gave the impression that they are interchangeable synonyms. In these more recent translations, the two words remain synonyms, as is evident from the rendering of verses Ps 46:6, Ps 80:4, and Ps 150:3, where Székely and Heltai deploy them according to the same logic as the Masoretic text or saint Jerome in the Hebraicum. As a matter of fact, Heltai uses *trombita* to render *bucina* / *šōṣar*, whereas *síppal* is used as a translation for *tuba* / *ḥāšōserāh*. Székely uses *kürt* for *bucina* and *trombita* for *tuba*. As for Károli, he does not seem to follow this logic outside of verse Ps 97:6. He is often closer to what we see in certain late French medieval translations. We consider that this differentiation is probably the result of an interest for the original

- ▶ *Angel playing the horn, trumpet, or perhaps the bucin in the scene of the Last Judgement in the Church of the Dormition of the Mother of God, Hălmagiu (Transylvania, Romania), 15th century.*

Credits: Anca Crișan.



Hebrew text, expected from the part of Protestant translators such as István Benczédi Székely, Gáspár Károli, and Gáspár Heltai. After all, they would be faced with more or less the same dilemma as the one faced by saint Jerome in the making of the Hebraicum, where he distinguished between *tuba* and *bucina*. Perhaps this can equally explain the use of the pair *trîmbita* and *bucin* in the Old Romanian Psalter of Coresi dated to 1589, where the two terms translate the reiteration of a Church Slavonic term *тpъжба*. Could this Romanian use of *trîmbita* be based on a similar logic as the Hungarian use of *trombita* in the Protestant texts of the sixteenth century? Coresi is known to have been influenced by Protestant translations, therefore some knowledge of the Masoretic text via a commentary, a gloss, or a translation in another language cannot be excluded.

This does not mean that Romanian texts, in general, were different because they date to a late period and often bear the imprint of Protestant influence. On the contrary, the instruments mentioned in verse Ps 97:6 are always rendered as the Old Romanian word *bucin* accompanied by an attribute, based on Church Slavonic (Voronet̃ Psalter: *îm bucire ferecate și cu glasure bucire de cornu*; Hurmuzaki Psalter: *În bucinre fărăcate cu glasul bucinre de coarne*; Scheian Psalter: *în bucinre ferecații și cu glasure bucinre de cornu*; Ciobanu Psalter: *În bucinrele ferecate cu glasure bucinre de cornu*; Coresi Psalter of 1570: *în bucinrele ferecate cu glasure bucinre de cornu*; Coresi Psalter of 1577: *în bucinrele ferecate cu glasure bucinre de cornu*). The Coresi Psalter of 1589 seems to be an exception to the general rule. This general rule would be that *bucin* is the crystallised term, followed by different attributes. However, once again, just like in the late Hungarian versions, Coresi 1589 witnesses the use of *trîmbita* and *bucin* as interchangeable synonyms (Ps 46:6 [46:5] *възиде бѣ въ въскликновени гѣ въ гласъ тpъжбнѣ / sui Dumnezeu întru strigări, Domnul în glasul bucinilor*; Ps 80:4 [80:3] *въстръжите на новъ мѣсець тpъжбож, въ нарочитъ днь празника вашего / trîmbitați la lună noao cu trîmbita, în nărocita zi de sârbătoarea voastră*; and Ps 150:3 *хвалите его въ гласъ тpъжбнѣ хвалите его въ фалтири и въ гжслехъ / lăudați pre dins în glas de trîmbite, lăudați pre dins în ceateri și ceateari*). He does this in the manner of Gáspár Károli, but with the attributes specific to the development we see in all versions derived from the Greek.

We will end this section of the demonstration with a simple observation concerning the Old Romanian translation choice *buci(n)r-* for the verb and noun corresponding to Latin *bucina* and *bucinare*. Even though this could be a strong argument in favour of a Latin source text, this is hardly imaginable. Ongoing research into the possible sources of the Romanian ‘rhotic’ psalters (cf. RoPSALT project) have identified that source as Church Slavonic. Furthermore, the problematic term (Latin *bucina*) is not used in Romanum, which had been identified as a possible source for the Romanian translations by Chițimia 1981. Instead, the use of a verb and noun derived from the etymon *buci(n)r-* could stem from the frequent use of this etymon in the Old Romanian language. *Buci(n)ra* is a Latin word in Romanian, perhaps just as frequent as it is in the Old French vernacular. In the case of the Romanian language, no previous uses of the terms can be identified, since the rhotic translations of the Psalms are the first texts attested in the language, but in the case of the Old French uses of the word *buisine* it is evident that this was the most relevant term to be used, and as a result the most obvious choice of translation. This observation was already made in the first instalment of this article

(cf. *Musical Instruments* 2019, p. 86: “*buisine* was the most common way of rendering any wind instrument. This is probably the reason why the word *tuba* was frequently translated as *buisine*”). This consideration is supported by the vernacular choice for rendering *tuba* in various French texts, such as the First French Psalm Commentary, which is not related to the Oxford Psalter group (*Ascendit Deus in iubilatione, et Dominus in voce tube > Deus monta en granz leëce, et li Sire en voiz de boisine* in the commentary of Ps 46:6) or in the adaptation of Pierre de Paris (BnF, MS fr. 1761), who uses *buisine* in all occurrences (Ps 46:6 *en la uois de la boussigne de son fill*; Ps 80:4 *boussignes en la boussigne de la nouvelle lune*; Ps 97:6 *et en les bouzignes magnables e en la uois de la bouzigne faite de corne*; Ps 150:3 *en le son della boussine*). Nevertheless, the ultimate piece of evidence comes from the Anglo-Norman glossaries of the thirteenth century. In all these texts, Latin *buccina* and *tuba* are always rendered as *buisine* (cf. Hunt 1991, vol. 3, p. 21, 171, 212, 213-214).

This explains why *buisine* is the preferred choice for Latin *tuba* in the Oxford Psalter (Ps 46:6, Ps 97:6, Ps 150:3). In this French text, verse Ps 97:6 becomes *en buisines turneices e en uoiz de buisine de corn*, thus maintaining the difference between *tuba ductilis* and *tuba cornea*. Yet the analyses from the earlier instalments of the current paper have shown that Ps 80:4 represents an exception from this general rule. The scribe translates there Latin *tuba* as Old French *tube* (*Buccinate in neomenia tuba > Buisinez en la festiuel tube*). As previously implied in *Musical Instruments* 2019, p. 88, “the use of the [Old French] word *tube* was probably restricted to an etymological context,” but in this specific case, we no longer agree with this interpretation. The translator’s choice could actually be justified by the desire to keep a distinction between the terms used in the verse, following the example of the Latin text: *Buccinate / tuba > Buisinez / tube*. The situation seems to be the same in the Winchester Psalter, a copy of the Oxford Psalter manuscript group. The formula of verse Ps 97:6 (*in tubis ductilibus & uoce tubae corneae*) is rendered as *en busines turneices e en uoiz de busine de corn*. It should be noted that *buisine* also appears in verses Ps 46:6 and Ps 150:3 of this text. However, *tube* is maintained in verse Ps 80:4: *Buisinez en la festiuel tube*.

In contrast, a different copy of the Oxford Psalter, the version of the Additional MS 35283 of the British Library, rewrites one of the passages. The translation of Ps 97:6 does not change (*in tubis ductilibus et in voce tvbe cornee > en buisines turneices et en uoiz de buisine de corn*) and the distinction between the two attributes is maintained by the two adjectives. Ps 46:6 and Ps 150:3 use *buisine* too. However, in Ps 80:4 *tube* is replaced by *buisine* (*buccinate in neomenia tuba; in insigni die solemnitatis uestre > businez en la nuele lune de busine, en noble iorn de la uostre festiualtet*) in what seems to be a concern for the faithful rendering of the Latin text. It is safe to assume that the scribe wished to preserve and enforce the same translation choice for all occurrences of Latin *tuba*. This is evident in the rest of the words of the Ps 80:4 vernacular rendering. For instance, the scribe probably wished to stay as close as possible to the etymology of the word *neomenia*. In the process, nevertheless, his reading of the Latin text also led to grave misunderstandings. The Oxford Psalter translator interpreted *neomenia* as an adjective, which he translated as *festiuel*, thus keeping a syntagmatic unity of meaning (*festiuel buisine*), just like the reference to the celebration (or festivity) of the new moon. This is particularly revealing. The Winchester Psalter scribe, as we have seen, remains faithful to the Oxford Psalter text, but

the scribe of the Additional MS 35283 seems to regard the sequence *in neomenia* as a complement and *tuba* as a second complement, in turn, of *in neomenia*. In doing so, the scribe reverses the semantics of the phrase. Indeed, logic would have him translate it as *en la busine de la nuele lune*. Moreover, the change in the adjective *festiu* and its transformation into a noun *festiauletet* moves away from a Latin text that his predecessors had translated in a rather faithful manner.

Let us pursue this parenthesis with the case of Harley MS 273 of the British Library, which is even more interesting. In verses Ps 46:6 and 150:3, the scribe uses *buisine*, since this is a late version of the Oxford Psalter. Nevertheless, in verse Ps 80:4, the phrase *en la nouele lune* comes close to the translation choice noticed in the Additional MS 35283. However, the scribe of Harley MS 273 seems to have mastered the semantic link between *neomenia* and *tuba*. He seems to consider that *in neomenia* was an adverbial phrase relating to time and *tuba* an adverbial phrase related to instrument. Just like his predecessors (Oxford Psalter and Winchester Psalter) the Harley MS 273 scribe preserves the rendering of *tuba* as *tube* (*businez en la nouele lune o tube en noble ior de nostre solempnete*). Yet for the first time one finds a change in verse Ps 97:6, the one that interests us the most: *en busines amenable et en voiz de tube de corn*. It seems that the scribe preserves the Latin distinction via attributes similar to *ductilis* and *cornea*, all while rendering *tuba* as both *buisine* and *tube*. This variation could be due to the fact that the author did not want to repeat *buisine*. Perhaps he would have preferred to stay close to the structure of Ps 80:4, where *tube* echoes the verb *businez* (or perhaps for other reasons, *vide infra*). The joint use of *tube* and *buisine* in this case, as in the Oxford Psalter and the Winchester Psalter, suggests that the two words could have been synonymous in his perception, but also that his choice was based on aesthetic reasons. He did not manage to recreate exactly what saint Jerome had created in Hebraicum, but he felt the need to reinstate an actual pair of instruments.

Speaking of Hebraicum, there is one case where French translations were based on it. In the Eadwine Psalter, the translator or scribe followed this Latin version. He always rendered *buccina* (Ps 46:6, Ps 80:4, Ps 150:3) as *buisine*, which is not surprising. However, for Ps 97:6, where the French syntax remains close to that of Hebraicum, the translator used *buisine* in order to render both *tuba* and *buccina*. This raises a few interesting questions. Did he understand that *tuba* and *buccina* refer to two realia that the three Hieronymian versions distinguish each in its own way, either through the use of precise attributes or through the use of two different Latin words? The modern eye notices that Gallicanum and Romanum use *tuba*, whereas Hebraicum uses *buccina*, thus pointing to the fact already noticed at the beginning of the current study: the medieval translator or scribe interpreted the two Latin words as being synonyms, hence his particular translation choice. It is hardly possible to imagine that he was not familiar with the word *tube* or any other name of a wind instrument in French. His choice to use *buisine* twice means that he regarded the two Latin terms as part of a synonymic pair. His choice would only attest that *buisine* was by far the most widespread automatism. In any case, the differentiation between the two realia is lost, despite the fact that saint Jerome tried to enforce it in Hebraicum, which is the basis of the Eadwine Psalter French gloss. As a result, *buisine* seems to be a catch-all term to render a wind instrument in a generic manner.

This is where we come to the oddest situation of all. In the Arundel Psalter, as in the Winchester and Eadwine Psalters, no occurrence of the French word *tube* can be noted in Ps 46:6, Ps 80:4, Ps 97:6 and Ps 150:3. The case of verse Ps 97:6 is perhaps essential. In this manuscript, the Latin text reads *in tubis ductilibus & uoce tubae corneae*, which is rendered in the vernacular as *en busine demenable e en uoiz de corn*. Certainly, this represents a simplification or a reworking of the translation from the Old French Oxford Psalter (*en busines turneices e en uoiz de busine de corn*). But this is also a term which designates a different musical instrument altogether.

The filiation between these texts is not clear. Several hypotheses have been proposed, therefore one cannot surely state that the Arundel Psalter is a copy of the Oxford Psalter. The relation between the two manuscripts could be even more complicated. However, one thing is certain: the two texts are related in one way or another. As a result, the Arundel scribe could either be the initial translator of the text or could have made a conscious choice to alter a previous translation. In both cases, the rendering of the Latin phrase *tubae corneae* by an abridgement highlights the material properties of the instrument (horn) and turns an attribute 'horn' into a noun, mentioning the actual 'horn'. This is a third translation choice for Latin *tuba* and we see it also in the Italian version of the Malermi Bible: *con trombe, et con suon di corno*. The second possibility is that the person writing the vernacular text of the Arundel Psalter made an error, forgetting to transcribe the words *de busine*. Yet this could also be linked in one way or another to the fact that the values of the preposition *de* (which introduces *buisine*) and *de* (which introduces *corn*) are the same. This would lead to a sort of lexical haplography, eliminating *de busine* and keeping only *de corn*. If we hold the first hypothesis to be correct, the situation will be similar to the one proposed as an easier solution for the translation of Old Romanian texts. Musicology research expected the use of the word *coarne* (*Musical Instruments* 2019, p. 129) in that particular instance, much in the manner of the Arundel Psalter. However, the Old Romanian translations had come up with the solution present in the Oxford Psalter, *bucirne de coarne*, because they kept the realia distinction first attested in the Greek text.

The most reasonable assumption would be that the initial French translation read, just like the Oxford Psalter, *en uoiz de busine de corn*, and that the Arundel Psalter represents a modified version of the initial translation. Nevertheless, previous research did not notice that the Arundel Psalter reading *demenable* (instead of the Oxford Psalter *turneices*) corresponds to the translation choice *amenable* in Harley MS 273. This complicates our understanding of the relationship between all these versions, since the Harley MS 273 version also reads *tube* instead of *buisine* in Ps 97:6. However, we previously argued that this particular translation choice in the Harley MS 273 was presumably influenced by the need to differentiate between two instruments, coupled with a second differentiation between two features (metallic and horn). Harley MS 273 reads here *en busines amenable et en voiz de tube de corn*. One of the explanations would be that the term *tube* could be reintroduced from a Latin text, to avoid repeating the word *buisine*, as previously suggested. Another possible explanation is that both Harley MS 273 and the Arundel Psalter derive from a now lost version (with *demenable* or *amenable*; with or without *tube* or *buisine*). Either way, this would be once again an aesthetic choice. Furthermore, this choice cannot be part of a



dynamic translation strategy, which would explain the alteration of the text. The Arundel Psalter is a perfect example of formal or functional translation strategy. Therefore, the aesthetic choice is not restricted to the type of strategy deployed by the translator. This is why we speak of a certain degree of resilience. It is as if the original text reestablishes its structure in various retranslations.

As a result, in the specific case of *tubae ductiles* and *tubae corneae*, the scribe of the Arundel Psalter (formal/functional translation strategy) acts in the manner of the versifiers of the same period (dynamic strategy). Let us look at the First French Metrical Psalter, where the Latin word *tuba* is always translated as *buisine* (Ps 46:6, Ps 80:4, Ps 150:3), except for verse Ps 97:5-6, where we find *busines* and *corns*: *En corns de tuz semblanz / En busines sunanz* (Harley MS 4070) or *En corns de tuz semblanz / En busines sunanz* (Additional MS 50000). Since the influence of Hebraicum seems to be excluded, this French text being based on the Oxford Psalter, on Gallicanum, or on a commentary to the latter, the poet presumably tried to distinguish between *tubae ductiles* and *tubae corneae*. He then rendered the latter by the noun *corns*, a translation choice that we have already identified in the Arundel Psalter. However, there is more than meets the eye. A divergent translation choice in the two versions of this metrical adaptation is the mention of *buisine* in verse Ps 150:3 of the Oscott Psalter (Additional MS 50000), whereas the fragmentary reading of Harley MS 4070 uses *corn*. In light of previous research, given that the Oscott Psalter text is probably an adaptation of a version which is closer to the text of Harley MS 4070, the Oscott Psalter scribe probably reworked the contents of the verse and deployed the formula *buisine sonant* already used in Ps 46:6 and Ps 97:6. *Corn* would be used because it was part of a synonymic group.

The Second French Metrical Psalter testifies to a gener-

alised use of the word *buisine* (Ps 46:6 *En voix de busine montes*; Ps 80:4 *En neuue busine cornez*; Ps 150:3 *Loes lo en son de buisiner*), as well as to the presence of an instrument defined as *buisine de cor*, by itself and without reference to Latin *tubae ductiles* of verse Ps 97:6. This latter is, of course, the result of metrical and prosodic constraints, as the versifier needed to fit a longer Latin sequence and abridge it in the space of a couple of verses. It cannot be based on exegetical texts of the time. For these texts, the Glossa ordinaria would be the immediate exegetical source, but the distinction between *ductilis* and *cornea* as separate instruments cannot originate in Glossa. Its text explains only (based on the interpretation of saint Jerome) that *ductilibus* should be interpreted as *Argenteis more Iudeorum*. Magna Glossatura expands saint Jerome and Cassiodorus as: *Et in tubis ductilibus, scilicet in tubis argenteis, vel ereis, que tundendo producuntur, et voce tube cornee. Morem Iudeorum tangit, qui et habebant duo genera tubarum sicut legitur in libro Numeri, alias que argento vel ere ductili producebantur, alias corneas* (cf. GLOSS-E). None of these pieces of information seem to have been of any use to the late twelfth and thirteenth century translators. It is perhaps just a problem of mere synonymy and nothing more.

Moving on, the cases documented in the Bible d'Acre, Anglo-Norman Judges, and the Quatre livre des reis confirm that *buisine* is the most obvious choice to render both *tuba* and *buccina*. As a matter of fact, many biblical translations or adaptations, such as the French text of the *Giffard Apocalypse*, frequently use *buisine* to render Latin *tuba*. The latter also uses the verb *buisiner* (Ap 9:13-14) as an equivalent of Latin *habere tubam*. This must be analysed in the context of synonymy once again. More often than not, the use of *buisine* and *tube* in Anglo-Norman texts such as the *Apocalypse* or *Revelacion* is based on this synonymy. The verse Ap 8:6 in the Anglo-



◆ Angels playing musical instruments in the mural paintings decorating the vaults of the crypt from the Cathedral of Our Lady in Bayeux (Normandy, France), 15th century.

Credits: Vladimir Agrigoroaei.

Norman *Apocalypse* explains the use of the translation choice *tube* not only by a desire to underline its etymological proximity to the Latin term, but also for aesthetic reasons, to render the translation more idiomatic or diverse, which can be similar to the one of the uses of Middle French synonymic binomials (*vide infra*). It was already suggested (cf. *Musical Instruments* 2019, p. 87) that the use of the word *tube* in verses Ap 8:6, Ap 10:7, and Ap 18:22 is dictated by rhythmic and prosodic constraints. Is it the same for verse Ap 8:2? In any case, if the Old French word *tube* was chosen for metrical reasons, this suggests that the etymological question was absent, or at least unimportant:

Vulgate, Ap 8:6: *Et septem angeli, qui habebant septem tubas, praeparaverunt se ut tuba canerent.* // Anglo-Norman Apocalypse: *E les seth angles ke busines hurent / Pur soner lur tubes tut prest furent.* // Anglo-Norman Revelacion: *E les angles que seeth busines urent / A soner lur busines se apparaillerent.*

Vulgate, Ap 18:22: *Et vox citharodorum, et musicorum, et tibia canentium, et tuba non audietur in te amplius: et omnis artifex omnis artis non inveniatur in te amplius: et vox molae non audietur in te amplius.* // Anglo-Norman Apocalypse: *Jammés ultre trové ne serra, / Ne harpe ne musike la ne chantera; / Tibies ne busines erent desornavant; / Voiz de tubes n'erent sonant, / Voiz de mole oy ne serra,...* // Anglo-Norman Revelacion: *Voiz de harpurs ne de musikes que chanterunt / En tibies e busines desorenavant; / E voiz de tube ne ert oy atant, / E la voice de la mole oy ne ert. / De chescun ovrs lur art pert...*



When used alone, tube is preferred over buisine in Ap 8:2 or in Ap 10:7. We would also like to point out the interesting choice (Ap 10:7) of the verb *tuber* as a translation for the Latin expression *tuba canere*:

Vulgate, Ap 8:2: *Et vidi septem angelos stantes in conspectu Dei: et datae sunt illis septem tubae. // Anglo-Norman Apocalypse: E jeo vi seth angles ki esturent / Devant Deu ke seth tubes hurent. // Anglo-Norman Revelacion: E jo vi .vii. angles que esturent / En award l'Angnel, que .vii. tubes urent.*

Vulgate, Ap 10:7: *sed in diebus vocis septimi angeli, cum coeperit tuba canere, consummabitur mysterium Dei sicut evangelizavit per servos suos prophetas. // Anglo-Norman Apocalypse: Més quant li setime angle tubera / La misterie de Deu dunc ert terminé / Si cum les prophetes hunt ewangelizé. // Anglo-Norman Revelacion: Mes quant li setime angel ad soné après / Sa tube, le misteris de Deu tut fet serront / E quanque ses serfs e prophetes ewangelicé out.*

In light of this comparison, the translation from the Kerr manuscript should attract even more attention. It uses the word *buisine* only once (Ap 1:10), then switches to the use of *trumpe* as well as the verb *trumper* in order to render the Latin expression *tuba canere* (Ap 8:10, Ap 8:12, Ap 11:15). Can this shift be justified as a result of a metric or prosodic issue, or simply on account of the translator's preference for the use of this word, which seems to keep track of *buisine* / *trumpe* as a synonymic pair? Could this be linked to the use of synonymy in double translations (*Doppelübersetzungen*) or in the so-called synonymic binomials (*binômes synonymiques*) such as in the Middle French Metz Psalter? *Doppelübersetzung* actually refers to more or less the same translation phenomenon as the French *binôme synonymique* already presented in *Musical Instruments* 2019, p. 67.

Previous instalments of the current study already highlighted that the translation of the Metz Psalter uses, just like the Kerr Apocalypse, the words *buisine* and *trompe* to render Latin *tuba*. Specifically, in Ps 46:6, *tuba* becomes *buisine* + *trompe*; in Ps 97:6, *tuba ductilis* becomes *trompe* + *buisine*, whereas *tuba cornea* is rendered as *trompe* + *corne*; and in Ps 150:3, *tuba* becomes *trompe* + *busyne*. The situation is particularly interesting in Ps 80:4, where the verb *buccinate* is rendered as *trompeiz*, all while maintaining the double translation of *tuba* as *buisine* + *trompe*. One could argue that the Latin term is split into a sort of synonymic binomial, which would not be unusual in the case of this fourteenth century text, where synonymic binomials are already frequent (cf. *Musical Instruments* 2020, p. 276). However, one can also notice the return of the word *corne* in Ps 97:6. This relates, on the one hand, to the etymon of Latin *cornea*, which begs for a translation as French *corne* (just like in the case of the Arundel Psalter and the two French metrical versions) but also to an aesthetic use of synonym pairs which, well attested in French literature. See for instance: [...] *Cor et graille i sonnent menu, / Trompes et buisines i sonnent, [...]* in the *Roman de Mahomet* by Alexandre du Pont, where these pairs of instruments are just formulae (Lepage 1996, p. 195, v. 1761-1762). The fluctuation concerning *tube*, *buisine*, *trompe* and (occasionally) *corne* is not just the result of a fluctuation in the perception of these realia, but also an aesthetic issue. Even though their source is often the Gallicanum, translators and versifiers reconstruct an image that saint Jerome had formulated in the Hebraicum. Not because of an awareness of that third Latin version translated by saint Jerome, which was not liturgical and, therefore, not as well known as the other ones, but because vernacular translators harness the potential of the target language in order to accentuate

the difference.

These constant reworkings of the same structure, independent of the Masoretic text or of the Hebraicum, cannot simply be random. There is a certain logic behind the choices that scribes and translators make, a logic that we define as “translation resilience” of an aesthetic nature. For the two authors of this conclusion, “resilience” defines a process or a phenomenon which can appear in multiple translations or adaptations of a source text, whereby certain aesthetic or structural features of a first text are lost in the process of translation in a second text, but can reappear in a third given text based on the second one.

As a side note, the comparison of an Occitan or Piemontese exemplum with the Latin and Greek lives of Barlaam and Josaphat upon which it was based led to a similar discovery: in the transfer between languages (Georgian > Greek > Latin), a key feature of the narrative structure was lost. A progression of three friends of the protagonist (the first one extremely rich, the second one rich, and

◆ *Players of musical instruments in the mural decorations of the Sala Vecchia or Sala di Apollo in the Castel Sant'Angelo, Rome, c.1547.*

Credits: Vladimir Agrigoroaei.



the last one rather poor) already existed in the Georgian text, but had been lost in the Greek and Latin translations and retranlations. The progression was reinstated only when the text was adapted in a vernacular language (Agrigoroaei 2017, p. 19), because the narrative begged for it. There are certainly countless other examples that need to be identified and this is only the starting point of a theory. When many more examples will be identified, perhaps they will provide a better understanding of the phenomenon. The current article is just the first proposal, and further discussion is needed.

Bibliographical Abbreviations:

Agrigoroaei 2017 – Vladimir Agrigoroaei, “Un sermon en langue vulgaire, tiré du Barlaam et Josaphat, sur les parois du baptistère Saint-Jean à Poitiers,” *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 60, 237, 2017, p. 1-25.

Chițimia 1981 – I. C. Chițimia, “Urme probabile ale unei vechi traducerii din latină în Psaltirea Scheiană,” *Revista de istorie și teorie literară*, 30, 2, 1981, p. 151-156.

DEAFÉL – *Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français*, fondé par Kurt Baldinger, continué par Frankwalt Möhren, puis par Thomas Städtler, Tübingen/..., Niemeyer/..., 1974-present [online: <http://www.deaf-page.de/>; accessed 09.11.2022].

GLOSS-E – Martin Morard (dir.), *Glossae Scripturae Sacrae elec-*

tronicae, Paris, IRHT-CNRS, 2016–2018 [online: <http://gloss-e.irht.cnrs.fr/>; accessed 09.11.2022].

Hunt 1991 – Tony Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-century England*, 3 vols, Cambridge, 1991.

Lepage 1996 – Alexandre du Pont: *Le roman de Mahomet, nouvelle édition, traduction, présentation et notes*, ed. Yvan G. Lepage, Leuven / Paris, Peeters, 1996.

Margot 1979 – Jean-Claude Margot, *Traduire sans trahir. La théorie de la traduction et son application aux textes bibliques*, Lausanne, L'Âge d'Homme, 1979.

MED – *Middle English Compendium: Middle English Dictionary* [online: <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/>; accessed 15.11.2022].

Meucci 1987 – Renato Meucci, “Lo strumento del bucinator A. Surus e il cod. Pal. Lat. 909 di Vegezio,” *Bonner Jahrbücher*, 187, 1987, p. 259-272.

Molina, Hurtado Albir 2002 – Lucía Molina, Amparo Hurtado Albir, “Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach,” *Meta. Journal des traducteurs*, 47, 4, 2002, p. 498-512.

Nida 1964 – Eugene A. Nida, *Towards a science of translating, with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*, Leiden, Brill, 1964.

OED – *Oxford English Dictionary* [online: <https://www.oed.com/>; accessed 15.11.2022].

Vinay, Darbelnet 1958 – Jean-Paul Vinay, Jean Darbelnet, *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*, Paris, Didier, 1958.

