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Translating the Slavonic Present Participles in the Early Romanian Psalters (16th Century)*

Abstract. It is often said that early Romanian biblical translations from Church Slavonic follow the source texts slavishly. This is believed to be especially true about the 16th century Romanian Psalters, a group of seven texts (both printed and hand-copied) descending from a single translation. Indeed, these texts stay close to their Church Slavonic originals in topic, lexical content, and orthographical rules. However, we aim to describe how the 16th century translators and redactors dealt with Church Slavonic structures that could not be easily adapted into Romanian by means of formal equivalence. The Slavonic present participle, which appears plenty in the Slavonic Psalter, was chosen as litmus test. While theoretically having a formal correspondent in Old Romanian (the gerund), the Slavonic present participle has a range of uses and meanings that the Old Romanian gerund lacks. Thus, Romanian scribes must depart from the comfort of formal equivalence that calques and loans provide and choose the translation that convey meaning. The dynamic equivalence is obtained by selecting different solutions: gerunds, adjectives, objects and, most often, clauses, especially relative ones. Rendering participles with clauses (i.e. adjectives with verbs) forces the translator to make decisions going beyond the Slavonic participle itself. The analysis shows a tension between betraying the Slavonic text as little as possible and rendering it to the best of the redactor’s ability.
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1. Introduction

Our study focuses on the translation of Slavonic present participles in the early Romanian versions of the Psalter: the “Hurmuzaki” Psalter (c. 1500),

* This work was supported by a grant of the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitization, CNCS/CCCDI – UEFISCDI, project number PN-III-P4-ID-PCE-2020-2939 (Re-evaluating the Sixteenth Century Romanian Psalters. Aligned Corpus and Comparative Studies), within PNCDI III. We would also like to express our gratitude to Vladislav Knoll and to reviewers for carefully reading the article and for their most useful input.

the Psalter from Voroneț (c. 1551–1558)\(^2\), “Scheian” Psalter (c. 1573–1578)\(^3\), the Slavonic-Romanian Psalter from 1577\(^4\), Șerban Coresi’s Slavonic-Romanian Psalter (c. 1589)\(^5\); of these, the first three are manuscripts, and the last two are printed\(^6\). The PC and Ps70 Psalters were not included in the study since their text is too close to Ps77 (see note 4). For comparison, we have also included the corresponding passages from the Old Testament translated from Church Slavonic\(^7\) by (presumably) Daniil Panoneanul\(^8\) in the 17\(^{th}\) century.

\(^1\) Ion-Mihai Felea, București 1982, p. 209; it was copied in the 17\(^{th}\) century.


\(^5\) Psaltirea slavo-română de la 1589, BAR, II–630844 (cetera: Ps89), printed by deacon Coresi’s son, it is based on Ps77, yet it contains numerous changes in both the Slavonic and Romanian texts, cf. Al. Mareș, Filiația..., p. 209.

\(^6\) In analyzing the Romanian material, we benefited greatly form the transcriptions provided by the Re-evaluating the Sixteenth Century Romanian Psalters. Aligned Corpus and Comparative Studies Project, funded under PN-III-P4-ID-PCE-2020-2939 | UEFISCD (cetera: roPsalt). roPsalt is an ongoing project aiming to create a digital corpus of the early Romanian Psalters and study them in a systematic manner in regard to their content, sources, interaction and context of appearance. The corpus will be ready for public acces in January 2024 on the following internet adress: https://scriptadacoromanica.ro/bin/view/roPsalt/ [26 VII 2023]. Other results of the project (articles, conferences) can be found there as well.

\(^7\) Namely after the Ostrog Bible of 1581–1582, [in:] Острозька Біблія, ed. Р. Тюрокняк, Львів 2006 (cetera: Ost).

\(^8\) N.A. Ursu, Activitatea literară necunoscută a lui Daniil Andrean Panoneanul, traducătorul “Îndreptării Legii” (Târgoviște, 1652). V [Unknown Literary Activity of Daniil Andrean Panoneanul,
Contemporary researchers tend to believe that all the 16th century Romanian versions of the Psalter derive from a single translation made from Slavonic at an unknown date. PH, the earliest of these, contains numerous readings pointing to pre-athonite redactions of the Slavonic Psalter, especially to the Belgrade Psalter. It is not clear whether the PH is a modified version of the original Romanian translation or its direct descendant. A thorough revision at a yet unknown date removed many of the features of the pre-athonite version, using as source text one or more Slavonic Psalters from the Athonite redaction, i.e. texts whose content had undergone rigorous correction in the 14th century according to the Greek version. One of the Athonite Slavonic Psalters used in the revision was a manuscript related to the Oxford Psalter. Ps89, the last surviving 16th century Romanian Psalter, was subsequently further revised according to texts not yet precisely identified.

the Translator of “Indreptarea Legii” (Târgoviște, 1652). V], SCL 54.1–2, 2003, p. 189 points out that numerous linguistic features common to Indreptarea Legii (a collection of laws) and the Old Testament in Ms. 4389 constitute indubitable evidence that the translation of the Old Testament was done by Daniil Panoneanul. The Old Testament he refers to is contained in the Ms. Rom. 4389, BAR (cetera: Pan), https://medievalia.com.ro/manuscrise/item/biblia [14 IV 2023].


Al. Mareș, Filiația..., p. 259 points out that the PH version is a massive and rather free processing of the old translations and may ultimately constitute a new translation of the canonical psalms. I. Camară, Cele mai vechi..., p. 79 believes that PH does not represent a free processing, as has been thought, but, on the contrary, it best preserves the intermediate A or perhaps even the primitive translation.

Based on the dates advanced by Al. Mareș, Datarea Psaltirilor..., p. 198 for PV, the terminus ante quem would be 1558.


Any typical Athonite Slavonic Psalter could have served as a model, the one in the interweaved text included. The PH version has also been proposed as a source: the compilers of the edition of the Psalter dating from around 1588–1589 worked on a version of the psalms related to the ‘Hurmuza’ Psalter (I. Gheție, Psaltirea Hurmuza și filiația psaltirilor românești din secolul al XVI-lea și al XVII-lea [Hurmuza Psalter and the Filiation of Romanian Psalters in the 16th and 17th Centuries],
Speaking of the literalness of translations in the early phase of Romanian writing, I. Bărbulescu states that one could speak of two Romanian “schools of translation” in the 16th century – one of translations “faithful to the meaning”, characterized by clarity on the one hand, and, on the other hand, of “word for word” translations. According to the distinction E. Nida makes between “formal” and “dynamic equivalence”, it can be said that Romanian translators and redactors adopted either the strategy of “dynamic equivalence”, by which the meaning is prioritized, or that of “formal equivalence”, i.e., literal translation, used mainly by translating religious texts from Slavonic. This particular perspective encourages views according to which, as times goes by, the extreme literalism of the 16th century is attenuated, admitting some deviations from the letter in favour of the meaning.

From our point of view, for the editors of the first Romanian Psalters the formal equivalence between Slavonic and Romanian terms was not an indispensable principle, at least not one that took precedence over the imperative of translating the meaning. In selecting the Slavonic participle as the topic of our research,

---


18 None of the early Romanian Psalters is believed to be the original translation, however, the Hurnuzaki Psalter might be closer to it and Ms. 4389 (Pan) is the autograph of its translator. Hence, we used the formula “translators and redactors”, the former being rather applicable to PH (although PH is not the original translation) and Pan, while the latter – to PS, PV, Ps77, Ps89, PC, i.e. texts derived from the original translation through revision.


20 This holds true for at least some early Romanian translations, cf. M. Ungureanu, I-M. Felea, Creative Calques in the Early Romanian Translations of the Psalter. Translatological and Philological Approaches, [in:] Translation Automatisms in the Vernacular Texts of the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period, ed. V. Agrigoroaei, I. Sasu, Turnhout 2023 [= Bver, 1], p. 239–243. Nonetheless, the translator of Pan was aware that some calques from Slavonic are not the best translations possible, noting, for example, twice on the same page that the meaning of mai pre deasupra (Ps 103:5 and 103:13), calque after the Slavonic прѣвыспрѣна, is ‘cerdac’ (Eng. ‘veranda’). In this case, it was easier to choose dynamic equivalence over formal equivalence since the author could consult a Romanian translation of another language – Greek; the marginalia mentioned above are taken from the Romanian translation of the Septuagint made by Nicolae Milescu Spătarul around same period from Greek (Old Testament of Nicolae Milescu Spătarul, Library of the Romanian Academy, Cluj branch, Ms. Rom. 45, 17th century); cf. Vecheul Testament – Septuaginta. Versiunea lui Nicolae Spătarul Milsecu (Ms. 45 de la Biblioteca Filialei din Cluj a Academiei Române) [Old Testament – Septuagint. Nicolae Milescu Spataru’s Version (Ms. Rom. 45, Library of the Romanian Academy – Cluj Branch)], ed. E. Munteanu, A.-M. Gînsac, L.-G. Munteanu, M. Ungureanu, Iași 2017.
we wanted to describe how texts traditionally seen as typical examples of formal-equivalence-translations deal with structures that are difficult to render literally.

2. The Slavonic participle and its equivalence in the early Romanian Psalters

2.1. The Slavonic participle

The Slavonic participle enters three types of oppositions: past – present, active – passive and short – long. Present participles are formed with the thematic root of the present, whereas past participles are formed with the aorist root. From a grammatical standpoint, Slavonic participles behave as adjectives (o-stem or jo-stem), i.e. they can occur in any gender, number and case, although they have a pronounced verbal character and express actions governed by other actions governed by finite verbs, thus functioning as subordinates. Pronominal (long) forms have an anaphoric function, indicating that the object introduced into the discourse is known, and are grammatically the closest equivalent of the definite article, which Slavonic lacks. Short past passive participle forms can be the source of numerous verbal nouns. In addition to the six categories listed above (present active or passive and nominal or pronominal participle, past active or passive and nominal or pronominal participle), standard Slavonic also employs a second type of short active past participle (L-Participle), used exclusively in verbal constructions (perfect, past perfect, conditional).

2.2. The Romanian participle

Slavonic biblical translations prove that the plethora of Greek participial forms could be faithfully rendered either through a process of enrichment of Slavonic grammar or by using the existing grammatical material. However, throughout the history of the written Romanian language, the Romanian participles have never displayed the versatility of the Slavonic ones. At the time of the first Romanian translations, participles and gerunds were used in basically the same manner they are used today, with only a few variations regarding etymological forms or forms analogically recreated at a later stage (făcut vs fapt, învis vs înviat, etc.). The main functions of the past participle in the Old Romanian language were: 1) as formant of the compound and over-compound tenses, of the passive and of the aspect; 2) adjectival, usually having a past tense value and occurring quite rarely with

---


a non-temporal nature\textsuperscript{25}. In contemporary Romanian, participles tend to oscillate, as is the case with the Slavonic participles, between a verbal and an adjectival nature\textsuperscript{26}, but, although they do not enter temporal or aspect oppositions in an explicit manner, they intrinsically contain past and perfective values\textsuperscript{27}. These temporal and aspect-related features are often lost once the adjectival value is emphasized (\textit{președintele ales mâine} ‘president elected tomorrow’), whereas certain transitive verbs form participles that carry both active and passive values (\textit{om băut} vs. \textit{vin băut} ‘drunk man’ vs. ‘drunk wine’). Moreover, the verbal or adjectival qualities depend on the nature of the verb from which they derive; agent participles retain their verbal nature to a greater extent\textsuperscript{28}.

In the Old Romanian, the gerund could occupy additional syntactic positions compared to contemporary Romanian and it could also be part of a larger variety of verbal periphrases, although its functions and typology were not very different from those of the contemporary gerund\textsuperscript{29}. Unlike modern Romanian, the old gerund had more pronounced verbal properties and occurred more often as the predicate of a subordinate clause\textsuperscript{30}. In most examples from Old Romanian texts, the gerund expresses the imperfective aspect\textsuperscript{31}. For these reasons, we can assimilate the Romanian gerund to the present or active participle\textsuperscript{32} and the Romanian participle to the past or passive participle\textsuperscript{33}. This overlap is reinforced by two other observations: first, gerund forms built on the model of the present participle from other European languages have survived as relics\textsuperscript{34}, and secondly, some Romanian grammars refer to the gerund as present participle\textsuperscript{35}.

\textsuperscript{25} Ibidem, p. 267.
\textsuperscript{27} GALR, p. 508. The patterns in which the Romanian modern participle occurs are briefly described in Al. Nicolae, Omonimia sintactică a participiilor românești [Syntactic Homonymy of Romanian Participles], [in:] Studii de gramatică. Omagiu Doamnei Profesoare Valeria Guțu-Romalo, ed. R. Zafiu, A.-M. Mihail, B. Croitor, București 2009, p. 193.
\textsuperscript{28} GALR, p. 509.
\textsuperscript{29} The Syntax…, p. 271.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibidem, p. 287.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibidem, p. 273.
\textsuperscript{32} Although the contemporary gerund does not lack passive values; cf. GALR, p. 538. At an earlier stage, the past gerund in forms such as \textit{fiind fost}, \textit{având aflat} also occurred in Romanian; cf. M. Avram, Există un gerunziu trecut în limba română? [Is there a Past Gerund in Romanian?], SCL 37.2, 1986, p. 155.
\textsuperscript{33} The Romanian supine and participle express, with few exceptions, a single temporal value – i.e., the perfect; cf. G. Pană-Dindelegan, Din nou despre participiu și supin. Câteva precizări [Again about the Participle and the Supine. Several Notes], SCL 58.1, 2007, p. 165.
\textsuperscript{34} Enciclopedia limbii române [The Encyclopedia of the Romanian Language], ed. M. Sala, M. Avram, J. Balacciu-Matei, I. Fischer, I. Gheție, București 2006, p. 240 with examples such as \textit{mănucare aburindă}, \textit{tensiune crescândă} ‘steaming food’, ‘rising tension’.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibidem, p. 419.
2.3. Equivalence of the Slavonic present participle in Romanian

Even with nomenclature stretched and polyvalences ignored, the Old Romanian participles do not correspond exactly to the classes of Slavonic participles, and consequently the Romanian translators and redactors were unable to apply the method of formal equivalence, as was done when translating Slavonic texts from Greek. This is why the translators and redactors of early Romanian biblical texts had to aim for dynamic equivalence while not losing sight of the Slavonic text. The way Slavonic participles were translated in the early Romanian texts was studied before, though less systematically\(^{36}\) and never focused on the Psalter. We have extracted all the Slavonic participles from Psalms 78 to 110\(^{37}\) in PV along with their corresponding translation paragraphs in the aforementioned Romanian Psalters. The psalm references followed the division of verses in the edition of the *Psalterium Bononiense*\(^{38}\). The Slavonic text in PV belongs to the Athonite redaction\(^{39}\) and therefore it does not constitute the primary source for any Romanian version. From our diagnostics, we have excluded both Ps70 and PC, since these texts are too close to Ps77 to be useful. The Slavonic text was diplomatically transcribed from PV. The Slavonic participles in the present tense, together with the context in which they occur, have been recorded in Table 1. In the last column we have abbreviated the grammatical description of the participle, by noting the category of participle: Tr (past), Pr (present), Ac (active), Pa (passive), then the type of the participle, using a colon (‘:’) for the long participle and a dot (‘.’) for the short participle; furthermore we indicated the case, number and gender, 


\(^{37}\) We have selected this interval since PV is preserved only from Ps77 to the end, with numerous lacunae.

\(^{38}\) *Psalterium Bononiense*, Bologna University Library, Ms. Slv. 2499, [in:] *Psalterium Bononiense, interpretationem veterem Slavicum cum alis codicibus collatam, adnotationibus ornatam, appendicibus auctum* (cetera: Bon), with readings from *Sofia Psalter, Bucharest Psalter* (cetera: Buc), *Sinaitic Psalter* (cetera: Sin), vol. I–II, ed. V. Jagić, Vindobonae 1907. We have used the same edition for the passages where the text from PV was not preserved. In rendering the examples, we have opted for references to the verse, not to the page number.

\(^{39}\) We took into account that the Romanian translations follow different sources, for example: PH se pierdu translates Bel да потреблю, cf. Ps77 să se cure translating потрѣбіти from the Athonite redaction (Ps 100:8); PH și ce se lăuda, translating Bel ʰχώλѧщеи мѧ, as opposed to Ps77 ce lăuda-mă, translating ʰχώλѧщеи мѧ in the Athonite redaction (Ps 101:9).
as follows: No (nominative), Acc (accusative), Gn (genitive), Da (dative), Vo (vocative), Lo (locative), In (instrumental), Sg (singular), Pl (plural), Ma (masculine), Fe (feminine). Where there is no mention of gender, masculine or neuter is implied (the forms often coincide in Slavonic); where two forms occur with the same grammatical paradigm, we have avoided redundancy by using the notation ‘x2’. The Slavonic participles are underlined, and the Romanian rendition is marked in italics.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>PV: Slavonic text</th>
<th>Romanian translations</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 78:3  | и не к’є похилаї | PH: și nu fu de-a-i ingruparea  
PV: și nu era ingrupătoriu  
PS: și nu era ingrupătoriu  
Ps77: și nu era ingrupătoriu  
Ps89: și nu era ingrupătoriu lor  
Pan: și n-au fost cine să-i ingroape | PrAc:NoSg |
| 78:4  | похилаї с’єйшій  
скръть на | PH: baterea-gioc a cei de pregjur noi  
PV: imputare ce era dimprejurul nostru  
PS: imputare ce era dimprejurul nostru  
Ps77: imputare ce era demprejurul nostru  
Ps89: imputare celor demprejurul nostru  
Pan: badjocire celor ce sănt împrejurul nostru | PrAc:DaPl |
| 78:6  | на ж’єкы не знай- 
шита тиї | PH: pre păgănri ce nu știu tine  
PV: spre limbi ce nu știu tire  
PS: spre limbi ce nu știu tire  
Ps77: spre limbi ce nu știu tine  
Ps89: spre limbile ce nu știu tine  
Pan: pre limbile cealea ce nu te știu | PrAc:AccPl |
| 82:3  | и нинадашни тиї | PH: și cei ce gălăuiia tinre  
PV: și cei ce urăia tire  
PS: și cei ce uria tire  
Ps77: și cine uria tine  
Ps89: și cei ce te urășă pre tine  
Pan: și ceia ce te urăsc | PrAc:NoPl |

Given according to the numbering in Psalterium Bononiense, for the same reasons as Altbauer’s: since Vatroslav Jagić’s edition of the Bolognese Psalter is the basis for all subsequent comparative studies of Slavonic psalters, An Early Slavonic Psalter from Rus’, ed. M. Altbauer, Harvard 1978, p. IX.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>PV: Slavonic text</th>
<th>Romanian translations</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 82:8  | съ живѫщїми въ тѷрѣ | PH: cu cei ce viia în Tir  
PV: cu cei ce viu întru Tiru  
PS: cu cei ce viu în Tiru  
Ps77: cu cei ce viu în Tir  
Ps89: cu cei ce viu în Tir  
Pan: cu ceia ce lăcuiesc în Tir | PrAc:InPl  |
| 83:12 | въ нє лишъ бѫга ѵёдѫнїй нєзлѫвѫкъ | PH: Domnul nu părrăseaște de la bunrătăte  
PV: Domnul nu lasă burul imblă fără de rreu  
PS: Domnul nu lăsă de bine imblătoriul fără rău  
Ps77: Domnul nu lăsă de bine imblătoriul fără rău  
Ps89: Domnul nu lasă pre cine bine imblă și nu cu rău  
Pan: Nu va lipsi Domnul de bunătăți pre ceia ce umblă cu nerăotate | PrAc:Gn-AccPl  |
| 84:9  | и на обращаѫщꙞѧ сѫца якъ нємѣ | PH: pre cei ce-şi intorc înrima cătăr-nsul  
PV: și spre ceia ce întrucă înrima cătă-însu  
PS: și spre ceia ce întrucă înrema sa cătăr-nsu  
Ps77: și spre ceia ce întrucă înema sa cătăr-îns  
Ps89: și spre ceia ce-şi intorc înema sa cătăr-ns  
Pan: și pre ceia ce-şi vor întoarce înima cătăr dânsul | PrAc:AccPlMa |
| 84:10 | оѧча бѫзъ коѧщий сѧ егѡ | PH: Însă e aproape de cei ce se tem  
PV: Mai virtos aproape e de temuții lui  
PS: E, însă, aproape de fricoși lui  
Ps77: Însă aproape de fricoși lui  
Ps89: Însă aproape e de fricoșii săi  
Pan: Însă aproape-i mântuirea lui de cei ce se tem de dânsul | PrAc:DaPl |
| 85:2  |спѢси раѢба тѡєгѡ ñє моѡ еѫпѫвѫщаѫ | PH: scoate șerbul tău, Dzeul mieu, cela ce nedejdit pre Tinre  
PV: mântuiaște șerbul Tău, Domnul mieu, nedejdiiu spre tire  
PS: spăseaste șerbul tău, Dzeul mieu, că upuvăiiu în tire  
Ps77: spăseaste șărbul tău, Doamne, că upovăi în tine  
Ps89: spăseaste șărbul tău, Doamne, care upovăi în tine  
Pan: mântuiesaște pre robul tău cela ce se nădăjduiescă pre tine, Dumnezeul mieu | PrAc:AccSg |

41 Although бѫзъ normally requires the genitive.
### Table 1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>PV: Slavonic text</th>
<th>Romanian translations</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85:5</td>
<td>мноⷢ҇млⷭ҇тивь въсѣ⬀</td>
<td>PH: multu milostiv tuturor <em>cinre te cheamă</em>&lt;br&gt;PN: multu milostiv tuturor <em>cei ce mărescu</em>&lt;br&gt;PS: multu milostiv tuturor <em>ce cheamă-te</em>&lt;br&gt;Ps77: mult milostiv tuturor <em>ce cheamă-te</em>&lt;br&gt;Ps89: mult milostiv tuturor <em>ce cheamă-ta</em>&lt;br&gt;Pan: mult milostiv tuturor <em>celor ce te chiiamă</em></td>
<td>PrAc:DaPl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85:10</td>
<td>яко вълн ішть ть • <em>Romanian translation</em> • й творѧи҆ чюдеса</td>
<td>PH: că mai mare ești tu <em>cinre face</em> ciude&lt;br&gt;PN: că mare ești tu și <em>ce face</em> mirure&lt;br&gt;PS: că mare ești tu și <em>ce faci</em> ciudele&lt;br&gt;Ps77: că mare ești tu și <em>ce faci</em> ciudele&lt;br&gt;Ps89: că mare ești tu și <em>ce faci</em> ciudele&lt;br&gt;Pan: Că tu ești cel mare și tu însuți ești Dumnezeu, <em>cela ce faci</em> minuni</td>
<td>PrAc:NoSgMa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90:1</td>
<td>Жи́вый въ помо́щи вы́шнѣго</td>
<td>PH: <em>care vie în agiutoriu</em> Cela-de-Sus&lt;br&gt;PN: <em>vio în agiutoriul Celuia-de-Sus</em>&lt;br&gt;PS: <em>viu în agiutoriul Susului</em>&lt;br&gt;Ps77: <em>vio întră agiutoriul Susului</em>&lt;br&gt;Ps89: <em>vietştoriul întră agiutoriul Susului</em>&lt;br&gt;Pan: <em>cela ce vieţuieaște în agiutoriul Celui-de-Sus</em></td>
<td>PrAc:NoSg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90:5</td>
<td>у стръклы летѧщѫѧ къ днѣ</td>
<td>PH: de săgeatele <em>ce zboară</em> dzua&lt;br&gt;PN: de săgeate <em>ce zboră</em> dzua&lt;br&gt;PS: de săgeate <em>ce zboară</em> ziaoa&lt;br&gt;Ps77: de săgeate <em>ce zboară</em> ziaoa&lt;br&gt;Ps89: de săgeate <em>ce zboară</em> zioa&lt;br&gt;Pan: de săgeata <em>carea zboară</em> zioa</td>
<td>PrAc:GnPlFe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90:6</td>
<td>у кици къ тѦлѧк прѦкудащѧла</td>
<td>PH: și firile întru întunareacru <em>ce trecu</em>&lt;br&gt;PN: de lucrure <em>ce întru înturearece trecu</em>&lt;br&gt;PS: de lucrure <em>ce întru întuneareac trecu</em>&lt;br&gt;Ps77: de lucrure <em>ce întru unțiuna to rec</em>&lt;br&gt;Ps89: din firii* ce întră utunearec trec*&lt;br&gt;Pan: De lucrul <em>care trece</em> în tunearec</td>
<td>PrAc:GnPlFe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91:8</td>
<td>я нѢкща кѦй дѦлащѦи бѦзакониѦ</td>
<td>PH: și izbucniră toți cei <em>ce facu</em> fărădelege&lt;br&gt;PN: și crescu toți <em>ce facu</em> fărălege&lt;br&gt;PS: și crescu toți <em>ce facu</em> fărălege&lt;br&gt;Ps77: și crescu toți <em>ce fac</em> fărălege&lt;br&gt;Ps89: și răsăriră toți <em>făcătorii</em> fărădelege&lt;br&gt;Pan: și crescură toți <em>ceia ce fac</em> fărădelegiure</td>
<td>PrAc:NoPlMa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42 Pronominal relic from the Slavonic version.
43 In the 16th century Slavonic-Romanian versions of the Psalter, short sequences of Slavonic text alternate with their corresponding Romanian translation.
44 Written фыри.
### Translating the Slavonic Present Participles in the Early Romanian Psalters…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>PV: Slavonic text</th>
<th>Romanian translations</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 91:10 | раꙁыдѫⷮ сѧ въсѝ дѣлаѫⷮ сѧ бꙁаконїе | PH: se vor răsvira toți ce deregu fărădeleagea
PV: spargu-se toți ce facu fărăleage
PS: spargu-se toți ce facu fărăleage
Ps77: spargu-se toți ce fac fărăleage
Ps89: răsipi-se-vor toți ce fac fărăleage
Pan: și se vor răsipi toți ceia ce fac fărădele-giuire | PrAc:NoPlMa |
| 91:12 | и҆ на въстѧщѫѧ на мѧ люѧще и҆ и҆стоуканⷮ, хвалѧщеи сѧ о҆ идолѣⷯ | PH: și pre carii se scoală pre menre hicleanii, audzi-va u<re>chea mea
PV: și ceia ce se sculară spre mire hecleanii, audzi-va ureachea mea
PS: și cei ce sculară-se spre mere hitleanii, audzi-va urechea mea
Ps77: și ce sculară-se spre mine, hitleanii, auzi-va urechea mea
Ps89: și spre cei ce scula-se-vor spre mine hitlenind, auzi-va urechea mea
Pan: și va auzi ureachii mea pre ceia ce se scoală asupra mea, carii hiclenesc | PrAc:AccPlMa |
| 96:7  | да постыдѧт сѧ въси кланѣѫщеи сѧ истуканнї, хвалѧ-шии сѧ о ідolk | PH: —
PV: se se rrușireadze toți cei ce se închiră idolilor, ce se laudă de idolii săi
PS: se rușireadze-se toți ce închiră-se bolvani-lor și ceia ce laudă-se de idolii săi
Ps77: să se rușineaze toți ce închinără-se idolilor și laudându-se de idolii săi
Ps89: să se rușineaze toți cei ce închină-se istucanilor, laudându-se de idolii săi
Pan: Să se rușineaze ceia ce se închină celor ciopliti, ceia ce se laudă de idolii lor | PrAc:NoPlMa |
| 96:10 | лєбѧщи га | PH: iubitori Domnului
PV: cire iubeaște Dzăul
PS: cire iubiți Dzeul
Ps77: cine iubiți Zeul
Ps89: cine iubiți Zeul
Pan: Ceia ce iubiți pre Domnul | PrAc:No(Vo) PlMa |
| 97:8  | въсінялѧ и въсія жиѧщи сѧ нѧй | PH: lumea și toți câți viu pre-nsa
PV: toată lumea și toți ce viu spre insu
PS: toată lumea și toți ce viu spre insa
Ps77: toată lumea și toți ce viu spre-ns
Ps89: lumea și toți ce viu într-însă
Pan: lumea și toți ceia ce viețuiesc într-însă | PrAc:AccPlMa |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>PV: Slavonic text</th>
<th>Romanian translations</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98:1</td>
<td>Сѣдѧи҆ на хера- геъдимъ да подвиж- нит сѧ зѣлѧ</td>
<td>PH: <em>cinre şede</em> pre heruvimi, se scuture pământul&lt;br&gt; PV: <em>şedu</em> spre herovimi, se se râdice pământul&lt;br&gt; PS: <em>ce şead</em> în heruvimi, se râdice-se pământul&lt;br&gt; Ps77: <em>ce şezu</em> în heruvimi, să se râdice pământul&lt;br&gt; Ps89: <em>cel ce şade</em> spre heruvimi, să se pleace pământul&lt;br&gt; Pan: <em>cela ce şade</em> pre heruvimi; să se clătească pământul</td>
<td>PrAc:NoSgMa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98:6</td>
<td>в приꙁываѫ́щи и҆мѧ</td>
<td>PH: <em>acei ce chema</em> numele lui&lt;br&gt; PV: <em>ce chemă</em> numele lui&lt;br&gt; PS: în <em>ce chiamă</em> numele lui&lt;br&gt; Ps77: în <em>ce chemă</em> numele lui&lt;br&gt; Ps89: întru <em>cei ce cheamă</em> numele său&lt;br&gt; Pan: întru <em>ceia ce chiiamă</em> numele lui</td>
<td>PrAc:LoPl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98:8</td>
<td>и҆ дъщаѫ на кѣскаѫ начинаніѧ ӵ</td>
<td>PH: și <em>pădzeaște</em> la toate începăturile lor&lt;br&gt; PV: și <em>izbândiiai</em> spre tot începutele lor&lt;br&gt; PS: și <em>izbândiai</em> în toate începutele lor&lt;br&gt; Ps77: și <em>izbândit-ai</em> în toate începuturile lor&lt;br&gt; Ps89: și <em>izbândiai</em> în toate începutele lor&lt;br&gt; Pan: și <em>izbândind</em> pre toate tocmealelor</td>
<td>PrAc:NoSgMa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100:3</td>
<td>творѧщѫѧ прѣстѫ́ прѣстѧ- пѣнѣі кѣзѣннавидѣлъ</td>
<td>PH: <em>cei ce facu</em> călcare, gilăliu&lt;br&gt; PV: <em>ce feaceră</em> treacere, urrăre&lt;br&gt; PS: <em>ce feacere</em> treacere, uriu&lt;br&gt; Ps77: <em>ce feaceră</em> treacere urăiu&lt;br&gt; Ps89: <em>pre cei ce feaceră</em> călcare, urăiu&lt;br&gt; Pan: urăt-am pre <em>ceia ce fac</em> călcare</td>
<td>PrAc:AccPlMa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100:4</td>
<td>еукалѣѫщѧ сѧ въ миѣ</td>
<td>PH: <em>a se rrădzima</em> de menre&lt;br&gt; PV: <em>ce feri-se</em> de mere&lt;br&gt; PS: <em>ce feri-se</em> de mere&lt;br&gt; Ps77: <em>ce feri-se</em> de mine&lt;br&gt; Ps89: <em>cel ce feri de mine</em>&lt;br&gt; Pan: pre hicleanul45 <em>care se-au abătut</em> de la mine</td>
<td>PrAc:Gn-Acc SgMa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45 The translation follows the redaction from Ost.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>PV: Slavonic text</th>
<th>Romanian translations</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 100:5 | о҆клеветаѫщаго тан | PH: clevetitorulu furiş vecenrul său, acela scoş  
PV: ce clevetiia întru ascunsu soţul său, acesta-i goniia  
PS: ce cleveti în ascunsu soţul său, acesta mărăiu  
Ps77: ce clevetii în ascuns soţul său, acesta mânai  
Ps89: cel ce clevetii în ascuns aproapele său, acesta gonii  
Pan: Cela ce mozavireaşte pre vecinul său în taină, pre acesta l-am goniț | PrAc:Gn-Acc SgMa |
|       | и҆скръ́нѣго свое҆го̀ |                       |      |
|       | [сего] и҆ꙁгонѣахь |                       |      |
| 100:6 | хўдъя по пѫ́ти непоро��ноу | PH: a îmbla pre cale nevinovatului  
PV: cei ce îmbla pre cale nevinovată  
PS: cei ce îmbla pre cale nevinovată  
Ps77: ce îmbla pre cale nevinovată  
Ps89: cei ce îmbla pre cale nevinovată  
Pan: cela ce umblă pre calea cea nevinovată | PrAc:NoSgMa |
|       |                       |                       |      |
| 100:7 | н писъкъ естьцъ домоу мо��го творѧи гръдынѧ | PH: și nu via în mijloc de casa mea cinre face trufășia și grăiia nedreptate, nu isprăvia înaintea ochilor miei  
PV: nu viia pri mijloc de casa mea ce făcea trufă, ce grăiia nedreptate, nu dereage între ochii miei.  
PS: nu via pre mijloc de casa mea ce făcea trufă, ce grăiia nedreptate nu dereage între ochii miei  
Ps77: nu viia pre mijloc de casa mea ce făcea trufă; ce grăiia nedreptate nu isprăvia înaintea ochilor miei  
Ps89: nu viia pre mijloc de casa mea ceia ce făcea trufă; cei ce grăiia nedreptate nu isprăvia înaintea ochilor miei  
Pan: N-au lăcuit pren mijlocul casii meale cela ce face trufie; cela ce au grăit ceale nedireapte nu se-au indireptat înaintea ochilor miei | PrAc:NoSgMa x2 |
|       | домоу мо��го творѧи гръдынѧ • Romanian translation • гўдъя непро��на неапра��аце прѫ очии мо��иа |                       |      |
| 100:8 | потрѣбити ѿ гра́да гн҃ѣ въсѧ̀ творѧи-щѫѧ беꙁаконїе | PH: se pierduz den ce<ta>tea lui Dumned-  
zeug toți făctorii fărădeage  
PV: se pără de cetatea Domnului toți ce facu fărălege | PrAc:AccPIMa |
|       | гѫдъя непро��на неапра��аце прѫ очии мо��иа |                       |      |

Translating the Slavonic Present Participles in the Early Romanian Psalters
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>PV: Slavonic text</th>
<th>Romanian translations</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 100:8 | PS: se curu de cetatea Domnului toți ce facu fărălege  
Ps77: să se cure de cetatea Domnului toți ce fac fărălege  
Ps89: a cura de în cetatea Domnului toți carii fac fărălege  
Pan: ca să pierz den cetatea Domnului pre toți cea ce fac fărădelegiuire | | |
| 101:8 | PH: ca paserea ce se usebeaște în zidu  
PV: ca pasarea însângură-se spre zidiu  
PS: ca pasarea ce însingură-se în zid  
Pan: ca o pasare carea se osibeaște la zid | PrAc:NoSgFe |
| 101:9 | PH: și ce se lăuda, cu menre blăstema-se  
PV: și cei ce lăuda-mă, cu mere giura-se  
PS: și ce lăuda-me, cu mere giura-se  
Pan: și ceia ce lăuda se jura cu mine | PrAc:NoPlMa |
| 101:19 | PH: și oameri tămâduiți lăuda-vor Domnulu  
PV: și omerii ce se zidescu laudă-i Domnul  
PS: și oamenii ce zidesc laudă Domnul  
Pan: nărodul cela ce se zideaște va lăuda pre Domnul | PrPa:NoSgMa |
| 103:2–5 | PH: îmbracași-te cu luminra ca cu cămeașe, întinseși cu apă pre mai susu lui, puseși nuorii în ieșitul tău, îmblași pre arepile vântului; făceai ingerii săi de duh și slugile sale ca focul ardzându; urdziiai pământul pre târia sa  
PV: Învești-te cu lumea ca cu cămeașe, tinsesi ceriul ca o piale, coperiși cu apă pre mai susul lui, Puse nuorii în suirea sa, îmblă spre arepile vintului[u], feace ingerii săi duhure și slugile sale focu aprinsu; urrdzi pământul spre învârtoșearea sa | Present participles that will be explained separately. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>PV: Slavonic text</th>
<th>Romanian translations</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103:2–5</td>
<td>PS: <em>înveștiși-te</em> cu lumină ca în câmeșe, <em>întinseși</em> ceriul ca o pială, <em>coperiși</em> cu apa mai susul lui, <em>puse nuorii suirea sa, înmlă spre arepile vântului; feace ingerii săi duhure și slugile sale</em> <em>foc aprinsul; urzi pământul în vârtutea sa</em>&lt;br&gt;Ps77: <em>înveștitu-te-ai</em> cu lumină în câmașe, <em>întinseși ceriul ca piialea, coperiși ca apa mai susul lui, puse nuorii suirea sa, îmblă spre arepile vântului, feace ingerii săi duhure și slugile sale</em> <em>foc aprins; urzi pământul în vârtutea sa</em>&lt;br&gt;Ps89: <em>înveștitu-te-ai</em> cu lumină ca în câmașe, <em>întinseși ceriul ca piialea, coperiși cu apa mai pre desupra sa, puseși nuorii suirea sa, care îmblăși spre arepile vântului, ce feceși ingerii săi duhure și slugile sale</em> <em>foc aprins, urziș pământul în vârteaul său</em>&lt;br&gt;Pan: <em>cela ce te îmbraci cu lumină ca cu o dulamă, cela ce întinzi ceriul ca o pială, cela ce acoperi cu ape ceale mai pre de supra ale lui, cela ce pui nori spre suirea ta, cela ce umbli pre aripile vântului, cela ce faci ingerii tăi duhuri și slugile tale</em> <em>foc arzător, cela ce ai întemeiat pământul pre întăriturile lui</em></td>
<td>PrAc.NoSgMa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 103:10 | посьедді́ї источ-
нику въ държ —<br>PH: *tremeți izvoarrele în tăure*<br>PS: *tremeși izvoare în balte*<br>Ps77: *tremeși izvoare în iazere*<br>Ps89: *tremeși izvoare în iazere*<br>Pan: *cela ce trimeți izvoarăle în lunci* | PrAc:NoSgMa |
| 103:13 | напад, горы щ прк-
выпрыгній свой —<br>PH: *adăpi codri de pre mai de susul tău*<br>PS: *adapă codrii de pre asupra sa*<br>Ps77: *adapă codrii de spre susul său*<br>Ps89: *adapă codrii de spre mai susul său*<br>Pan: *Cela ce adapă munții den ceale de mai pre de supra ale sale* | PrAc.NoSgMa |

46 Written ṿмблате. PV inaccurately follows a reading similar to PS in balte.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>PV: Slavonic text</th>
<th>Romanian translations</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 103:14 | просябы й пажи скотъ | PH: rrăsări pajiște vitelor  
PV: ce rrăsăriși pajiște vitelor  
PS: ce răsăriși pajiște vitelor  
Ps89: crescși pajiște vitelor  
Pan: Cela ce răsări iarbă dobitoacelor | PrAc:NoSgMa |
| 106:9  | и душа душага испить кътъ | PH: <și sufletul> flămândziților împlu de bunrătate  
PV: și sufletul flămându împlu-l de dulceață  
PS: și sufletul flămându împlu de dulceață  
Ps77: și sufletul flemând împlu de de dulceață  
Ps89: și sufletul flămând împlu de dulceață  
Pan: și sufletul cel flămînd l-au umplut de bunătăți | PrAc:AccSgFe |
| 106:10 | седѫѧ въ темѣ | PH: cei ce șed în tunarec  
PV: cei ce ședzură întru înturearecu  
PS: ce ședzură întru înturearecu  
Ps77: ce șezură întru untunearec  
Ps89: cei ce ședea întru untunearec  
Pan: pre ceia ce șădea în tunearec | PrAc:AccPlMa |
| 106:12 | и не въ помагаѫи | PH: și nu fu cinre de agiutoriu  
PV: și nu era lor agiutoriu  
PS: și nu era agiutoriu  
Ps77: și nu era ajutoriu  
Ps89: și nu era ajutoriu  
Pan: și nu fu cine să le ajute | PrAc:NoSgMa |
| 106:23 | нине сѫда и въ ко рѫсѧ кай густа и въ воду многа | PH: afundă-se în mare în corabie, făcându lucrui întru apă multă  
PV: giosu mergea în mare în corabie ce făcea faceri în ape multe  
PS: gios mergea în mare în corabie ce făcea faceri în ape multe  
Ps77: jos mergea în mare în corabii ce făcea faceri în ape multe  
Ps89: jos mergând în mare în corabii ce făcea faceri în ape multe  
Pan: ceia ce se pogoară în mare în corăbii, ceia ce fac lucrure în aple ceale multe | PrAc:NoPlMa x2 |
The Slavonic present participle is almost exclusively represented in Table 1 by the “active” category, since in addition to its function as an auxiliary of the passive voice, the present passive participle has a pronounced adjectival value. We have not included in our diagnosis any examples with adjectives derived from the participle, which, in context, retain little of their verbal value. An example in this respect is the adjective лакомъ ‘greedy’, originally the present passive participle of the verb алъкати ‘to starve’, borrowed into Romanian also as an adjective. Such participle-adjectives were naturally translated by Romanian adjectives. We have identified only one example of a present passive participle, in Ps 101:9, where зиждемїи preserves some of the predicative value of the verb зьдати ‘to build, to form’; some Romanian redactors recognize this verbal value and attempt to reproduce it. Thus, PH and Ps89 resort to adjectives derived from participles (pl. тамăduiți ‘healed’, respectively pl. zidiți ‘built’); in the other Psalters, the translation resorts to subordinate sentences introduced by relative pronoun (ce se дзидescu ‘which are built’).

In Table 2 we have statistically indicated (horizontally) the translational solution (by means of: clause, object, present participle – “gerunziu” [gerund] in Romanian, infinitive and adjective) employed in each text (vertically). The last row contains
the number of solutions shared by all the texts (for example, “1” in the cell at the intersection of “Shared” row and “Object column” means that in one verse all Psalters used an object to rend the Slavonic participle, in this case Ps 106:36).

### Table 2

**Translation solutions for rendering the Slavonic participle into Romanian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psalter/ Solution</th>
<th>Clause (dependent or independent)</th>
<th>Object (noun, pronoun)</th>
<th>Present participle (gerund)</th>
<th>Infinitive (short/ long)</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps89</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3.1. Equivalence by periphrasis

Our selection revealed 52 Slavonic participles translated in all the Romanian texts. We notice that the 16th century Romanian translators and redactors are reluctant to the constraints of a word-for-word translation – through noun, gerund or adjective – and adopt such solutions rarely (PH, PV, PS, Ps77, Ps89) or almost never (Pan). The favorite translation solution for the Slavonic present participle seems to be by far a subordinate clause introduced by a relative pronoun47. PH, which is considered the oldest of these texts, shows the highest degree of variation. PV, PS and Ps77 have not only the same solutions in the same places48, but also extremely

---

47 Vis-à-vis the fact that the periphrastic translation best renders the meaning of the Slavonic active present participle in Romanian, P. Cancel (Studiu..., p. 42), points out that: having no other choice, we opted for cel ce seamănă ‘he who resembles’; [i.e., to translate the Slavonic собираный – I.-M.F.] yet we had to use more words, we were forced to make a whole sentence in Romanian, and to resort to the present indicative, which is so far from the determined present participle in the Old Slavonic. However, by this periphrastic translation, we have succeeded in rendering the original meaning as closely as possible...

48 With a single exception, in PV, where the redactor interprets Ps 83:12 differently from other translations.
close solutions, which indicates that they belong (alongside Ps70 and PC) to the same group, which we shall refer to as the “Oxford” Group (cetera: OxG)\(^{49}\). On certain occasions, Ps89 foregoes the solution provided by the OxG, whereas Pan almost exclusively prefers the periphrastic translation.

In PH we often detect a degree of uncertainty in translating the Slavonic participle. The most frequent solution seems to be the subordinate periphrasis introduced by a relative pronoun – ce, care, cine ‘that, which, who’\(^{50}\) – meaning in most cases ‘the one who’, occasionally câți ‘how many’ (Ps 97:8 lumea și toți câți viu pre-nsa ‘the world and all who live in it’). The relative pronoun can be doubled by the semi-independent pronoun – (a)cel(a) ce/are ‘he who/the one who’. There are, however, many exceptions. In addition to subordination by relative pronoun, PH also uses the short infinitive\(^{51}\), the gerund (see 2.3.2.), the noun\(^{52}\), the predicative verb (Ps 98:8 și pâdzeaște\(^{53}\) la toate începăturlile lor ‘and guard to all their inceptions’). In one case, for translating πορτκάκα (Ps 78:3), PH probably uses the structure de + a + long infinitive, which does not occur often in Old Romanian texts\(^{54}\). There are three occurrences in PH where this structure renders adjectives

\(^{49}\) Although a revision of the Romanian text according to a text related to Ox can be mentioned with certainty only as far as PS and Ps77 are concerned, together with the related Psalters (Ps70 and PC), the translation of the participles enables us, at least from this perspective, to include PV in the OxG.

\(^{50}\) In Ps 85:10, the relative pronoun cine ‘who’ is used as subject of an attributive clause (mare ești tu cine face ciude ‘great are you, who does wonders’), that is not allowed in modern Romanian and, as far as we can tell, was not used in other Romanian Psalters. PH does make use of these kind of attributives; cf., for example, Ps 21:7 toți cine mă vădzu ‘all who saw me’, but toți ce… ‘all who…’ in all other Psalters, where we find the same meaning, but a different form of the relative pronoun. The pronoun is also used by PH in Ps 98:1 cine șade pre heruvimi ‘who sits on cherubs’.

\(^{51}\) E.g., Ps 100:4 a se șraîzdima de menre ‘to prop against me’; Ps 100:6 a îmbla pre cale ‘to walk on the path’, but (cei) ce îmbla ‘(those) who walked’ etc. in subsequent Psalters.

\(^{52}\) E.g., Ps 96:10 iubitori Domnului ‘devotees to God; a solution replaced by relative clause in subsequent translations: PV cine iubeaște Deâulu ‘who loves God’, PS, Ps77, Ps89 cine iubiți Zeul; PS, Ps89 cine iubiți Zeul; PS: 100:5 clevetitoriu ‘the slanderer’, replaced by an antecedent direct object clause in all other translations: ce clevetii... acesta-i mânaui etc. ‘who slandered… that one I drove’; Ps 100:8 făcătorii ‘doers’; Ps 106:9 flămândziților ‘of hungered (ones)’, replaced by an adjective in all other translations: sufletul flămând ‘hungry soul’; Ps 106:36 mută acie flămânzii ‘moved here the hungered’.

\(^{53}\) Translates the Slavonic participle ἀνέμαξ (Old Church Slavonic Dictionary, [in:] Gorazd. The Old Church Slavonic Digital Hub, ed. Š. Ptuž, Prague 2016–2020, http://gorazd.org/gulliver/ [14 IV 2023], s.v. ἀνέμαξ). I. to revenge, to punish; 2. to defend, to vindicate, which renders the Greek ἐκδικάει with the same two meanings, cf. LSJ, s.v. –). There is no such polysemous verb in Romanian; consequently, the translator, who must opt for one of the meanings, chooses the second, following the context and the coordinating preposition η = Rom. și ‘and’: tu milostiv era lor și pâdzeaște la toate începăturlile lor ‘You were merciful towards them and guarded all their inceptions’. The reviewers of subsequent Psalters opt for the first meaning; cf. Dicționarul Tezaur al Limbii Române [Thesaurus Dictionary of the Romanian Language], București 2010, https://dlri.ro/ [14 IV 2023], s.v. izbândi.

\(^{54}\) Cf. I. Diaconescu, Infinitivul lung în secolul al XVI-lea [The Long Infinitive in the 16th Century], SCL 18.4, 1967, p. 442: the construction of the type ‘preposition de + a + long infinitive’ has a restricted circulation, occurring in most instances, only in syntactic situations, as an element aimed to complete...
and deverbal nouns in genitive\textsuperscript{55}, while in two other occurrences (Ps 78:3 and 93:1) is attached to a copulative verb\textsuperscript{56}. Since the Slavonic syntagm градъ обителныи is not translated homogenously in PH (Ps 106:4 cetației de mânrecare, Ps 106:6 cete de-a mâncarea, Ps 106:36 ceteții de agonisită) we can assume that the prepositional structure (de + a + long infinitive) is not limited to translating a Slavonic genitive attribute and could have been used for rendering a participle with pronounced nominal value.

Some of the non-clause translation in PH are rendered in subsequent texts by subordinates or regent clauses, yet in some instances the PH translations are either retained, as in Ps 106:36 flămândzii ‘hungered (ones)’, or modified in reverse: turning the relative clause into a noun/substantive adjective, as in Ps 90:1 viu agiutoriul, PV, PS viu in agiutoriul, Ps77 viu intru ajutoriul, Ps89 viețuitoriu întru ajutoriul, all meaning ‘alive (in) the help’, as opposed to PH care vie in agiutoriu and Pan cela ce viețuiaste în ajutoriu, both translatable as ‘the one who lives in the help’. In respect to PH, we can say that the redactors of the later Romanian Psalters (starting with PV and ending with Pan) do not leave intact any of the translations of the Slavonic participles, either using a dependent clause instead of a non-periphrastic solution, meddling with tense and number of the verb, changing the topic, adding prepositions, using synonyms etc. Ps89 and Pan seem to favour certain readings in PH over those in the other Psalters.

One of the common features of the OxG is the rendering of the active present participle by a subordinate clause whose core is a verb in the past tense, usually in the imperfect. More rarely, translations in this group transform the participle into a main clause. Some imperfect forms could indicate the intention to harmonize the subordinate with an imperfect in the main clause or in the clause coordinated with the one in which the participle is translated: Ps 98:8 (PV, PS, Ps89) Ps 98:8 (PV, PS, Ps89) milositiv erai lor și îzbândiiai ‘you were merciful to them and avenged’; Ps 100:5 (PV) ce clevetiia… acesta-i goniia ‘who spoke ill… this one

\textit{the meaning of certain verbs or verbal phrases. A. Dragomirescu, Particularități sintactice ale limbii române in context romanic. Supinul [Syntactic Features of Romanian in Romance Context. The Supine], București 2013, p. 140–144 shows that the infinitive is gradually replaced by the supine. We say that the construction is only probable in PH because the manuscript reads МИЙ АФЯВЫЯК and the particle a is restored by specialists’ transcriptions such as \textit{Psaltirea Hurmuzaki. Studii filologic…, p. 154.}\textsuperscript{55} E.g., Ps 54:24 \textit{în puțulu de-a putredirea} ‘in the well of rotting’, \textit{Bon в къ столмъичъя истъплинна (Gen sg., cf. Gr. διαφθοράς); Ps 93:1 Dumnedzeu e de-a fălosirea} ‘God is of pride, Bel Бь мъстъи (Gen pl., cf. Gr. έκδικήσεων), Ps 106:7 to <i>ntra in cetate de-a mâ<nre>carea ‘go in a citadel of habitation’, Bel БУЛИТИ в къ градъ шеътъкъннън (Acc, vs. Gr. Gen κατοικητηρίου); Ps 107:11 \textit{Cine mă va duce in cetate de-a chinuirea} ‘Who will guide me in a citadel of torment’, Bon въ къто вярътъ ма въ градъ шеътъкъннън (Gen, cf. Gr. περιοχῆς). It is unclear whether the translations fălosirea and chinuirea are interpretive, originate from an unknown Slavonic redaction or represent errors.\textsuperscript{56} Cf. A. Dragomirescu, Particularități sintactice…, p. 144; I. Diaconescu, Infinitivul lung…, p. 442. The verb \textit{a fi} ‘to be’ in the Romanian translation of Ps 93:1 has no support in the source texts; \textit{e} represents in fact not a verbal form, but the particle used in Old Romanian to translate the Slavonic particle жи. However, we have not identified a Slavonic text with the reading \textit{в къ жи млкнин}.{/p}
Translating the Slavonic Present Participles in the Early Romanian Psalters

drove them out; Ps 100:6 ce imbla... acesta-mi/aceia-mi slujiia ‘who walked... this one/these served me’ (in all translations, except for Pan, which restores the participle to the present tense and translates the verb using past perfect: cela ce umblă... acela au slujiit ‘the one who walks... that one served’); Ps 100:7 (Ps77, Ps89) nu viia... ce făcea trufă, ce grăiia... nu deregea/ispârâia ‘dwelt not... who made (i.e. displayed) pride, who spoke... did not conduct’.

In certain instances, the participle is translated in the present tense even when the main verb remains in the past tense: Ps 100:7 PH nu viiaIMP... cinre face ‘did not dwell... who does’ și Pan n-au lăcuitPERF... cela ce face, both opting however for the past tense in the case of the second Slavonic participle in the verse: PH grăiia nedreptate, nu isprăvia ‘spoke unjusti, did not conduct’ and Pan cela ce au grăit ceale nedireapte nu se-au îndirepatat ‘the one who spoke those unfair, did not correct’.

In some cases, all translations resort to the same solutions, even if they change the word order or use different lexical material. In Ps 100:9, all the Psalters translate the participle using a subjective clause, with the verb in imperfect, in agreement with the Slavonic imperfect in the main clause: și cei ce se lăuda cu menre/ lăuda-mă blăstămâ-se/giura-se ‘and those who boasted with me/praised (me), cursed (me)/swore’ (the 16th century Psalters), whereas Pan: și ceia ce mă lăuda se jura cu mine ‘and those who praised me, swore with me’ changes the word order to render the message more clearly, emphasizing the fact that the prepositional object is related to the verb jura ‘swore’, rather than to lăuda ‘praise’.

In some cases, the Romanian Psalters translate the participle using imperfect tense verbs in correlation with another past tense verb in the context:

1) analytic past perfect: Ps 106:34 PV, PS pus-auPERF riure... de reale ce viiaIMPERF ‘(he) put rivers... from the evils of (those) who lived’;

2) aorist: Ps 82:3 PH cei ce gîlăluiaIMP... ridicarăAOR, the OxG cei ce ur(r)iiiaIMP... ridicarăAOR ‘those who detested... lifted’, but Ps89 cei ce te urâscAOR, Pan ceia ce te urâscPRES, rădicară, switching to either present, or aorist for the participle nimihaiadâi; Ps 100:3 PV, PS, Ps77, Ps89 ce feaceraAOR treacere/câlcare, urâiu/urrâre ‘who made transgression, (I) hatedAOR; Ps 106:23 the OxG gios mergeaIMP... ce făceaIMP... acei vădzurăAOR ‘down went... who did... those saw’; In Ps 100:4, PS, PV, Ps77 and Ps89 translate the participle by an attributive clause with the verb in the aorist, in agreement with the regime of the verb in the subordinating clause: (cel) ce feri-seAOR de mine, râul, nu cunoscuieAOR ‘who turned aside from me, the evil one, I did not know’; in contrast, Pan renders both verbs in the simple past tense, also changing the word order for more clarity: pre hicleanul ce se-au abătut de la mine nu l-am cunoscut ‘the evil one who deviated from me I did not know’.
A closer examination of Ps 100 shows that the translators or redactors are not always consistent, even in verses occurring in proximity. In Ps 100:4, where the Slavonic text following the paragraph described above is identical, with the participle denoting persons with reprehensible behavior and verbs in the past tense indicating punitive measures, the Romanian translations oscillate between aorist (PS, Ps77 ce cleveti... acesta mâncau) and imperfect (PV ce clevetiia... acesta goniia) or both (Ps89 cel ce clevetiia... acesta goniia). In the same psalm present participle творѧщѫѧ occurs twice ‘(the ones) doing’ (Ps 100:3, 8), yet the translation is not identical. PH translates the first participle by the direct object clause placed before it, with the verb in the present tense, whereas the second participle is rendered by a noun (Ps 100:3 cei ce facu călcare, gilăului ‘the ones who do transgression I detested’; Ps 100:8 se pierdu... toți făcătorii ‘to destroy... all doers’). The reviewers of the following Romanian versions translate the first participle using the aorist, in agreement with the Slavonic aorist (PS, Ps77, Ps89 <pre> ce feaceră treacere/călcare, ur<â>i ‘those who did transgression (I) hated’), whereas the second is rendered in the present tense, in agreement with the Slavonic infinitive in the context, translated by either the subjunctive or infinitive (să piară/SUBJ/să se cure/SUBJ/a cură/INF... toți ce/carii facu ‘to die/clear away... all who do’). In both cases, Pan chooses the standard solution of the relative clause with a present tense verb. In each case the translator chose the solution that best fits the context, even if the results are not necessarily similar.

In Ps 103:10, OxG uses the aorist to translate the Slavonic participle: tremeseși izvoare în tăure/im balte/in balte/in iazere ‘(you) sent springs in valleys/in lakes/in ponds’. The tense of the verb is preserved from one version to another, yet consistent efforts are directed into rendering the Slavonic term дьбрь ‘valley’, for which we find not only different translations, but also a marginal note in Pan. PH and Pan render the verb in the present tense: cela ce trimeți/tremeți ‘you who sends’. A similar pattern can be identified in several instances in Ps 106, where PV, PS, Ps77 and Ps89 translate the Slavonic active present participle by aorist (Ps 106:10) or imperfect (Ps 106:23, 34), as opposed to PH, which always uses the present tense: cei ce șed ‘those who sit’, afundă-se ‘let them submerge’, celor ce lăcuiesc ‘to those who dwell’.

---

57 Some Slavonic Psalters use imperfects (Bon зназъ, июкъ) to translate Greek imperfects (Gr. ἐγίνοσκον, ἐξεδίωκον), while others employ perfective verbs, thus aorists, in one or even both places (Sin, Buc познахъ, вьгънахъ). It is for this reason that Romanian Psalters fluctuate between the two past tenses, and it becomes more apparent that PV was the first step in the Athonite revision of the Romanian texts.

58 Pan once again takes distance from the Slavonic text, using present and perfect tenses in translation: cela ce mozavireaște... pre acesta l-am goni ‘the one who slanders... this one I cast out’.

59 PV уръра ‘dread’, perhaps an erroneous reading.
In other instances, the OxG translates homogeneously in the present tense, whereas the other translations opt for the past tense Ps 91:8 \(\text{și cresc}\) \(\text{toți} \) ‘and all grow’\(^{60}\), as opposed to \(\text{izbucn}\)\(\text{iră} \) ‘(they) broke out’ (PH), \(\text{răsăriră} \) ‘(they) arose/ sprung’ (Ps89) and \(\text{crescură} \) ‘(they) grew’ (Pan). There are also exceptions within the group; in Ps 96:7, the text Ps77 does not use the present tense as the other translations and goes for \(\text{închinară-se} \) and \(\text{lăudă-se} \) ‘(they) worshiped, (he) boasted’. In Ps 98:1, the translations are challenged by the absence of both an expressed subject and an obvious subordinating relation, as well as by the lack of a predicate verb: \(\text{C\u{a}dăni \ n\u{a} \ cеpеvкiăнk \ dа \ pоdкiнкинk \ c\u{a} \ wелmа} \) ‘(The one who is) sitting upon the cherubs, let the earth be shaken’. PH, PS and Ps89 resort to relative clauses with the verb in the present tense\(^{61}\), while Ps77 opts for either a past tense form or perhaps an unclear present tense \(\langle cе \ sеzu… \ '\text{who sat/sit…}' \rangle\)\(^{62}\); PV even omits the relative pronoun altogether \(\langle \text{sezu spre hеrovimi 'sat upon the cherubs'} \rangle\)\(^{63}\).

The semi-independent demonstrative\(^{64}\), used to introduce the subordinate relative clause\(^{65}\), is frequently omitted in OxG and we are not sure whether this is due to a language peculiarity specific to the area where the revision was done or the redactors aimed for a “more minimalist” translation, one closer to the Slavonic text. This decision becomes the source of some ambiguities, as in Ps 106:23, for instance, where the OxG proposes \(\text{giosu mergea în mare în cеrаbiе cе făсеrе} \) ‘down went in the sea, in the ship who/that did doings’, and the reader might understand that the one doing the doings would be the ship. Pan solves this ambiguity by translating \(\text{cеiа cе se pоgоаră \ în mаrе \ în cеrăbii, cеiа cе fас lucrоrе} \) ‘those who go down in the sea in ships, those who do things’. The lack of prepositional regime of direct objects or direct object clauses seems to contribute to this ambiguity, which is perceived by the modern reader, but may not have been as strange in the 16\(^{th}\) century. This feature is not necessarily characteristic to the popular language, but was rather common in translated texts\(^{66}\), due to pressure of the Slavonic model. However,

\(^{60}\) In this instance, a confusion regarding the number that would result in a 3\(^{rd}\) person aorist, \(\text{(el) cresc} \) \(\text{(pe) toți 'he} \) raised \(\text{them} \) all’, is possible, but quite improbable.

\(^{61}\) All equivalent to ‘the one who sits’ in Old Romanian.

\(^{62}\) Although Romanian can use accent to differentiate between present (rhizotonic) and past tense, the accent notation in the early Romanian texts is not reliable enough.

\(^{63}\) The translation in PV is either an attempt to slavishly follow the Slavonic, or a copying mistake.

\(^{64}\) GALR, I, p. 246 uses the term “semi-independent pronoun” for the apheresis forms of demonstratives, explaining that in the old language this type of demonstrative was also used without apheresis.

\(^{65}\) GALR, I, p. 282–283 shows that the two components of a syntagm of the type \(\text{cel ce} \) ‘that which’ have an autonomous morphosyntactic behaviour and the following decomposition is required: semi-independent demonstrative pronoun, followed by a subordinate introduced by a relative pronoun. The GALR authors speak about a “compound pronoun” only when referring to to \(\text{ceea ce} \) (cf. GALR, II, p. 214).

\(^{66}\) Cf. C. Frâncu, Gramatica..., p. 173: usually, the direct object in the accusative without preposition reproduces non-prepositional constructions from foreign originals.
it is certain that both types of relative subordinates, with or without demonstrative pronoun, can be identified in the 16th century Romanian texts. PS, PV, Ps77 and Ps89 have an almost categorical preference for the relative pronoun, using only the form ce, while care occurs only sporadically in PH (Ps 83:12 carii îmblâ) and Pan (Ps 90:6 carii îmblâ, 101:8 pasâre carea)...

Paraphrasing the verse Ps 43:14 in 78:4 allows us to check whether the Romanian translators and redactors had a unified approach in translating the same participle. The Slavonic text reads (Bon):

Ps 43:14 Положилъ ны еси поношении сѫсѣдомъ нашимъ. ПодрѢживании и порѫгание сѫщимъ

You put us (for) scorn to our neighbours. Ridicule and derision (to those) being around us

Ps 78:4 Быхомъ поношении сѫсѣдомъ нашиⷨ. Подражание и порѫгание сѫщимъ окрⷭ҇тъ насъ

'(We) were scorn to our neighbours. Ridicule and derision (to those) being around us.'

In the first case, PH translates the first occurrence of the participle сѫщимъ by a pronominal object in the dative (or by a relative clause with the verb a fi ‘to be’ omitted in the first case): batugiocură celor de pregjur de noi ’scorn to those around us’, while the second occurrence is translated by an analytic dative composed of the preposition a + relative pronoun in the accusative, omitting the verb in both cases. The meaning of the analytic structure is clear, and the variation of synthetic dative vs. analytic dative could be explained by the existence of two distinct layers of language. PS and Ps77 translate in both cases by relative with the verb in the present tense (Ps 43 ce-su, ce sânt ‘who are’) or with the verb in the past continuous/imperfect (Ps 78 ce era ‘who were’). Ps89 ce era changes the present to imperfect and omits the verb in the second example, leaving only the relative pronoun. Identical sentences with participial centers placed in similar contexts (main clause with the verb in the past tense) do not yield identical outcomes. Nevertheless,

68 A phenomenon also pointed out in Ibidem, p. 66. The relative pronoun care is missing from PV, PS and Ps77, but is not entirely absent from Ps89; cf. Ps 100:8 toţi carii fac fărăleage ‘all who do unlawfulness’.
69 This example of the analytic dative is not singular in PH (cf. Ps 143:3 Omul a deșertu asemână-se ‘Man was likened to vanity’) and occurs sporadically in early Romanian texts; for further details and examples cf. Ş. Găitănaru, Cazul dativ în limba veche [Dative in Old Romanian], AUAIC.L 61, 2015, p. 118, https://www.diacronia.ro/ro/indexing/details/A24853/pdf [14 IV 2023].
70 PV does not preserve this fragment.
71 Ps89 also replaces batjocură ’scorn’ through imputăciune ‘accusation’, which can be roughly regarded as synonyms, and uses a prepositional direct object: pre noi (Acc) instead of noi (N). This is not surprising, the revision of Ps89 was thorough, although not particularly courageous, and affected almost every verse.
in general, the selection of verbal forms is not random\textsuperscript{72}. A homogenous approach will be reached by Pan – both participles translated by means of relative clauses in the present – in a more crystallized stage of literary Romanian.

Ps 103:2–5 captures all the stages of the translation of the Slavonic present participle in Romanian texts. All the Slavonic participles in the three verses of the beginning of the psalm are present active participles. All except παλαμί (AccSgMa adjective) are in NoSgMa. In PV, the first participle is copied erroneously, resulting in a form that could be mistaken for the aorist of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} person (but, as we said, it has not been convincingly proved that the intercalated Slavonic text participated in the revision). Pan translates almost all Slavonic participles by an enumeration of relative clauses with the verb in the present tense introduced by a semi-independent pronoun: cela ce te îmbraci..., cela ce întinzi..., cela ce acoperi ‘the one who...’ etc. The Romanian Psalters oscillate between aorist and imperfect and between the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} person singular. PH proposes verbs in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person aorist, then the imperfect, in all cases: Îmbrăcași\textsuperscript{AOR}... întinseși\textsuperscript{AOR}... acoperiși\textsuperscript{AOR}... îmblași\textsuperscript{IMP}... făceai\textsuperscript{IMP}... urdzia\textsuperscript{IMP} ‘(you) dressed... stretched... covered... were doing... were weaving.’ The OxG translates the first three verbs in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person aorist\textsuperscript{73},

\textsuperscript{72} G. CHIVU, Limba română de la primele texte până la sfârșitul secolului al XVII-lea. Varianțe stilistice [The Romanian Language from the Oldest Texts to the End of the 17\textsuperscript{th} Century], București 2000, p. 37 holds a different view in noting attention must be paid, first and foremost, to the absence of any restriction in the selection of persons, modes, tenses, or voices. The transition from one verbal form to another is made, even in restrained contexts, regardless of the objective or subjective character, of the narrative or rhetorical structure of the text, providing several examples, the first of which is taken from the Coresi’s Apostle, Brașov, 1563–1566, [in:] Codicile Bratul. Ediție de text [Bratul Codex. Critical Edition], ed. et trans. A. GAFTON, Jași 2003: Mirără-se toți și nu se dumirea, unul cătră alalt grăia ce amu să fie acceasta, e alții batjocorea, grăia că de must împluți sânt ‘all were wondering’\textsuperscript{AOR} and did not understand\textsuperscript{IMP}, were speaking\textsuperscript{IMP}, one to another: “now what would that be\textsuperscript{AOR}’, but others were scoffing\textsuperscript{IMP}, spoke that they are full of must\textsuperscript{PASSVOICE}. However, comparing this sequence with the Athonite Slavonic version of Mărașescu’s Apostle (BAR, Ms. Slav. 93, c. 1500, available online at: https://medievalia.com.ro/manuscris/item/ms-sl-93 [14 IV 2023]), we notice that all the Romanian verbal forms follow the Slavonic ones, except for the first one: днищик га вл ‘they were wondering’ (imperfect, 6\textsuperscript{th} person) яди нишмашках ‘they did not understand’ (imperfect, 6\textsuperscript{th} person) еднак къ друугому глаш ‘saying’ (pres. act. part.) что оуко хохет се бъти ‘want to be’ (present + infinitive, structure that can be confused with the analytic future) ни жи роугляш вл ‘mocking’ (reflexive present participle with active value) глаш ‘they said’ (imperfect 6\textsuperscript{th} pers.) ико мъгелмь ипальнин елт ‘are full,’ (passive voice). The Romanian translation expresses present participles through the imperfect, in agreement with the basic tense of the narrative. The translation of the first verb into aorist is due to the original translation since it is also found in the Bratul Codex, “Dosoftei” Memorial House in Jași, Ms. Rom. 14, c. 1550, [in:] Codicile Bratul... Otherwise, the persons, voices, modes, and tenses are those of the Slavonic text, which the translator transfers to the verbs he uses to translate the participles. The only difference from Codicile Bratul... is the notation of the verb in a subjunctive structure va să fie.

\textsuperscript{73} Except for Ps77 înveștitu-te-ai, which is translated by past perfect. PV seems to use an aorist învești-te, but we consider the reading a haplography resulted from the erroneous copying of the ἰνβήσωνί Ῥείονε sequence.
and the others in the 3rd person aorist, e.g.: PS înveștiști-te... întinseși... coperiși... puse... îmbla... feace... urdzie. PH (the text believed to be the oldest) identifies the 2nd person (ŏk ĕe moon kățăzălichca ca eș călă, PH Doamne, Domnul mieu, măritu-te ai vărtos ‘O Lord, my God, you have magnified yourself greatly’) and the past tense context of the previous verse (ŏk bălățăpătă șrășă ca, PH în tru mare frum-Seațe învășcusi-Te ‘as in great beauty You clothed yourself’). The participles are then translated by predicates, the translator choosing the past tense form regarded as most appropriate, first by the aorist, then by the imperfect, while the adjectival participle is rendered by an adjective in the gerund (focul arzându ‘burning fire’). Subsequently as the OxG reviewers were not satisfied with the original solution, they must have consulted other versions in the attempt to find a better translation. Lexically, PV replaces luminra with lumea ‘light’ vs ‘world’, tăriia with învărtosarea ‘solidity’ and focul arzându with focu aprinsu ‘lit fire’ (participle instead of gerund), to eventually restore the last four verbs in the 3rd person. The reasons for the substitution of person are unclear. The most parsimonious explanation would be that the reviewers of the OxG noted the shift from nominal/short Slavonic participles to pronominal/long participles and reacted accordingly. PS and Ps77 correct the semantic confusion arising from the double meaning of světъ, namely ‘light’ and ‘world’, change one preposition (from ca cu câmeașe in ca în câmeașe) and eliminate another (puse nuorii [in] suirea sa), adjust the translation învărtosarea replacing it by vărtutea and change the first aorist into a perfect tense, preserving the number regime of the verbs. Ps89 adjusts the translation of vărtute once more, opting for vărtosul, then inserts two relative pronouns before the verbs translating participles: care îmblași… ce feceși. The insertion of the relative pronoun usually occurs earlier in the process of emending the text of the Psalm and is frequently recorded in the OxG in relation to PH, but the lack of a subordinating element explains the reluctance of older texts to resort to relative pronouns. The process will be completed by Pan, where the participles in Ost are translated in Romanian by subordinates introduced by the relative pronoun (cela ce ‘that who’) in the present tense, except for the latter, where the past tense is preferred for obvious reasons – the earth has already been created and translating the utterance in the present tense would make no sense.

74 Except for the readings described in the previous note, the verbs coincide in the OxG.
75 The separation of verses in Psaltirea Hurmuzaki. Studiu filologic..., p. 172 is erroneous. The verb învășcusi-te is part of the previous verse; cf. also the sequencing in Ps89 și pe mară frumăște șare-țiște; moreover, the PH manuscript clearly marks the ending of the sentence with a period.
76 Cf. Ox șăte șe... propină... poșămă... psalmă... șă mi... trebui... șeninăș (emphasis added). Nor can we exclude the influence of another language, cf. Psalterium Romanum, [in:] Le Psautier Romain et les autres anciens psautiers latins, ed. D.R. Webber, Vatican 1953, where the transition from the 2nd person (qui tegis) to the 3rd person (qui ponit, qui ambulat, qui facit, qui fundavit) is made in the same place, yet in this case we consider that the Slavonic text has sufficient explanatory force.
2.3.2. Equivalence by gerund

The gerund is rarely used in translating the Slavonic active present participle. In the analyzed interval, the gerund is used in two situations:

a) when two Slavonic participles have the same referent, for instance in Ps 106:23 "низсходѧщеи… творѧщеи ‘the ones descending… the ones doing’, translated in PH by a verbal center determined by an adverbial gerund (afundă-se… făcând ‘(they) descend… doing’), and by Ps89, conversely, by a gerund that anticipates the verbal center (jos-mergând … ce făcea ‘descending… (those) who did’). The OxG turns the first participle into a main clause and the second into a subject clause (gios mergea… ce făcea ‘went down… [those] that did’), while Pan resorts to the simple and clear solution of enumeration, logically linking the subordinate clauses to the following sentence: ceia ce se pogoară… ceia ce fac… aceia vădzură ‘the ones that descend… the ones that do… those saw’. The same happens Ps 91:12, where the translator must render two Slavonic participles, one of which is appositional (на въстаѫщѫѧ на мѧ лъкавноуѫ́щѫѧ ‘upon the ones rising up against me, the ones acting wickedly’). PH translates the first with a direct object clause and uses an adverbial gerund for the second (carii se scolă… hicleindu ‘the ones who rise… acting wickedly’). The OxG uses the aorist for the first participle and a noun for the second (se sculară… hitleanii ‘(who) rose… the wicked’), and Ps89 reverts to the PH solution, but substitutes aorist for future tense (cei ce scula-se-vor … hitleind ‘the ones that will rise… acting wickedly’). Pan rephrases and disambiguates (ceia ce se scolă…, carii hiclenesc ‘the ones who rise…, who act wickedly’).

b) when the participle is interpreted as an action which is concomitant with another action. In Ps 83:12, PV uses a gerund where other Psalters (PH, Ps89, Pan) use a direct object clause (carii imblă fără rău ‘who walk without evil’) or a compound object (îmblătoriul fără rău ‘the walker without evil’ in PS, Ps77). In Ps 98:8, Pan uses the gerund izbândind ‘revenging’ in Old Romanian, to express an action secondary to that which the agent (the Lord) is performing (ai fost loru milostiv ‘You have been merciful towards them’). At the same time, Pan ignores the Slavonic imperfect бывашь and translates the action by an aorist. The other Romanian translations render the Slavonic imperfect and, except for PH, which translates the participle with present tense (pădzeaște ‘guards’), transform the participle into the core of an independent sentence with the verb in the past continuous (PV, PS, Ps89 și izbândiiai) or past simple (Ps77 și izbândit-ai).
Although Table 2 might suggest the opposite, gerunds are not avoided at all costs in the OxG or in Pan. Thus, PS and Ps77 resort to the gerund even in instances where a periphrasis would have been at least as fitting: Ps 5:12 и похвалѧтъ сѧ тобоѫ любѧще(и) имѧ твое, with the participle translated by gerund in PS и se laud cu tire iubindu numele tău ‘and (they) boast with you loving your name’, as opposed to PH carii iubescu numele tău and Ps89 ceia ce iubăscu numele tău both ‘(the ones) who love your name’; Ps 9:17 знаемъ естъ ё бъ скѧдѧчы твартѧ, where the underlined participle is translated with a gerund in PS, Ps77, Ps89 judeţ făcând ‘judgement doing’ (with slight variation), while PH and Pan opt for a predicate: giudecari face ‘does judgements’ and cela ce face judecățile ‘the one doing the judgements’. Naturally, the Slavonic past participle is translated with predictable past participles in all Romanian texts (ştiut, cunoscut)  77. A similar pattern can be seen in Ps 13:4 сънѣдаѫщеи люди мои въ хлѣба мѣсто, translated with a present participle (gerund) in PS, Ps77 and Ps89 mâncând oamenii mei în loc de pâine ‘eating my people instead of bread’, while PH and Pan use a relative clause, although in different tenses.

Participles expressing actions that are concomitant with those of the subordinating verb are occasionally translated by gerunds78, with some obvious exceptions79.

In Ps 106:36, all Romanian translations use the noun flămândzii ‘(the) hungry (ones)’ (or a compound prepositional object such as in Pan pre cei flămânzi), yet the gerundial or gerundive nature of the adjective flămând is debatable.

---

77 Slavonic passive participles are fewer and do not pose any problems of transposition into Romanian; the solution provided by the first translation being repeated basically unchanged in all subsequent Psalters. The same can be said of the passive voice and the past tense, forms which are easily rendered in. Occasional mistakes do happen; for example, PV uses passive voice instead of past perfect in Ps 106:9 că săturu taste sufletul desert ‘as satiated is the hollow soul’ for Slavonic ꙗѥ наситиль иѥ дшоу тьщоу (Bel). Other Psalters have accurate, albeit slightly varying, translations.

78 Ps 125:5–6 Сѣѫщеи слъзами въ радости пожънѫт. Хѡдѧщеи хѡждаахѫ и плакаахѫ сѧ метаѫще сѣмена своа. Грѧдѫще же прїидѫть радостїѫ въземлѧще рѫкоѫти своѫ. For brevity’s sake, we will only give the corresponding Romanian translations for the underlined Slavonic verbs and participles: PH Sămănătorul, sânăatând seaceră. Cei înmătători îmbrăță și plânseră, aruncând. Vinidu, venri-vor, luându, PV, PS Ce samărară, secera-vor. Îmblîndu, îmblă și plingea lepădîndu, viindu, viru, luîndu, Ps77 Ce seamenă, secera-vor. Îmblînd, îmblă și plingea, lepădînd; viind, vin, luînd, Ps89 Cine seamănă, secera-vor. Îmblînd, îmbrăță și plingea aruncînd; viind, veni-vor, luîndu-ș, Pan Ceia ce seamănă, vor secera. Umblînd, mergea și arunca plîngîndu, viind, vor venî, rădicînd. The pattern is quite clear; PH oscillates between nouns and present participles and no translation shies away from the present participle/gerund.

79 Ps77:9 сънове ефремови налѧцаѫще и стрѣлѣѫще лѫкы, translated using gerunds in PH intinzăndu și săgetându ‘stretching and shooting’, while all the other texts use relative clauses.
3. Conclusions

Our analysis allowed us not only to understand the rendition of Slavonic participles in the early Romanian Psalters and describe the employed strategies in detail, but also to cast further light on the relationship between the Psalters themselves. The analysis of these texts indicates that PS, Ps77 and PV contain the same translation/revision. The strategies adopted in PV are fairly identical to those in PS and Ps77. The status of intermediate text between the stage represented by PH and that represented by PS and Ps77 is proven not only by the dating of PV, but also by the principles of *lectio difficilior* and *lectio brevior*.

Regarding the translation strategies, it can be safely said that, even though some of the editors seem to have been guided by a series of basic principles, the translation of Slavonic participles into Romanian is not an automatic process. Countless identical Slavonic readings, placed in contexts with a similar meaning, generate inconsistent translations of the Romanian text from one redaction stage to another. Since the principle of literality was not always followed for the translation of frequently used Slavonic words with a clear meaning, one cannot expect formal equivalence in the case of complex structures such as participles. The general conclusion is that translators and redactors of Romanian Psalters were all aware of the fact that they could not translate Slavonic participles literally and consequently attempted to render their meaning by resorting most often to a solution that implied turning participles into predicates. This solution will be adopted almost universally a century later, in the translation of the *Old Testament* attributed to Daniil Panoneanul. The transformation of an adjective into a verb brings obvious challenges, since, to ensure the accuracy and uniformity of the message, the Romanian translator has to decide on the grammatical framing of the verb. The significant variations in terms of number, gender and tense indicate that the task was far from easy. The translator had to make use of the copied or translated text, of his own comprehension, of the tradition of other Romanian or Slavonic texts, or perhaps even of texts in other languages and aimed to provide a contextual and, dare we say, clearer translation. The challenge is real, since the redactor is forced by the very nature of the Romanian language to resort to a predicate that must be placed in a grammatical configuration organically dependent on the context.

80 However, dividing the language of the early Romanian Psalters into “difficult” and “easy to understand” by the standards of the 16th century reader is a complicated task. A. Gafton expresses a similar idea in his preface to the edition of *Bratul Codex*, when stating that the punctuation marks have been placed according to the current norm, yet without attempting to modernize and modify the text or to clarify aspects about which one cannot say for sure how were actually understood by the scribe (Codicele Bratul..., p. VI).
The general tendency of the OxG (PV, PS, Ps77, Ps89) is to render Slavonic present participles by predicates, using verbs that are appropriate for the logic of the narrative. Other types of translation are sporadically added to this basic strategy: by present or past participle, noun or adjective, predicative, long or short infinitive. Given the nature of the text, which often describes the relationship between man and God in terms of interactions that already took place, the logical tense of the narrative is often the past. If the Slavonic participle is rendered by a subordinate, the verb tense is borrowed from the verb of the subordinating clause. Although there is an obvious tendency to use the imperfect or aorist, there is no uniform principle. On the contrary, the translator or reviser tries to decide in each particular case which tense would be more appropriate and whether the reading needs revision. The cases in which one reading is prevalent in this group of four texts are quite numerous, but variation does exist. The present tense is used less often than in PH or Pan. This permanent uncertainty regarding the way Slavonic present participles should be rendered is clearly illustrated in the first verses of Psalm 103.

The study of Slavonic participles from the perspective of their translation into Romanian enables us to conclude that the editors of the first Romanian Psalters walk a very fine line between fidelity towards the Slavonic text and fidelity to its meaning, or, in Eugene Nida's terms, between formal and dynamic equivalence. The Romanian translator tries to identify the solution that comes closest to the meaning, while remaining least removed from the form. While calque remains the most successful solution, as the transfer of form into the target language entails at least some transfer of meaning, the participles, however, highlight the tension inherent in a situation where meaning cannot always enter the target language along with the form. PH witnesses a stage in which scholars decide on the meaning and look for the form that is least remote from the Slavonic text. We should keep in mind that "least remote" does not equal "closest". In PS and in Coresi's texts, some solutions begin to gain ground, while solutions regarded as unsatisfactory are gradually eliminated. These texts generally prefer turning participles into predicates, a solution which best translates the meaning, although the outcome is rather rigid in terms of form (especially in the case of relative clauses introduced by the same relative pronoun with no inflected forms ce), slightly artificial and generating ambiguities. This might be a concession to the compact form of the Slavonic participle.

In the following century, the focus turns steadily towards meaning. Pan, the Old Testament translation, is quite predictable in rendering Slavonic participles, almost always opting for dynamic equivalence and changing the word order whenever necessary. By comparison, in terms of vocabulary, form seems to be more resistant over meaning. The translator of Pan often inserts marginal notes pointing to the tension between form and meaning. As far as the translation of the Slavonic present participle is concerned, the history of the translation of Psalms into Romanian
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represents neither the transition from formal to dynamic equivalence – in PH, the efforts to translate meaning at the expense of form are obvious – nor the history of two mutually contradictory schools – the translation in Coresi’s Psalters is more formal, yet more accurate – but one in which the two approaches coexist. In time, the redactors of the early Romanian Psalters came to understand that прѣложити оубо же мало прѣдати мъного тлъкоѧ.

81 “Translating is betraying a little while interpreting a lot”.
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