




Ion-Mihai Felea (Iași)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3223-8446>

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.

Keywords: Psalter, Present Participle, Church Slavonic, Old Romanian, 16th century, translation

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)¹,

* 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.

¹ “*Hurmuzaki*” Psalter, Library of the Romanian Academy, București (cetera: BAR), Ms. Rom. 3077, [in:] *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki. Studiu filologic, studiu lingvistic* [Hurmuzaki Psalter. Philological Study, Linguistic Study], vol. I, ed. I. GHEȚIE, M. TEODORESCU, București 2005, <https://medievalia.com.ro/manuscrite/item/ms-rom-3077> [14 IV 2023] (cetera: PH). Al. MAREȘ, *Considerații pe marginea*

the Psalter from Voroneț (c. 1551–1558)², “Scheian” Psalter (c. 1573–1578)³, the Slavonic-Romanian Psalter from 1577⁴, Șerban Coresi’s Slavonic-Romanian Psalter (c. 1589)⁵; of these, the first three are manuscripts, and the last two are printed⁶. 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 Slavonic⁷ by (presumably) Daniil Panoneanul⁸ in the 17th century.

datării Psaltirii Hurmuzaki [Considerations on Dating the Hurmuzaki Psalter], LR 4–6, 2000, p. 682–683, based on more extensive research in Venetian archives, considers that the text could have been written between 1491 and 1516. Other authors propose similar dates (P.P. PANAITESCU, *Începuturile și biruința scrisului în limba română* [Beginnings and Triumph of the Romanian Writing], București 1965, p. 75) or avoid expressing an opinion in this respect, hoping that future research will establish the exact year when the Hurmuzaki Psalter was copied (*Psaltirea Hurmuzaki. Studiu filologic...*, p. 19).

² *Psaltirea Voronețeană*, BAR, Ms. Rom. 693, <https://medievalia.com.ro/manuscise/item/ms-rom-693> [14 IV 2023] (cetera: PV). For the dating, cf. AL. MAREȘ, *Datarea Psaltirilor Scheiană și Voronețeană* [Dating the Scheian and Voroneț Psalters], LR 33.3, 1984, p. 198; I. GHEȚIE, AL. MAREȘ, *De când se scrie românește* [The Beginnings of the Romanian Writing], București 2001, p. 51.

³ *Psaltirea Scheiană*, BAR, Ms. Rom. 449, [in:] *Psaltirea Scheiană (1482)*, Ms. 449 BAR, vol. I, *Textul în facsimile și transcriere, cu variante din Coresi (1577)* [Scheian Psalter. Ms. 449 BAR, vol. I, Facsimiles and Transcription, with Variants from Coresi (1577)], ed. I. BIANU, București 1889, <https://medievalia.com.ro/manuscise/item/ms-rom-44> [14 IV 2023] (cetera: PS). For the dating, cf. AL. MAREȘ, *Datarea Psaltirilor...*, p. 197.

⁴ *Psaltirea slavo-română de la 1577*, BAR, I–630858 (cetera: Ps77), printed by deacon Coresi (in: *Coresi. Psaltirea slavo-română (1577) în comparație cu psaltirile coresiene din 1570 și 1589* [Coresi. The Slavonic-Romanian Psalter (1577) Compared to the Coresi’s Psalters from 1570 and 1589], ed. S. ТОМА, București 1976). The Romanian text is almost identical to that of the *Romanian Psalter* of 1570, BAR, I–630855 (cetera: Ps70), as shown in AL. MAREȘ, *Filiația psaltirilor românești din secolul al XVI-lea* [The Filiation of Romanian Psalters in the 16th Century], [in:] *Cele mai vechi texte românești. Contribuții filologice și lingvistice*, ed. I. GHEȚIE, București 1982, p. 209; it was copied in Moldavia in a manuscript called the “*Ciobanu*” Psalter, BAR, Ms. Rom. 3465, <https://medievalia.com.ro/manuscise/item/ms-rom-3465> [14 IV 2023] (cetera: PC), dated between 1573 and 1585; cf. AL. MAREȘ, *O nouă psaltire slavo-română manuscrisă din secolul al XVI-lea* [A New Slavonic-Romanian Handwritten Psalter from the 16th Century], [in:] *Studii de limbă literară și filologie*, vol. II, București 1972, p. 267–268.

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 from 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 access in January 2024 on the following internet address: <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 Библия*, ed. P. ТУРКОНЯК, 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 date⁹. PH, the earliest of these, contains numerous readings pointing to pre-athonite redactions of the Slavonic Psalter¹⁰, especially to the *Belgrade Psalter*¹¹. It is not clear whether the PH is a modified version of the original Romanian translation or its direct descendant¹². A thorough revision at a yet unknown date¹³ 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*¹⁴. Ps89, the last surviving 16th century Romanian Psalter, was subsequently further revised according to texts not yet precisely identified¹⁵.

the Translator of “Îndreptarea Legii” (Târgoviște, 1652). V], SCL 54.1–2, 2003, p. 189 points out that numerous linguistic features common to *Îndreptarea 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/manuscrite/item/biblia> [14 IV 2023].

⁹ AL. MAREȘ, *Filiația...*, p. 240–241.

¹⁰ On the classification of the Slavonic Psalters, cf. C.M. MACROBERT, *The Textual Tradition of the Church Slavonic Psalter up to the Fifteenth Century*, [in:] *Interpretation of the Bible. The International Symposium in Slovenia*, ed. J. KRAŠOVEC, Ljubljana–Sheffield 1998, p. 928.

¹¹ Manuscript from the late 13th or the early 14th century, a collated version (cetera: Bel) provided by the roPsalt project was used; its fragments are preserved in various locations (C.M. MACROBERT, *The Problems in the Study of the ‘Athonite’ Redaction of the Psalter in South Slavonic Manuscripts*, [in:] *Studies of Medieval South Slavic Manuscripts. Proceedings of the 3rd International Hilandar Conference held from March 28 to 30 1989*, ed. P. Ivić, Belgrade 1995, p. 197). C.M. MACROBERT, *The Problems...*, the Belgrade Psalter belongs to the second redaction of the Slavonic Psalter. On the relationship of the Romanian Psalters to Bel, cf. I. CAMARĂ, *Cele mai vechi psaltiri românești și redacțiile psaltirii slavone* [The Oldest Romanian Psalters and the Redactions of the Slavonic Psalter], [in:] *Caietele “Sextil Pușcariu”. Actele Conferinței Internaționale Zilele “Sextil Pușcariu”*, Cluj-Napoca, September 9–10 2021, ed. E. PAVEL et al., Cluj-Napoca 2021, p. 72–81.

¹² 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.

¹³ Based on the dates advanced by AL. MAREȘ, *Datarea Psaltirilor...*, p. 198 for PV, the *terminus ante quem* would be 1558.

¹⁴ The *Oxford Psalter*, Bodleian Library, Ms. e Mus 184 (cetera: Ox), 14th century. On specific Ox readings reflected in the Romanian versions, cf.: I. CAMARĂ, *New Information on the Slavonic Sources of the Oldest Romanian Psalters*, Pbg 66, 2022, p. 81–94; A.-M. GÎNSAC, *Gr. ἀπό βάρρων ἐλεφαντίνων în vechile versiuni românești ale Psaltirii* [Gr. ἀπό βάρρων ἐλεφαντίνων in the Old Romanian Versions of the Psalter], PhJass 18.2, 2022, p. 75–82.

¹⁵ 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 ‘Hurmuzaki’ Psalter* (I. GHEȚIE, *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki și filiația psaltirilor românești din secolul al XVI-lea și al XVII-lea* [Hurmuzaki 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” translations¹⁶. According to the distinction E. Nida makes between “formal” and “dynamic equivalence”¹⁷, it can be said that Romanian translators and redactors¹⁸ 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*¹⁹. 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 meaning²⁰. In selecting the Slavonic participle as the topic of our research,

LR 27.1, 1978, p. 55). Readings such as съставиѣ праздниѣ оукрашених (Ps 117:27) suggest that a text related to Ost might have also contributed to the final stage of the revision. It is also almost certain that the redactors of Ps89 used the interweaved Slavonic text for certain emendations, cf. errors like љзики ѿхъ въкоупѣ ‘their tongues together’ for жзики ѿхъ въкоупѣ ‘their relatives together’ reflected in the Romanian text: *limbile lor depreună* (Ps 73:8).

¹⁶ I. BĂRBULESCU, *Curente literare la români în perioada slavonismului cultural* [Literary Currents of Romanians in the Era of Cultural Slavonism], București 1928, p. 375–376.

¹⁷ E. NIDA, C.R. TABER, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden 1982, p. 24.

¹⁸ None of the early Romanian Psalters is believed to be the original translation, however, the Hurmuzaki 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.

¹⁹ I. MOLDOVANU, *Structura lingvistică a Bibliei de la București și problema contribuției sale la dezvoltarea limbii române literare* [The Linguistic Structure of the 1688 Bible and the Issue of its Contribution to the Development of Literary Romanian], ALIL 39–41, 1999–2001, p. 67.

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 Automatism in the Vernacular Texts of the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period*, ed. V. AGRIGOROEI, 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 прѣвыспрѣнька, 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. *Vechiul Testament – Septuaginta. Versiunea lui Nicolae Spătarul Milescu (Ms. 45 de la Biblioteca Filialei din Cluj a Academiei Române)* [Old Testament – Septuagint. Nicolae Milescu Spătaru’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 – long²¹. 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 subordinatess²². 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.)²³. 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) adjectival²⁴, usually having a past tense value and occurring quite rarely with

²¹ The information on Slavonic participles is provided according to H.G. LUNT, *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, 7Berlin–New York 2001, p. 54, 99, 108, 153 and G. NANDRIȘ, *The Handbook of Old Slavonic*, London 1969, p. 113–120, 128, 149–154.

²² Cf. H.G. LUNT, *Old Church Slavonic...*, p. 157.

²³ Cf. C. FRÂNCU, *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521–1780)* [Grammar of Old Romanian (1521–1780)], Iași 2009, p. 129–132.

²⁴ *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, ed. G. PANĂ-DINDELEGAN, Oxford 2016, p. 260.

a non-temporal nature²⁵. In contemporary Romanian, participles tend to oscillate, as is the case with the Slavonic participles, between a verbal and an adjectival nature²⁶, but, although they do not enter temporal or aspect oppositions in an explicit manner, they intrinsically contain past and perfective values²⁷. These temporal and aspect-related features are often lost once the adjectival value is emphasized (*președintele ales mâine* ‘president elected tomorrow’), whereas certain transitive verbs form participles that carry both active and passive values (*om băut* vs. *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 extent²⁸.

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 gerund²⁹. Unlike modern Romanian, the old gerund had more pronounced verbal properties and occurred more often as the predicate of a subordinate clause³⁰. In most examples from Old Romanian texts, the gerund expresses the imperfective aspect³¹. For these reasons, we can assimilate the Romanian gerund to the present or active participle³² and the Romanian participle to the past or passive participle³³. 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 relics³⁴, and secondly, some Romanian grammars refer to the gerund as present participle³⁵.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 267.

²⁶ *Gramatica limbii române* [Grammar of Romanian Language], vol. I–II, coord. V. GUȚU-ROMALO, București 2008 (cetera: GALR), p. 509.

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.

²⁸ GALR, p. 509.

²⁹ *The Syntax...*, p. 271.

³⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 287.

³¹ *Ibidem*, p. 273.

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 *fiind fost*, *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.

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.

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 *mâncare aburindă*, *tensiune crescândă* ‘steaming food’, ‘rising tension’.

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 systematically³⁶ and never focused on the Psalter. We have extracted all the Slavonic participles from Psalms 78 to 110³⁷ 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 redaction³⁹ 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,

³⁶ Cf. P. CANCEL, *Studiul verbului slav* [A Study of the Slavic Verb], București 1938; M. RĂDULESCU, *Formele perifrastice "a fi" + gerunziul în textele românești traduse din secolul al XVI-lea* [Periphrastic Forms of "a fi" + Gerund in Translated Romanian Texts of the 16th Century], SCL 11.3, 1960, p. 691–698; C. FRÂNCU, *Geneza și evoluția formelor verbale supracompuse în limba română* [Genesis and Evolution of Multi-compound Verbal Forms in Romanian], ALIL 29, 1983–1984, p. 23–62; A. DRAGOMIRESCU, *The Past Participle and the Participial Clause...*; D. NICULESCU, *The Gerund and the Gerundial Construction in The Syntax...*, p. 259–270, 271–323. For an analysis of the infinitive in early Romanian Psalters, cf. C. BURLACU, *The Rendering of Infinitival Constructions in the Psalter Text: Greek to Slavonic, and Slavonic to Romanian*, Pbg 45.1, 2021, p. 37–56.

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 Slavicam cum aliis codicibus collatam, adnotationibus ornatam, appendicibus auctam* (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 pierdzu* translates Bel да потреблю, cf. Ps77 *să se cure* translating потребвити from the Athonite redaction (Ps 100:8); PH *și ce se lăuda*, translating Bel хвалеше се, as opposed to Ps77 *ce lăuda-mă*, translating хвалиши 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

Slavonic participles in the present tense

Verse ⁴⁰	PV: Slavonic text	Romanian translations	Form
78:3	и не бѣ погрѣбѣхъ	PH: și nu fu <i>de-a-i îngruparea</i> PV: și nu era <i>îngrupătoriu</i> PS: și nu era <i>îngrupătoriu</i> Ps77: și nu era <i>îngrupătoriu</i> Ps89: și nu era <i>îngrupătoriu</i> lor Pan: și n-au fost <i>cine să-i îngroape</i>	PrAc:NoSg
78:4	пожганіе <u>сжщій</u> окрытъ на	PH: baterea-gioc <i>a cei de pregiur noi</i> PV: imputare <i>ce era dimpregiurul nostru</i> PS: imputare <i>ce era dimpregiurul nostru</i> Ps77: imputare <i>ce era demprejurul nostru</i> Ps89: imputare <i>celor demprejurul nostru</i> Pan: badjocorire <i>celor ce sânt imprejurul nostru</i>	PrAc:DaPl
78:6	на жзыкы не знахъ щѣд тебе	PH: pre păgânri <i>ce nu știi tinre</i> PV: spre limbi <i>ce nu știi tire</i> PS: spre limbi <i>ce nu știi tire</i> Ps77: spre limbi <i>ce nu știi tine</i> Ps89: spre limbile <i>ce nu știi tine</i> Pan: pre limbile <i>cealea ce nu te știi</i>	PrAc:AccPl
82:3	и ненавиждѣши тебе	PH: și <i>cei ce gîlăluia tinre</i> PV: și <i>cei ce urrîia tire</i> PS: și <i>cei cei uria tire</i> Ps77: și <i>cine urîia tine</i> Ps89: și <i>cei ce te urâră pre tine</i> Pan: și <i>ceia ce te urăsc</i>	PrAc:NoPl

⁴⁰ 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.

Verse	PV: Slavonic text	Romanian translations	Form
82:8	сѣ живѣщїиѣи въ тѣрѣ	PH: cu <i>cei ce viia</i> în Tir PV: cu <i>cei ce viu</i> întru Tiru PS: cu <i>cei ce viu</i> în Tiru Ps77: cu <i>cei ce viu</i> în Tir Ps89: cu <i>cei ce viu</i> în Tir Pan: cu <i>ceia ce lăcuiesc</i> în Tir	PrAc:InPl
83:12	гѣ не лишїѣ блга хѣдѣщїи неzlбѣж	PH: Domnul nu părăsește de la bunrătate <i>carii împlă</i> fără de rreu PV: Domnul nu lasă burul <i>împlindu</i> fără rrau PS: Domnul nu lăsă de bine <i>împlătorul</i> fără rău Ps77: Domnul nu lăsă de bine <i>împlătorul</i> fără rău Ps89: Domnul nu lasă pre <i>cine</i> bine <i>împlă</i> și nu cu rău Pan: Nu va lipsi Domnul de bunătăți pre <i>ceia</i> <i>ce umblă</i> cu nerăotate	PrAc:Gn-AccPl
84:9	и на ѡбращѣщїѣх сѣца къ немиѣ	PH: pre <i>cei ce-și întorcu</i> înrîma cătră-nsul PV: și spre <i>ceia ce întorcu</i> înrîma cătr-însu PS: și spre <i>cei ce întorcu</i> înrema sa cătră-nsu Ps77: și spre <i>ceia ce întorc</i> inema sa cătr-îns Ps89: și spre <i>ceia ce-ș întorc</i> inema sa cătră-ns Pan: și pre <i>ceia ce-și vor întoarce</i> inima cătră dânsul	PrAc:AccPlMa
84:10	ѡбаче близѣ бжщїи сѣ егѡ	PH: Însă e aproape <de> <i>cei ce se tem</i> PV: Mai virtos aproape e de <i>temuții</i> lui PS: E, însă, aproape de <i>fricoși</i> lui Ps77: Însă aproape de <i>fricoșii</i> lui Ps89: Însă aproape e de <i>fricoșii</i> săi Pan: Însă aproape-i mântuirea lui de <i>cei</i> <i>ce se tem</i> de dânsul	PrAc:DaPl ⁴¹
85:2	спси рѣба твоѣгѡ бѣ моѡ ѡповѣщѣго на тѣ	PH: scoate șerbul tău, Dzeul meu, <i>cela ce</i> <i>nedejdît</i> pre Tinre PV: mântuiaște șerbul Tău, Domnul meu, <i>nedejduii</i> spre tire PS: spăsește șerbul tău, Dzeul meu, că <i>upuvăi</i> în tire Ps77: spăsește șărbul tău, Doamne, că <i>upovăi</i> în tine Ps89: spăsește șărbul tău, Doamne, <i>care</i> <i>upovăi</i> în tine Pan: mântuiaște pre robul tău <i>cela ce se</i> <i>nădăjduiește</i> pre tine, Dumnezeuul meu	PrAc:AccSg

⁴¹ Although близѣ normally requires the genitive.

Table 1 (cont.)

Verse	PV: Slavonic text	Romanian translations	Form
85:5	МНОГОМІЛТНІВЪ ВЪСѢ ПРИЗЫВАЮЩІИ ТѢ	PH: multu milostiv tuturor <i>cinre te cheamă</i> PV: multu milostiv tuturor <i>cei ce te mărescu</i> PS: multu milostiv tuturor <i>ce cheamă-te</i> Ps77: mult milostiv tuturor <i>ce cheamă-te</i> Ps89: mult milostiv tuturor <i>ce cheamă-ta</i> ⁴² Pan: mult milostiv tuturor <i>celor ce te chiiamă</i>	PrAc:DaPl
85:10	ІАКО ВЕЛИ ЕСИ ТЫ • Romanian translation • І ТВОРАИ ЧЮДЕСА ⁴³	PH: că mai mare ești tu <i>cinre face ciude</i> PV: că mare ești tu și <i>ce face mirure</i> PS: că mare ești tu și <i>ce faci ciudele</i> Ps77: că mare ești tu și <i>ce faci ciudele</i> Ps89: că mare ești tu și <i>ce faci ciudele</i> Pan: Că tu ești cel mare și tu însuși ești Dum- nezeu, <i>cela ce faci minuni</i>	PrAc:NoSgMa
90:1	ЖИВЫИ ВЪ ПОМОЩИ ВЪШНѢГО	PH: <i>care vie</i> în ajutoriu Cella-de-Sus PV: <i>viu</i> ajutoriul Celuia-de-Sus PS: <i>viu</i> în ajutoriul Susului Ps77: <i>viu</i> întru ajutoriul Susului Ps89: <i>viețuitoriu</i> întru ajutoriul Susului Pan: <i>cela ce viețuieaște</i> în ajutoriul Celui-de-Sus	PrAc:NoSg
90:5	Ѡ СТРЕЛЫ ЛЕТАЮЩА ВЪ ДНѢ	PH: de săgeate <i>ce zboară dzua</i> PV: de săgeate <i>ce zboră dzua</i> PS: de săgeate <i>ce zboară dzua</i> Ps77: de săgeate <i>ce zboară zioa</i> Ps89: de săgeate <i>ce zboară zioa</i> Pan: de săgeata <i>carea zboară zioa</i>	PrAc:GnPlFe
90:6	Ѡ ВЕЩИ ВЪ ТЪМѢ ПРЕХОДАЮЩА	PH: și firile întru întunarecu <i>ce trecu</i> PV: de lucrure <i>ce</i> întru întunarecu <i>trecu</i> PS: de lucrure <i>ce</i> întru întunarecu <i>trecu</i> Ps77: de lucrure <i>ce</i> întru untunarec <i>trec</i> Ps89: den firi ⁴⁴ <i>ce</i> întru utunarec <i>trec</i> Pan: De lucrul <i>care treace</i> în tunearec	PrAc:GnPlFe
91:8	І НИКОША ВЪСІ ДѢЛАЩЕИ БЕЗАКОНІЕ	PH: și izbucniră toți cei <i>ce facu</i> fărădelege PV: și crescú toți <i>ce facu</i> fărăleage PS: și crescú toți <i>ce facu</i> fărăleage Ps77: și crescú toți <i>ce fac</i> fărăleage Ps89: și răsăriră toți <i>făcătorii</i> fărădelege Pan: și crescură toți <i>ceia ce fac</i> fărădelegiuire	PrAc:NoPlMa

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*.

Verse	PV: Slavonic text	Romanian translations	Form
91:10	РАЗЫДѢ СѦ ВЪСІ ДѢЛАЖЩЕИ ВЪЗАКОНІЕ	PH: se vor rrăsvira toți <i>ce deregu</i> fărădeleage PV: spargu-se toți <i>cei ce facu</i> fărăleage PS: spargu-se toți <i>ce facu</i> fărăleage Ps77: spargu-se toți <i>ce fac</i> fărăleage Ps89: răsipi-se-vor toți <i>ce fac</i> fărăleage Pan: și se vor răsipi toți <i>ceia ce fac</i> fărădele- giuire	PrAc:NoPIMa
91:12	И НА ВЪСТАЖЩЕА НА МА ДЪКАВНОУЖЩЕА ОУСЛЫШИ ОУХО МОЕ	PH: și pre <i>carii se scoală</i> pre menre <i>hi- cleni</i> <n>du audzi-va u<re>chea mea PV: și <i>ceia ce se sculară</i> spre mire <i>hecleanii</i> , audzi-va ureachea mea PS: și <i>cei ce sculară-se</i> spre mere <i>hitleanii</i> , audzi-va urechea mea Ps77: și <i>ce sculară-se</i> spre mine, <i>hitleanii</i> , auzi-va ureachea mea Ps89: și spre <i>cei ce scula-se-vor</i> spre mine <i>hitlenind</i> , auzi-va ureachea mea Pan: și va auzi ureachiia mea pre <i>ceia ce se scoală</i> asupra mea, <i>carii hiclenesc</i>	PrAc:AccPIMa
96:7	ДА ПОСТЫДАТ СѦ ВЪСИ БЛАНЪЖЩЕИ СѦ ИСТОУКАННЫ, ХВАДА- ЩЕИ СѦ О ИДОЛѢ	PH: — PV: se se rușireadze toți <i>cei ce se închiră</i> idolilor, <i>ce se laudă</i> de idolii săi PS: se rușiredze-se toți <i>ce închiră-se</i> bolvani- lor și <i>ceia ce laudă-se</i> de idolii săi Ps77: să se rușineaze toți <i>ce închină-se</i> idolilor și <i>laudă-se</i> de idolii săi Ps89: să se rușineaze toți <i>cei ce închină-se</i> istucanilor, <i>laudându-se</i> de idolii săi Pan: Să se rușineaze <i>ceia ce se închină</i> celor ciopliți, <i>ceia ce se laudă</i> de idolii lor	PrAc:NoPIMa
96:10	ЛЮБѢЩЕИ ГѦ	PH: <i>iubitori</i> Domnului PV: <i>cire iubeaște</i> Dzăul PS: <i>cire iubiți</i> Dzeul Ps77: <i>cine iubiți</i> Zeul Ps89: <i>cine iubiți</i> Zeul Pan: <i>Ceia ce iubiți</i> pre Domnul	PrAc:No(Vo) PIMa
97:8	ВЪСѢЛЕНА И ВЪСІ ЖИВЕЩЕИ НА НЕИ	PH: lumea și toți <i>câți viu</i> pre-nsa PV: toată lumea și toți <i>ce viu</i> spre însu PS: toată lumea și toți <i>ce viu</i> spre insa Ps77: toată lumea și toți <i>ce viu</i> spre-ns Ps89: lumea și toți <i>ce viu</i> într-însă Pan: lumea și toți <i>ceia ce viețuiesc</i> într-însa	PrAc:AccPIMa

Table 1 (cont.)

Verse	PV: Slavonic text	Romanian translations	Form
98:1	О҃ґДѦИ ꙗ҃ херо- у҃вѣи҃ѣ да подвиж- нит сѧ з҃емлѧ	PH: <i>cinre șede</i> pre heruvimi, se scuture pământul PV: <i>ședzu</i> spre herovimi, se se rrădice pământul PS: <i>ce șeade</i> în heruvimi, se rădice-se pământul Ps77: <i>ce șezu</i> în heruvimi, să se rădice pământul Ps89: <i>cel ce șade</i> spre heruvimi, să se pleace pământul Pan: <i>cela ce șade</i> pre heruvimi; să se clătească pământul	PrAc.NoSgMa
98:6	В ПРІЗЫВАЮЩІИ ІМѦ Е҃ГО	PH: <i>acei ce chema</i> numele lui PV: <i>ce chemă</i> numele lui PS: în <i>ce chiiamă</i> numele lui Ps77: în <i>ce chemă</i> numele lui Ps89: întru <i>cei ce cheamă</i> numele său Pan: întru <i>ceia ce chiiamă</i> numele lui	PrAc.LoPl
98:8	И ꙗ҃ЩѦ НА ВЪСЪКЪЖ НАЧИНАНІѦ И	PH: și <i>pădzește</i> la toate începuturile lor PV: și <i>izbândii</i> ai spre tote începutele lor PS: și <i>izbândii</i> ai în toate începutele lor Ps77: și <i>izbândit-ai</i> în toate începuturile lor Ps89: și <i>izbândii</i> ai în toate începutele lor Pan: și <i>izbândind</i> pre toate tocmealele lor	PrAc.NoSgMa
100:3	ТВОРИЩѦ ПРѢСТѢ- ПЛЕНІЕ ВЪЗНЕВИДИШѢ	PH: <i>cei ce facu</i> călcare, gilăliuiu PV: <i>ce feaceră</i> treacere, urrâre PS: <i>ce feacere</i> treacere, uriu Ps77: <i>ce feaceră</i> treacere urâiu Ps89: pre <i>cei ce feaceră</i> călcare, urâiu Pan: urât-am pre <i>ceia ce fac</i> călcare	PrAc.AccPlMa
100:4	О҃ґКЛАНѢЮЩАГО СѦ Ѡ МЕНЕ	PH: <i>a se rrădzima</i> de menre PV: <i>ce feri-se</i> de mere PS: <i>ce feri-se</i> de mere Ps77: <i>ce feri-se</i> de mine Ps89: <i>cel ce se feri</i> de mine Pan: pre hicleanul ⁴⁵ <i>care se-au abătut</i> de la mine	PrAc:Gn-Acc SgMa

⁴⁵ The translation follows the redaction from Ost.

Verse	PV: Slavonic text	Romanian translations	Form
100:5	<p>ѠКЛЕВЕТАЖЩАГО ТАИ ИСКРЪНЬЕГО СВОЕГО [СЕГО] ИЗГОИЧАХЪ</p>	<p>PH: <i>clevetoriulu</i> furiş vecenrul său, acela scoş PV: <i>ce clevetiia</i> întru ascunsu soţul său, acesta-i goniia PS: <i>ce cleveti</i> în ascunsu soţul său, acesta măraiu Ps77: <i>ce cleveti</i> în ascuns soţul său, acesta mânai Ps89: <i>cel ce clevetiia</i> în ascuns aproapele său, acesta gonii Pan: <i>Cela ce mozavireaşte</i> pre vecinul său în taină, pre acesta l-am gonit</p>	PrAc:Gn-Acc SgMa
100:6	<p>ХѠДѠИ ПО ПЪТИ НЕПОРОЧНОУ</p>	<p>PH: <i>a îmbla</i> pre cale nevinovatului PV: <i>cei ce îmbla</i> pre cale nevinovată PS: <i>cei ce îmbla</i> pre cale nevinovată Ps77: <i>ce îmbla</i> pre cale nevinovată Ps89: <i>cei ce îmbla</i> pre cale nevinovată Pan: <i>cela ce umblă</i> pre calea cea nevinovată</p>	PrAc:NoSgMa
100:7	<p>НЕ ЖИВЕШЕ ПОСРЪК ДОМОУ МОЕГО ТВОРАДИ ГРЪДЫНА • Romanian translation • ГЛАДИ НЕПРАВЕДА НЕСПРАВАША ПРЪК ОЧИМА МОИНА</p>	<p>PH: şi nu via în mijloc de casa mea <i>cinre</i> <i>face</i> trufăşia şi <i>grăiia</i> nedreptate, nu isprăvia înaintea ochilor miei PV: nu viia pri mijloc de casa mea <i>ce făcea</i> trufă, <i>ce grăiia</i> nedreptate, nu dereage între ochii miei. PS: nu via pre mijloc de casa mea <i>ce făcea</i> trufă, <i>ce grăiia</i> nedreptate nu dereage între ochii miei Ps77: nu viia pre mijloc de casa mea <i>ce făcea</i> trufă; <i>ce grăiia</i> nedreptate nu dereagea între ochii miei Ps89: nu viia pre mijloc de casa mea <i>ceia ce</i> <i>făcea</i> trufă; <i>cei ce grăiia</i> nedreptate nu ispră- viia înaintea ochilor miei Pan: N-au lăcuit pre mijlocul casii mele <i>cela</i> <i>ce face</i> trufie; <i>cela ce au grăit</i> ceale nedireapte nu se-au îndireptat înaintea ochilor miei</p>	PrAc:NoSgMa x2
100:8	<p>ПОТРЕБИТИ Ѡ ГРАДА ГНЪК ВЪСА ТВОРАД- ЩЕА БЕЗАКОНІЕ</p>	<p>PH: se pierdzu den ce<ta>tea lui Dumned- zeu toţi <i>făcătorii</i> fărădelege PV: se piară de cetatea Domnului toţi <i>ce facu</i> fărăleage</p>	PrAc:AccPlMa

Table 1 (cont.)

Verse	PV: Slavonic text	Romanian translations	Form
100:8		PS: se curu de cetatea Domnului toți <i>ce facu</i> fărăleage Ps77: să se cure de cetatea Domnului toți <i>ce fac</i> fărăleage Ps89: a cura de în cetatea Domnului toți <i>carii fac</i> fărăleage Pan: ca să pierz den cetatea Domnului pre toți <i>ceia ce fac</i> fărădelegiuire	
101:8	іако птица <u>о̀совѡщїа</u> сѡ на зѣдѣ	PH: ca paserea <i>ce se usebeaște</i> în zidu PV: ca pasărea <i>însângură-se</i> spre zidul PS: ca pasărea <i>ce însingură-se</i> în zid Ps77: ca pasărea <i>ce însingură-se</i> în zid Ps89: ca pasărea <i>ce se usebeaște</i> la zid Pan: ca o pasăre <i>care se osibeaște</i> la zid	PrAc:NoSgFe
101:9	и хвалѡщен мѡ мноꙗ клѣнѣахъ сѡ	PH: și <i>ce se lăuda</i> , cu menre blăstema-se PV: și <i>cei ce lăuda-mă</i> , cu mere giura-se PS: și <i>ce lăuda-me</i> , cu mere giura-se Ps77: și <i>ce lăuda-mă</i> , cu mine jura-se Ps89: și <i>cei ce lăuda-mă</i> , cu mine jura-se Pan: și <i>ceia ce mă lăuda</i> se jura cu mine	PrAc:NoPlMa
101:19	и людіе <u>снїжеиїи</u> въсхвалѡѣ га	PH: și oameri <i>tămăduiți</i> lăuda-vor Domnulu PV: și omerii <i>ce se dzidescu</i> laudă-i Domnul PS: și oamerii <i>ce zidescu-se</i> laudă Domnul Ps77: și oamenii <i>ce se zidesc</i> laudă Domnul Ps89: și oamenii <i>zidiți</i> să laude Domnul Pan: nărodul cela <i>ce se zideaște</i> va lăuda pre Domnul	PrPa:NoSgMa
103:2–5	<u>Одѣ́а сѡ свѣтѡ іако</u> <u>ризож...</u> <u>пропинаж</u> <u>нѣо іако кѡжж...</u> <u>покрывѡж</u> водани <u>прѣвспрѣнѣа іго...</u> <u>полагѡжї</u> ѡбѡлѡкы <на> въсхожѣнїе своѡ... <u>ходѡи</u> на крилѡ вѣтрѡнїю... <u>творѡди</u> аргѡлы своѡ <u>дѡхы</u> , и слѡгы своѡ <u>огнь</u> <u>падѡшь...</u> <u>осныважї</u> зѡмѡлѡ на тврѡди своѡи	PH: <i>îmbracași-te</i> cu luminra ca cu cămeașe, <i>întinseși</i> ceriu ca o pele, <i>acoperiși</i> cu apă pre mai susu lui, <i>puseși</i> nuorii în ieșitul tău, <i>îmblași</i> pre arepile vântului; <i>făceai</i> îngerii săi de duh și slugile sale ca focul <i>ardzându; urdziu</i> ai pământul pre tăriia sa PV: <i>Învești-te</i> cu lumea ca cu cămeașe, <i>tinseși</i> ceriul ca o piale, <i>coperiși</i> cu apă pre mai susul lui, <i>Puse</i> nuorii în suirea sa, <i>îmblă</i> spre arepile vîntul[u]i, <i>feace</i> îngerii săi duhure și slugile sale focu <i>aprinșu; urrdzi</i> pămîntul spre învărtoșearea sa	Present participles that will be explained separately.

Verse	PV: Slavonic text	Romanian translations	Form
103:2–5		<p>PS: <i>învești-te</i> cu lumiră ca în cămașe, <i>întinseși</i> ceriul ca o piale, <i>coperiși</i> cu apă mai susul lui, <i>puse</i> nuorii suirea sa, <i>îmblă</i> spre arepile vântului; <i>feace</i> îngerii săi duhure și slugile sale foc <i>aprinso</i>; <i>urdzi</i> pământul în vârtutea sa</p> <p>Ps77: <i>înveștitu-te-ai</i> cu lumină în cămașe, <i>întinseși</i> ceriul ca piialea, <i>coperiși</i> ca apa mai susul lui, <i>puse</i> nuorii suirea sa, <i>îmblă</i> spre arepile vântului, <i>feace</i> îngerii săi duhure și slugile sale foc <i>aprinso</i>; <i>urzi</i> pământul în vârtutea sa</p> <p>Ps89: <i>înveștitu-te-ai</i> cu lumină ca în cămașe, <i>întinseși</i> ceriul ca piialea, <i>coperiși</i> cu apa mai pre desupra sa, <i>puseși</i> nuorii suirea sa, <i>care îmblași</i> spre arepile vântului, <i>ce feceși</i> îngerii săi duhure și slugile sale foc <i>aprinso</i>; <i>urziș</i> pământul în vârtosul său</p> <p>Pan: <i>cela ce te îmbraci</i> cu lumină ca cu o dulamă, <i>cela ce întinzi</i> ceriul ca o piiale, <i>cela ce acoperi</i> cu ape ceale mai pre de supra ale lui, <i>cela ce pui</i> nori spre suirea ta, <i>cela ce umbli</i> pre aripile vântului, <i>cela ce faci</i> îngerii tăi duhuri și slugile tale foc arzător, <i>cela ce ai întemeiat</i> pământul pre întăriturile lui</p>	
103:10	посылажи́ источ- ники въ дѣвѣ	<p>PH: <i>tremeși</i> izvoarele în tăure</p> <p>PV: <i>tremeseși</i> izvoară în balte⁴⁶</p> <p>PS: <i>tremeseși</i> izvoare în balte</p> <p>Ps77: <i>tremeseși</i> izvoare în iazere</p> <p>Ps89: <i>tremeseși</i> izvoare în iazere</p> <p>Pan: <i>cela ce trimeși</i> izvoarele în lunci</p>	PrAc.NoSgMa
103:13	напажъ гóры ѿ прѣ- выспръннй свой	<p>PH: <i>adăpi</i> codri de pre mai de susul tău</p> <p>PV: <i>adapă</i> codrii de pre asupra sa</p> <p>PS: <i>adapă</i> codrii de pre susul său</p> <p>Ps77: <i>adapă</i> codrii de spre susul său</p> <p>Ps89: <i>adapă</i> codrii de spre mai susul său</p> <p>Pan: <i>Cela ce adapă</i> munții den ceale de mai pre de supra ale sale</p>	PrAc.NoSgMa

⁴⁶ Written ФИБЛАТЕ. PV inaccurately follows a reading similar to PS in balte.

Table 1 (cont.)

Verse	PV: Slavonic text	Romanian translations	Form
103:14	прѣсѣбѣжѣ пажѣ скотѣ	PH: <i>rrăsări</i> pajiște viteei PV: <i>ce rrăsăriși</i> pajiște vitelor PS: <i>ce răsăriși</i> pajiște vitelor Ps77: <i>ce răsăriși</i> pajiște vitelor Ps89: <i>crescuși</i> pajiște vitelor Pan: <i>Cela ce răsari</i> iarbă dobitoacelor	PrAc:NoSgMa
106:9	и душѣ личицѣхъ испльни блѣгъ	PH: <și sufletul> <i>flămândziților</i> împlu de bunrătate PV: și sufletul <i>flămându</i> împlu-l de dulceață PS: și sufletul <i>flămându</i> împlu de dulceață Ps77: și sufletul <i>flemând</i> împlu de de dulceață Ps89: și sufletul <i>flămând</i> împlu de dulceață Pan: și sufletul <i>cel flămînd</i> l-au umplut de bunătăți	PrAc:AccSgFe
106:10	сѣдѣщѣхъ въ тѣлѣхъ	PH: <i>cei ce șed</i> în tunrearecu PV: <i>cei ce ședzură</i> întru înturearecu PS: <i>ce ședzură</i> întru înturearecu Ps77: <i>ce șezură</i> întru untunearec Ps89: <i>cei ce ședea</i> întru untunearec Pan: <i>pre ceia ce șădea</i> în tunearec	PrAc:AccPlMa
106:12	и не бѣ помагѣхъ	PH: și nu fu <i>cinre de agiutoriu</i> PV: și nu era lor <i>agiutoriu</i> PS: și nu era <i>agiutoriu</i> Ps77: și nu era <i>ajutoriu</i> Ps89: și nu era <i>ajutoriu</i> Pan: și nu fu <i>cin</i> să le ajute	PrAc:NoSgMa
106:23	низсѣдѣщѣхъ въ морѣ въ ко<ра>блѣхъ .. творѣщѣхъ дѣланїѣ въ водѣхъ многѣхъ	PH: <i>afundă-se</i> în mare în corabie, <i>făcându</i> lucru întru apă multă PV: <i>giosu mergea</i> în mare în corabie <i>ce făcea</i> faceri în ape multe PS: <i>gios mergea</i> în mare în corabie <i>ce făcea</i> faceri în ape multe Ps77: <i>jos mergea</i> în mare în corabie <i>ce făcea</i> faceri în ape multe Ps89: <i>jos mergând</i> în mare în corabii <i>ce făcea</i> faceri în ape multe Pan: <i>ceia ce se pogoară</i> în mare în corăbii, <i>ceia ce fac lucrure</i> în apele ceale multe	PrAc:NoPlMa x2

Verse	PV: Slavonic text	Romanian translations	Form
106:34	ѿ злѡбѣ живѣщихъ на ней	PH: de rreul <i>celor ce lăcuiesc</i> pre-nsul PV: de rreale <i>ce viia</i> spre însu PS: de reale <i>ce viia</i> spre insu Ps77: de reale <i>ce viia</i> spre-nsu Ps89: de reale <i>celor ce viia</i> spre-nsu Pan: pentru răotatea <i>celor ce lăcuiesc</i> pre dânsul	PrAc:GnPlMa
106:36	и вѣсѣли тоу дичѣ- щѣд	PH: și mută acie <i>flămânzii</i> PV: și sălășlui acie <i>flămânzii</i> PS: și băgă acie <i>flămânzii</i> Ps77: și băgă acia <i>flămânzii</i> Ps89: și sălășlui acia <i>flămânzii</i> Pan: Și sălășlui acolo pre cei <i>flămânzi</i>	PrAc:AccPlMa
110:10	разоу же елѣ вѣсѣ творѣщѣи и	PH: e înțeleptu bunr tuturor <i>cinre o va face</i> PV: e înțelepciure bură tuturor <i>ce o facu</i> PS: e înțelepciure bură tuturor <i>ce facu-o</i> Ps77: înțelepciune bună tuturor <i>ce fac</i> Ps89: înțelepciune bună tuturor <i>ce o fac</i> Pan: și înțeleagere bună tuturor <i>celor ce o fac</i>	PrAc:DaPlMa

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 *лакъати* ‘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 *зидѣи* preserves some of the predicative value of the verb *зѣдати* ‘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. *tămăduiți* ‘healed’, respectively pl. *zidiți* ‘built’); in the other Psalters, the translation resorts to subordinate sentences introduced by relative pronoun (*ce se dzidescu* ‘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 render the Slavonic participle, in this case Ps 106:36).

Table 2

Translation solutions for rendering the Slavonic participle into Romanian

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

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 (*Studiul...*, p. 42), points out that: *having no other choice, we opted for cel ce seamănă 'he who resembles'*; [i.e., to translate the Slavonic събвирани – 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/care* ‘he who/the one who’. There are, however, many exceptions. In addition to subordination by relative pronoun, PH also uses the short infinitive⁵¹, the gerund (see 2.3.2.), the noun⁵², the predicative verb (Ps 98:8 *și pădzește*⁵³ *la toate începăturile lor* ‘and guard to all their inceptions’). In one case, for translating *погрѣбѣжи* (Ps 78:3), PH probably uses the structure *de + a + long infinitive*, which does not occur often in Old Romanian texts⁵⁴. 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 cinre 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 cinre 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 rrădzima 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 *cinre iubeaște Dzăul* ‘who loves God’; PS, Ps77, Ps89 *cine iubiți Zeul*; Ps 100:5 *clevetoriul* ‘the slanderer’, replaced by an antecedent direct object clause in all other translations: *ce clevetii...* *acesta-i mânaiu* etc. ‘who slandered... that one I drove’; Ps 100:8 *făcătorii* ‘doers’; Ps 106:9 *flămândașilor* ‘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 *мъщѣж* (*Old Church Slavonic Dictionary*, [in:] Gorazd. *The Old Church Slavonic Digital Hub*, ed. Š. PÍLÁT, Prague 2016–2020, <http://gorazd.org/gulliver/> [14 IV 2023], s.v. *мъщѣж* ‘1. to revenge, to punish; 2. to defend, to vindicate’, which renders the Greek *ἐκδικῶν* 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 *и* = Rom. *și* ‘and’: *tu milostiv era lor și pădzește la toate începăturile 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 genitive⁵⁵, while in two other occurrences (Ps 78:3 and 93:1) is attached to a copulative verb⁵⁶. Since the Slavonic syntagm *градъ обитєлныи* is not translated homogenously in PH (Ps 106:4 *cetației de mânrecare*, Ps 106:6 *cetate de-a mânecarea*, Ps 106:36 *cețăi 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 agiutoriu*, PV, PS *viu în agiutoriu*, Ps77 *viu întru ajutoriu*, Ps89 *viețuitoriu întru ajutoriu*, all meaning ‘alive (in) the help’, as opposed to PH *care vie în agiutoriu* and Pan *cela ce viețuiaște 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 izbândiiai* ‘you were merciful to them and avenged’; Ps 100:5 (PV) *ce clevetiia... acesta-i goniia* ‘who spoke ill... this one

the meaning of certain verbs or verbal phrases. A. DRAGOMIRESCU, *Particularități sintactice ale limbii române în 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 *дѣи агрѣнарѣк* and the particle *a* is restored by specialists’ transcriptions such as *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki*. *Studiu filologic...*, p. 154.

⁵⁵ E.g., Ps 54:24 *în puțulu de-a putredirea* ‘in the well of rotting’, *Вон въ студенѣцѣхъ истлѣнниа* (Gen sg., cf. Gr. διαφθοράς); Ps 93:1 *Dumnezeu e de-a fălosirea* ‘God is of pride’, *Бѣ льстѣи* (Gen pl., cf. Gr. ἐκδικήσεων), Ps 106:7 *to <i>ntra în cetate de-a mâ<nre>carea* ‘go in a citadel of habitation’, *Вѣ въниѣ въ града ѡбитѣлныи* (Acc, vs. Gr. Gen κατοικητηρίου); Ps 107:11 *Cine mă va duce în cetate de-a chinuirea* ‘Who will guide me in a citadel of torment’, *Вон кѣто вѣдетѣ ма въ градѣ ѡбстоианиа* (Gen, cf. Gr. περὶ οὐχίς). It is unclear whether the translations *fălosirea* and *chinuirea* are interpretive, originate from an unknown Slavonic redaction or represent errors.

⁵⁶ Cf. A. DRAGOMIRESCU, *Particularități sintactice...*, p. 144; I. DIACONESCU, *Infinitivul lung...*, p. 442. The verb *a fi* ‘to be’ in the Romanian translation of Ps 93:1 has no support in the source texts; *e* represents in fact not a verbal form, but the particle used in Old Romanian to translate the Slavonic particle *же*. However, we have not identified a Slavonic text with the reading *бѣ же льстѣни*.

drove them out'; Ps 100:6 *ce îmbla... acesta-mi/aceia-mi slujii* '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 slujit* 'the one who walks... that one served'); Ps 100:7 (Ps77, Ps89) *nu viia... ce făcea trufă, ce grăia... nu deregea/isprăvia* '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 viia^{IMP}... cinre face* 'did not dwell... who does' și Pan *n-au lăcuit^{PERF}... cela ce face*, both opting however for the past tense in the case of the second Slavonic participle in the verse: PH *grăia nedreptate, nu isprăvia* 'spoke injustice, did not conduct' and Pan *cela ce au grăit ceale nedreapte nu se-au îndireptat* '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 blăstăma-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-au^{PERF} riure... de reale ce viia^{IMPERF}* '(he) put rivers... from the evils of (those) who lived';
- 2) aorist: Ps 82:3 PH *cei ce gilăluia^{IMP}... ridicară^{AOR}*, the OxG *cei ce ur(r)ia^{IMP}... ridicară^{AOR}* 'those who detested... lifted', but Ps89 *cei ce te urâră^{AOR}*, Pan *ceia ce te urăsc^{PRES}, rădicară*, switching to either present, or aorist for the participle **НЕНАВИДЦЕН**; Ps 100:3 PV, PS, Ps77, Ps89 *ce feaceră^{AOR} treacere/călcare, urăiu/urrăre* 'who made transgression, (I) hated^{AOR}'; Ps 106:23 the OxG *gios mergea^{IMP}... ce făcea^{IMP}... acei vădzură^{AOR}* '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-se^{AOR} de mine, răul, nu cunoscuu^{AOR}* '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 tense⁵⁷ indicating punitive measures, the Romanian translations oscillate between aorist (PS, Ps77 *ce cleveti... acesta mânaiu*) and imperfect (PV *ce clevetiia... acesta-i goniia*) or both (Ps89 *cel ce clevetiia... acesta gonii*)⁵⁸. In the same psalm present participle *ТВОРАЩА* 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, gîlăluuu* 'the ones who do transgression I detested'; Ps 100:8 *se pierdzu... 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<ă>iu* 'those who did transgression (I) hated'⁵⁹), 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 cura*^{NF}... *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/în balte/în balte/în 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 *ДЪБРЪ* '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 trimeși/tremeși* '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 (Вон знаахъ, изгонѣахъ) to translate Greek imperfects (Gr. ἐγίνωσκον, ἐξεδίωκον), while others employ perfective verbs, thus aorists, in one or even both places (Sin, Вус познахъ, выгнѣахъ). 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 gonit* 'the one who slanders... this one I cast out'.

⁵⁹ PV *urrâre* 'disdain', 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 *și crescū toți* ‘and all grow’⁶⁰, as opposed to *izbucniră* ‘(they) broke out’ (PH), *rășăriră* ‘(they) arose/sprung’ (Ps89) and *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 *închinară-se* and *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 predicative verb: *СѢДАН НА ХЕРОУВІМѢ ДА ПОДВИЖНИТ СѦ ЗЕМЛА* ‘(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 tense⁶¹, while Ps77 opts for either a past tense form or perhaps an unclear present tense (*ce șezu...* ‘who sat/sit...’)⁶²; PV even omits the relative pronoun altogether (*șezu spre herovimi* ‘sat upon the cherubs’)⁶³.

The semi-independent demonstrative⁶⁴, used to introduce the subordinate relative clause⁶⁵, 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 *giosu mergea în mare în corabie ce făcea faceri* ‘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 *ceia ce se pogoară în mare în corăbii, ceia ce fac lucrure* ‘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 16th century. This feature is not necessarily characteristic to the popular language, but was rather common in translated texts⁶⁶, due to pressure of the Slavonic model. However,

⁶⁰ In this instance, a confusion regarding the number that would result in a 3rd person aorist, (*el*) *crescu* (*pe*) *toți* ‘(he) raised (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 *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 *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 texts⁶⁷. 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 împlă*) and Pan (Ps 90:6 *carii împlă*, 101:8 *pasăre carea...*)⁶⁸.

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 поношению съсѣдомъ нашимъ. Подръжаніе и поржганіе същииимъ окрътъ насъ
 ‘You put us (for) scorn to our neighbours. Ridicule and derision (to those) being around us’

Ps 78:4 Быхомъ поношению съсѣдомъ нашихъ. Подръжаніе и поржганіе същииимъ окрътъ 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 *същииимъ* by a pronominal object in the dative (or by a relative clause with the verb *a fi* ‘to be’ omitted in the first case): *batujocură celor de pregiur 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 cases⁶⁹. 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 Ps77⁷⁰ 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 pronoun⁷¹. Identical sentences with participial centers placed in similar contexts (main clause with the verb in the past tense) do not yield identical outcomes. Nevertheless,

⁶⁷ Cf. *Ibidem*, p. 64, 211–215.

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 *toți carii fac fărăleage* ‘all who do unlawfulness’.

⁶⁹ This example of the analytic dative is not singular in PH (cf. Ps 143:3 *Omula a deșertu asemănă-se* ‘Man was likened to vanity’) and occurs sporadically in early Romanian texts; for further details and examples cf. Ș. 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 *împuțaciune* ‘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 random⁷². 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 *палашцѣ* (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 2nd or 3rd 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 2nd and 3rd person singular. PH proposes verbs in the 2nd person aorist, then the imperfect, in all cases: *Îmbrăcași*^{AOR}... *întinseși*^{AOR}... *acoperiși*^{AOR}... *îmblăși*^{IMP}... *făceai*^{IMP}... *urdziai*^{IMP} ‘(you) dressed... stretched... covered... were doing... were weaving’. The OxG translates the first three verbs in the 2nd person aorist⁷³,

⁷² G. CHIVU, *Limba română de la primele texte până la sfârșitul secolului al XVII-lea. Variante stilistice* [The Romanian Language from the Oldest Texts to the End of the 17th 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:] *Codicele Bratul. Ediție de text* [Bratul Codex. Critical Edition], ed. et trans. A. GAFTON, Iași 2003: *Mirară-se toți și nu se dumirea, unul cătră alalt grăia ce amu să fie aceasta, e alții batjocorea, grăia că de must împluți sănt* ‘all were wondering^{AOR} and did not understand^{IMP}’, were speaking^{IMP} one to another: “now what would that be^{SUBJ}”, but others were scoffing^{IMP}, spoke that they are full of must^{PASSVOICE}’. However, comparing this sequence with the Athonite Slavonic version of *Mărășescu's Apostle* (BAR, Ms. Slav. 93, c. 1500, available online at: <https://medievalia.com.ro/manuscrite/item/ms-sl-93> [14 IV 2023]), we notice that all the Romanian verbal forms follow the Slavonic ones, except for the first one: *диваѣхъже са* ‘they were wondering’, (imperfect, 6th person) *въси недомышлѣахъ* ‘they did not understand’ (imperfect, 6th person) *единъ къ дроугомоу глѣаще* ‘saying’ (pres. act. part.) *что оубо хоцеть се быти* ‘want to be’ (present + infinitive, structure that can be confused with the analytic future) *ини же роуугащѣ са* ‘mocking’ (reflexive present participle with active value) *глѣахъ* ‘they said’ (imperfect 6th pers.) *пакъ мьстомя исплѣнени сѣт* ‘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 Iași, Ms. Rom. 14, c. 1550, [in:] *Codicele 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 *Codicele Bratul...* is the notation of the verb in a subjunctive structure *va să fie*.

⁷³ Except for Ps77 *îneștitu-te-ai*, which is translated by past perfect. PV seems to use an aorist *înești-te*, but we consider the reading a haplogy resulted from the erroneous copying of the *инвѣщитѣ* sequence.

and the others in the 3rd person aorist, e.g.: PS *încești-te... întinseși... coperiși... puse... îmblă... feace... urdzi*⁷⁴. PH (the text believed to be the oldest) identifies the 2nd person (Г҃Ъ Б҃Е МОИ В҃ЪЗВЕЛИЧИЛ СЯ ЕСИ С҃ВЛО, PH *Doamne, Domnul meu, măritute-ai vârtos* ‘O Lord, my God, you have magnified yourself greatly’) and the past tense context of the previous verse (В҃Ъ ВЕЛЛЕКОТЪ ОБЛЕЧЕ СЯ, PH *întru mare frum-seațe învăscuși-Te*⁷⁵ ‘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’, *tăria* with *învârtoșarea* ‘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 accordingly⁷⁶. PS and Ps77 correct the semantic confusion arising from the double meaning of СВ҃ТЪ, namely ‘light’ and ‘world’, change one preposition (from *ca cu cămeașe* in *ca în cămeașe*) and eliminate another (*puse nuorii [în] suirea sa*), adjust the translation *învârtoșarea* replacing it by *vârtutea* and change the first aorist into a perfect tense, preserving the number regime of the verbs. Ps89 adjusts the translation of *vârtute* once more, opting for *vârtosul*, then inserts two relative pronouns before the verbs translating participles: *care îmblăși... 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 *învăscuși-te* is part of the previous verse; cf. also the sequencing in Ps89 *ши ѿ море фр҃лан҃ѣце фве-щит҃е*; moreover, the PH manuscript clearly marks the ending of the sentence with a period.

⁷⁶ Cf. *Ох о҃д҃ѣе се... пропинаю... покрываю... полагаю... ходю... творю... осниваю* (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 *низсходѡщи... творѡщи* ‘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... cea 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 вѣстаѡщѡхъ на мѧ лѣкѡвнѡуѡщѡхъ* ‘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 scoală... hicleinindu* ‘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 ... hitlenind* ‘the ones that will rise... acting wickedly’). Pan rephrases and disambiguates (*ceia ce se scoală..., carii hiclesesc* ‘the ones who rise..., who act wickedly’). In Ps 96:7, only Ps89 turns the second participle in *кланѣщи сѧ истоукающихъ, хвалѡщи сѧ ѡ идолаѣ* into an adverbial gerund ‘(the ones) venerating the statues, (the ones) boasting with the idols’ – *cei ce închină-se istucanilor, lăudându-se de idoli* ‘the ones who venerate the statues, boasting the idols’.

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 împlă fără rău* ‘who walk without evil’) or a compound object (*împlătoria 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 *вываши* 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 izbândii*) or past simple (Ps77 *și izbândit-ai*).

Although Table 2 might suggest the opposite, gerunds are not avoided at all costs in the O_xG 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 ПОХВАЛАТЪ СЯ ТОВОЖ ЛЮБАЩЕ(И) ИМА ТВОЕ**, with the participle translated by gerund in PS *și 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 ЕСТЬ ГЪ СЪДЪВЫ ТВОРА**, where the underlined participle is translated with a gerund in PS, Ps77, Ps89 *județ 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 (*știut, cunoscut*)⁷⁷. A similar pattern can be seen in Ps 13:4 **СЪНЪДАЩЕН ЛЮДИ МОИ ВЪ ХЛЪБА МЪСТО**, 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 *flămân(d)zii* ‘(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 săturatu iaste sufletul desert* ‘as satiated is the hollow soul’ for Slavonic **ИКО НАСИТИЛЪ ИЕ ДШОУ ТЪШОУ** (Bel). Other Psalters have accurate, albeit slightly varying, translations.

⁷⁸ Ps 125:5–6 **СЪЖЩЕН СЪВЗАМИ ВЪ РАДОСТИ ПОЖЪНЖТ. ХЪДАЩЕН ХЪЖДААХЖ И ПЛАКААХЖ СЯ МЕТАЖЩЕ СЪМЕНА СВОА. ГРАДЖЩЕ ЖЕ ПРІИДЖТЬ РАДОСТІЖ ВЪЗЕМЛАЩЕ РЖКОЖТИ СВОЖ**. For brevity’s sake, we will only give the corresponding Romanian translations for the underlined Slavonic verbs and participles: PH *Sămănătoriu, sămănând seacera. Cei îmblători îmblară și plâneră, aruncând. Vinidu, venri-vor, luându*, PV, PS *Ce sămărară, secera-vor. Îmblîndu, îmbla și plîngea lepădîndu, viindu, viru, luîndu*, Ps77 *Ce seamenă, secera-vor. Îmblînd, îmbla și plîngea, lepădînd; viind, vin, luînd*, Ps89 *Cine seamănă, secera-vor. Îmblînd, îmblară și plîngea aruncînd; viind, veni-vor, luîndu-ș*, Pan *Ceia ce seamănă, vor secera. Umblînd, mergea și arunca plîngînd, viind, vor veni, 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 ИФРЕМОВИ НАЛАЩАЩЕ И СТРЕЛЪЖЩЕ ЛЖКЫ**, translated using gerunds in PH *întinzându 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 translation⁸⁰. 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

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 мѣного тлѣкоуѣ*⁸¹.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Bratul Codex*, “Dosoței” Memorial House in Jași, Ms. Rom. 14, c. 1550, [in:] *Codicele Bratul. Ediție de text*, ed. et trans. A. GAFTON, Jași 2003.
- “*Ciobanu*” *Psalter*, Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. Rom. 3465, 16th century, <https://medievalia.com.ro/manuscrite/item/ms-rom-3465> [14 IV 2023].
- Coresi's Apostle*, Brașov, 1563–1566, [in:] *Codicele Bratul. Ediție de text*, ed. et trans. A. GAFTON, Jași 2003.
- “*Hurmuzaki*” *Psalter*, Library of the Romanian Academy, București, Ms. Rom. 3077, 16th century, [in:] *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki. Studiu filologic, studiu lingvistic*, vol. I, ed. I. GHEȚIE, M. TEODORESCU, București 2005, <https://medievalia.com.ro/manuscrite/item/ms-rom-3077> [14 IV 2023].
- Mărășescu's Apostle*, Library of the Romanian Academy, București, Ms. Slv. 93, c. 1500, <https://medievalia.com.ro/manuscrite/item/ms-sl-93> [14 IV 2023].
- Old Testament*, Library of the Romanian Academy, București, Ms. Rom. 4389, 17th century, <https://medievalia.com.ro/manuscrite/item/biblia> [14 IV 2023].
- Old Testament of Nicolae Milescu Spătarul*, Library of the Romanian Academy, București, Ms. Rom. 45, 17th century, [in:] *Vechiul Testament – Septuaginta. Versiunea lui Nicolae Spătarul Milescu (Ms. 45 de la Biblioteca Filialei din Cluj a Academiei Române)*, ed. E. MUNTEANU, A.-M. GÎNSAC, L.-G. MUNTEANU, M. UNGUREANU, Iași 2017.
- Ostrog Bible*, 1581–1582, [in:] *Ostroz'ka Biblija*, ed. R. TURKONJAK, Lviv 2006.
- Oxford Psalter*, Bodleian Library, Ms. e Mus 184, 14th century.
- Psalter from Voroneț*, Library of the Romanian Academy, București, Ms. Rom. 693, 16th century, <https://medievalia.com.ro/manuscrite/item/ms-rom-693> [14 IV 2023].
- Psalterium Bononiense*, Bologna University Library, Ms. Slv. 2499, [in:] *Psalterium Bononiense, interpretationem veterem Slavicam cum aliis codicibus collatam, adnotationibus ornatam, appendicibus auctam*, with readings from *Sofia Psalter*, *Bucharest Psalter* (= *Buc*), *Sinaitic Psalter* (= *Sim*), vol. I–II, ed. V. JAGIĆ, Vindobonae 1907.
- Psalterium Romanum*, [in:] *Le Psautier Romain et les autres anciens psautiers latins*, ed. D.R. WEBBER, Vatican 1953.
- Romanian Psalter*, Brașov, 1570, Library of the Romanian Academy, București, I–630855, [in:] *Coresi. Psaltirea slavo-română (1577) în comparație cu psaltrile coresiene din 1570 și 1589*, ed. S. TOMA, București 1976.

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

- Scheian Psalter*, Library of the Romanian Academy, București, Ms. Rom. 449, 16th century, [in:] *Psaltirea Scheiană (1482)*, Ms. 449 BAR, vol. I, *Textul în facsimile și transcriere, cu variante din Coresi (1577)*, ed. I. BIANU, București 1889, <https://medievalia.com.ro/manuscrise/item/ms-rom-449> [14 IV 2023].
- Slavonic-Romanian Psalter*, Brașov, 1577, Library of the Romanian Academy, București, I–630858, [in:] *Coresi. Psaltirea slavo-română (1577) în comparație cu psaltirile coresiene din 1570 și 1589*, ed. S. TOMA, București 1976.
- Slavonic-Romanian Psalter*, Brașov, 1589, Library of the Romanian Academy, București, II–630844, [in:] *Coresi. Psaltirea slavo-română (1577) în comparație cu psaltirile coresiene din 1570 și 1589*, ed. S. TOMA, București 1976.

Secondary Literature

- AVRAM M., *Există un gerunziu trecut în limba română?*, “Studii și cercetări lingvistice” 37.2, 1986, p. 153–157.
- BĂRBULESCU I., *Curente literare la români în perioada slavonismului cultural*, București 1928.
- BURLACU C., *The Rendering of Infinitival Constructions in the Psalter Text: Greek to Slavonic, and Slavonic to Romanian*, “Palaeobulgarica” 45.1, 2021, p. 37–56.
- CAMARĂ I., *Cele mai vechi psaltiri românești și redacțiile psaltirii slavone*, [in:] *Caietele “Sextil Pușcariu”. Actele Conferinței Internaționale Zilele “Sextil Pușcariu”, Cluj-Napoca, September 9–10 2021*, ed. E. PAVEL et al., Cluj-Napoca 2021, p. 72–81, <https://doi.org/10.33993/csp.2021.5.69.78>
- CAMARĂ I., *New Information on the Slavonic Sources of the Oldest Romanian Psalters*, “Palaeobulgarica” 66, 2022, p. 81–94.
- CANCEL P., *Studiul verbului slav*, București 1938.
- CHIVU G., *Limba română de la primele texte până la sfârșitul secolului al XVII-lea. Variante stilistice*, București 2000.
- DIACONESCU I., *Infinitivul lung în secolul al XVI-lea*, “Studii și cercetări lingvistice” 18.4, 1967, p. 435–446.
- Dicționarul tezaur al limbii române*, vol. I–XIX, București 2010, <https://dlri.ro/> [14 IV 2023].
- DRAGOMIRESCU A., *Particularități sintactice ale limbii române în context romanic. Supinul*, București 2013.
- An Early Slavonic Psalter from Rus'*, ed. M. ALTBAUER, Harvard 1978.
- Enciclopedia limbii române*, ed. M. SALA, M. AVRAM, J. BALACCIU-MATEI, I. FISCHER, I. GHEȚIE, București 2006.
- FRÂNCU C., *Geneza și evoluția formelor verbale supracompuse în limba română*, “Anuar de lingvistică și istorie literară” 29, 1983–1984, p. 23–62.
- FRÂNCU C., *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521–1780)*, Iași 2009.
- GĂITĂNARU Ș., *Cazul dativ în limba veche*, “Analele Universității Alexandru Ioan Cuza din Iași. Lingvistică” 61, 2015, p. 109–129.
- GHEȚIE I., *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki și filiația psaltirilor românești din secolul al XVI-lea și al XVII-lea*, “Limba română” 27.1, 1978, p. 51–57.
- GHEȚIE I., MAREȘ AL., *De când se scrie românește*, București 2001.
- GÎNSAC A.-M., *Gr. ἀπό βάρων ἐλεφαντίνων în vechile versiuni românești ale Psaltirii*, “Philologica Jassyensia” 18.2, 2022, p. 75–82.
- Gramatica limbii române*, vol. I–II, coord. V. GUȚU-ROMALO, București 2008.
- LIDDELL H.G., SCOTT R., JONES H.S. et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1996.

- LUNT H.G., *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, ⁷Berlin–New York 2001, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110876888>
- MACROBERT C.M., *The Problems in the Study of the 'Athonite' Redaction of the Psalter in South Slavonic Manuscripts*, [in:] *Studies of Medieval South Slavic Manuscripts. Proceedings of the 3rd International Hilandar Conference held from March 28 to 30 1989*, ed. P. Ivić, Belgrade 1995, p. 195–212.
- MACROBERT C.M., *The Textual Tradition of the Church Slavonic Psalter up to the Fifteenth Century*, [in:] *Interpretation of the Bible. The International Symposium in Slovenia*, ed. J. KRAŠOVEC, Ljubljana–Sheffield 1998, p. 921–942.
- MAREȘ AL., *Considerații pe marginea datării Psaltirii Hurmuzaki*, “Limba română” 4–6, 2000, p. 675–683.
- MAREȘ AL., *Datarea Psaltirilor Scheiană și Voronețeană*, “Limba română” 33.3, 1984, p. 191–198.
- MAREȘ AL., *Filiația psaltirilor românești din secolul al XVI-lea*, [in:] *Cele mai vechi texte românești. Contribuții filologice și lingvistice*, ed. I. GHEȚIE, București 1982, p. 207–261.
- MAREȘ AL., *O nouă psaltire slavo-română manuscrisă din secolul al XVI-lea*, [in:] *Studii de limbă literară și filologie*, vol. II, București 1972, p. 259–268.
- MOLDOVANU I., *Structura lingvistică a Bibliei de la București și problema contribuției sale la dezvoltarea limbii române literare*, “Anuar de lingvistică și istorie literară” 39–41, 1999–2001, p. 65–100.
- NANDRIȘ G., *The Handbook of Old Slavonic*, London 1969.
- NICOLAE AL., *Omonimia sintactică a participiilor românești*, [in:] *Studii de gramatică. Omagiu Doamnei Profesoare Valeria Guțu-Romalo*, ed. R. ZAFIU, A.-M. MIHAIL, B. CROITOR, București 2009, p. 193–205.
- NIDA E., TABER C.R., *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden 1982.
- Old Church Slavonic Dictionary*, [in:] *Gorazd. The Old Church Slavonic Digital Hub*, ed. Ș. PILĂT, Prague 2016–2020, <http://gorazd.org/gulliver/> [14 IV 2023].
- PANĂ-DINDELEGAN G., *Din nou despre participiu și supin. Câteva precizări*, “Studii și cercetări lingvistice” 58.1, 2007, p. 163–173.
- PANAITEȘCU P.P., *Începuturile și biruința scrisului în limba română*, București 1965.
- RĂDULESCU M., *Formele perifrastice “a fi” + gerunziul în textele românești traduse din secolul al XVI-lea*, “Studii și cercetări lingvistice” 11.3, 1960, p. 691–698.
- The Syntax of Old Romanian*, ed. G. PANĂ-DINDELEGAN, Oxford 2016.
- UNGUREANU M., FELEA I.-M., *Creative Calques in the Early Romanian Translations of the Psalter. Translatological and Philological Approaches*, [in:] *Translation Automatism in the Vernacular Texts of the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period*, ed. V. AGRIGOROAIE, I. SASU, Turnhout 2023 [= *Biblia Vernacula*, 1], p. 239–243.
- URSU N.A., *Activitatea literară necunoscută a lui Daniil Andrean Panoneanu, traducătorul “Îndreptării Legii” (Târgoviște, 1652)*, V, “Studii și cercetări lingvistice” 54.1–2, 2003, p. 189–201.

Ion-Mihai Felea

Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași
roPsalt Project, The Institute of Interdisciplinary Research
Alexandru Lăpușneanu street nr. 26
700057 Iași, Romania
imfelea@gmail.com