

Constanța Burlacu (Oxford, United Kingdom)

THE RENDERING OF INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE PSALTER TEXT: GREEK TO SLAVONIC, AND SLAVONIC TO ROMANIAN

INTRODUCTION

Sixteenth century psalter texts are amongst the oldest literary evidence in (old) Romanian which survive today¹. Given their biblical content and the period in which they were produced, they fall within a specific category of textual witnesses: non-original literary texts, which are the result of a word-by-word translation from what was then considered an authoritative source. Most biblical texts copied or printed in Romanian in the 16th century are thought to go back to Slavonic sources, used both for translating and revising religious texts, and the psalter text is no exception. However, while various textual analyses of the psalter text have been published over the past century (Candrea 1916; Toma 1976; Gheție 1982; Mareș 1982), it is yet to be understood which redaction of the psalter text in Church Slavonic was used for translating it into Romanian, how Slavonic or other textual sources were used during the process of revising the text in Romanian, and how a genealogical tree, linking all the sources of the psalter text in Romanian, might look. Taking as a starting point the assumption that a Slavonic source was the basis of the first translation of the psalter text into Romanian², this article focuses on the three above-mentioned issues and attempts an answer by looking at one specific aspect of textual translation – the rendering of Greek nominalized infinitives in Church Slavonic and from Church Slavonic into Romanian.

If so far few studies have faced the issue of drawing the genealogical tree depicting the textual tradition of the Romanian psalter text, the Slavonic tradition has received far more attention. It has been demonstrated that already by the 11th century, that is, by the period from which the oldest surviving Slavonic

¹ See list of the 16th century psalters in Romanian. The label old Romanian is used here in continuity with the Romanian scholarly tradition, which distinguishes between an old and a modern period of Romanian language (Hill, Alboiu 2016: XIV).

² For a summary: Camară, Ungureanu 2019: 79–82.

psalter manuscripts are attested, there were at least three distinct varieties of the texts, to which at least three others were added around the 14th century – an important period in Slavonic literary history for the substantial editorial work its religious books were exposed to (MacRobert 1998: 921–927). Today scholars such as Francis Thomson and Catherine Mary MacRobert distinguish several redactions, that is, Redactions I and II being attested as early as the 11th century sources and Redactions III, IV (*Norov Psalter* as the only textual witness of this redaction) and V for the material of the later 14th–15th centuries. For the purpose of the article, it is important to mention that while Redaction III became standard in South Slavonic early printed *Psalters*, e.g. the *Cetinje* and *Goražde Psalters*, the East Slavonic printed tradition started from Redaction V (Thomson 1998: 825–826). Additionally, in parallel to this tradition, from an early stage, translations of commentated *Psalters* were made as well: the commentaries of Hesychius (also known as the Pseudo-Athanasian commentary) and of Theodoret of Cyrhus. In less than three centuries, therefore, the processes of translation and revision which the psalter text underwent resulted in what can be seen as distinct textual redactions; these, however, are very much interrelated, since one is the improvement, the correction or simply the alteration of a previous one, which was considered somehow unsatisfactory. The reasons behind these changes vary – sometimes they depend on the existing discrepancies between the original sources, at other times they are subject to the approach a certain scribe or a scribal centre applied to translation. All in all, to talk about redactions means to identify a group of manuscripts that share certain textual peculiarities, such as interpretative textual variants, vocabulary and grammatical features, which are distinct from other manuscripts having as their basis the same text.

One aspect, for example, that caused problems for centuries in Church Slavonic translations of the Greek psalter text was the treatment of nominalized infinitives, as MacRobert points in her article (MacRobert 2018). In Greek this involved two types of structures: the infinitive could be introduced either by a definite article or by a combination of preposition and definite article. These two patterns are used in two different syntactic constructions: in the first instance, if the definite article is in the genitive, a final clause; in the second instance, a circumstantial subordinate clause. The rendering of these in Church Slavonic changed over time, together with a change in approach to translation, which ultimately led to the appearance of various redactions of the Slavonic psalter text between the 10th–15th centuries (Thomson 1998; MacRobert 2008). Indeed, while in the first redactions preference was given to constructions with finite verbs introduced by ВЪНЕРГДА in subordinate clauses and by ДА for the final clause, from Redaction III on and even more so in Redactions IV and V these are replaced by infinitival constructions as a literal translation of the Greek. This aspect is quite relevant to this study, since it can help in understanding which version of the Church Sla-

onic psalter was used for the translation into Romanian³. As with the Slavonic case, the approach to the translation of the psalter text in Romanian was that of maximum textual faithfulness, i.e., word-by-word translation. Therefore, an aspect to take into consideration in studying the translation and revision processes affecting the tradition of the psalter in Romanian is that of specific grammatical issues that arise in the passage from a Greek to a Slavonic text and their parallels in Romanian, such as the treatment of the nominalized infinitive. This is essential because, on the one hand, it leads to a better understanding of Old Romanian and to identifying those characteristics that are proper to it, but it also takes into account the fact that in this context the language is used for translation purposes and that it is therefore influenced by the source text, and what is more, can point toward establishing which sources the text has been in contact with.

FINAL CLAUSE

A. Final clauses expressed by an infinitive construction in Church Slavonic

Overall, the final clause in Greek introduced by τοῦ + infinitive is rendered by ΔΑ + finite verb in Church Slavonic. Nonetheless, there are some textual examples where from early on Greek infinitives are rendered similarly by bare infinitives in Church Slavonic, which in Redaction IV add εκε before the verb, imitating the Greek τοῦ. The translation into Old Romanian of these examples follows a constant pattern, that is, in the *Hurmuzaki Psalter* they are rendered by infinitival constructions and in PS, PC1 and PC2 by subjunctive verbs.

- 1) 30:3 τοῦ σῶσαι;
 сѡпачи RI RII – imperative; сѡпачѣ RIII⁴ RV; εκε сѡпачѣ RIV;
 Δ ΜΑ σκατε PH – infinitive; сѣѡпаче PS; сѣѡпаче мѡ PC1 PC2 PCb –
 imperative;
- 2) 33:14 τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι;
 не глаголати RI RII RIII; εке не глаголати RIV RV;
 Δ гън PH – infinitive; се н8 гъѡскъ PS сѡ н8 гъѡскѡ PC1 PC2 – subjunctive;
- 3) 33:17 τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι;
 погъбѣнѣти RI RII RIII; εке погъбѣнѣти RIV RV;

³ All textual examples in Greek and Slavonic analysed in this article have been taken from MacRobert's work on the nominalised infinitive (MacRobert 2018: 179–188). Additionally, this study focuses mainly on the *Hurmuzaki Psalter*, the *Scheia Psalter*, the bilingual psalter printed by Coresi in 1577, and the edition of c. 1588. *Ciobanu* and *Voroneț Psalters* have been considered marginally, mainly because of the many lacunae the *Voroneț Psalter* presents and because *Ciobanu Psalter* quite often resembles PC1.

⁴ Correction and additional note from MacRobert – the imperative сѡпачи is a variant reading in RI and is standard in RII. The infinitive сѡпачѣ, to be added in MacRobert's article (MacRobert 2018: 182), is more usual in RIII.

- α πῆρεδε PH – infinitive; κουμπλην се PS к8мплае се PC1 сз к8мпла̑ PC2 – subjunctive;
- 4) 36:32 τοῦ θανατῶσαι;
 ѡмрѣтвѣтѣ RI RII RIII; еже ѡмрѣтвѣтѣ RV; еже ѡсмерѣтѣ RIV;
 α φωμορρη PH – infinitive; се ωμορѣскъ PS сз ωμορ̑ PC1 PC2 – subjunctive;
- 5) 36:34 τοῦ κατακληρονομήσαι;
 наслѣдѣтѣ RI RII RIII; еже наслѣдѣтѣ RV; еже наслѣдствоваѣ RIV;
 α Δοβηδη PH – infinitive; се цнρη PS сз ц̑н PC1 сз моцетеѣи PC2 – subjunctive;
- 6) 39:9 τοῦ ποιῆσαι;
 сзтвоρηтѣ RI RIII RV; еже сзтвоρηтѣ RII RIV;
 α φαγε PH – infinitive; се φακ8 PS сз φακ̑ PC1 – subjunctive; α φαγε PC2 – infinitive;
- 7) 59:6 τοῦ φυγεῖν;
 ѡбѣжаѣтѣ RI RII RIII; еже ѡбѣжаѣтѣ RIV RV;
 α скъпа PH – infinitive; се ф8гъ PS сз ф̑г̑ PC1 – subjunctive; PC2 α ск̑па – infinitive;
- 8) 67:19 τοῦ κατασκηνῶσαι;
 вѣселѣтѣ RI RII RIII; еже вѣселѣтѣ RIV RV;
 α сзлѣшѣи PH – infinitive; the verb is not translated in PS and PC1 PCb;
 α н вѣсѣлн PC2 – infinitive;
- 9) 70:3 τοῦ σῶσαι;
 сзпачѣ RI RII – imperative; сзпачѣ RIII RV; еже сзпачѣ RIV;
 α ма скодате PH – infinitive; шн с̑щеме PS спзс̑ще м̑ PC1 PCb – imperative; α м̑ сп̑чѣи PC2 – infinitive;
- 10) 106:7 τοῦ πορευθῆναι;
 вѣнѣтѣ RI RII RIII RV еже вѣнѣтѣ RIV;
 α н̑тра PH – infinitive; се фнтре PS сз ф̑нтре PC1 PC2 PCb – subjunctive.

[All examples from above are missing in PV.]

The regularity with which an infinitival construction in PH is opposed by a subjunctival one in PS and PC1 is quite striking, and, since the Slavonic redactions here have infinitival verbal forms only (except for examples 1 and 9 in RI and RII, which present a verb in the imperative), it is clear that a final clause with an infinitive verb in Church Slavonic was rendered either by another infinitive verb or by subjunctive in Old Romanian. These examples point also to a linguistic tendency in Old Romanian, which is in development from the 16th century onwards: the competition between infinitival and subjunctive constructions, with the latter taking the place of the former. Consequently, by analysing these examples, it is possible to formulate three alternative hypotheses:

- a. The *Hurmuzaki Psalter* was influenced by the Church Slavonic version(s) of the psalter text, to which it was faithful also in terms of syntactic parallelism;

- b. Infinitival constructions of PH indicate a more archaic translation of the *Psalter*, which in other versions of the text have been replaced by subjunctive structures – a sign of modernization of the language, as Diaconescu pointed out in his article (Diaconescu 1965). In this instance PC2 would be an exception, for although it was printed quite late in the century, in 1588 c., it presents both subjunctival and infinitival constructions (see examples 6, 7, 8, 9);
- c. The infinitival constructions present in PH point either to the attempt which the copyist/translator made to improve the linguistic register of the text (Hill, Alboiu 2016: 199), or to the actual linguistic norms of the region where the scribe/revisor was based – the further north of Danube, the more frequently infinitival constructions were used (Pană Dindelegan 2016: 242).

As mentioned above, there are two instances in which RI and RII present an imperative rather than an infinitival construction (see examples 1 and 9). Interestingly, while PH here has an infinitive, as does PC2 in example 9 only, the other Romanian psalter texts present an imperative. This aspect would suggest that RI and/or RII might have influenced PS, PC1, PCb and PC2, although in order to be able to put forward such a hypothesis more textual examples are needed.

B. Final clauses in Redactions III, IV and V: change to infinitival constructions

The examples from above, however, are a few instances in which all redactions of the *Psalter* in Church Slavonic present an infinitival construction. Commonly there are differences between the earlier and the revised versions of the Slavonic text. For examples, those final clauses rendered by ΔΔ + finite verbs in Redactions I and II were changed to bare infinitives in Redaction III and V, and to εже + infinitive verbal forms in Redaction IV. When it comes to Old Romanian, the translation follows the same dichotomy as above between the *Hurmuzaki Psalter* on the one hand, and PS, PC1, PC2 and PCb on the other.

- 1) 25:7 τοῦ ἀκούσαι ... διηγῆσασθαι;
 ΔΔ οὐκ εὐχάρησῃ ... несповѣмь RI RII; οὐκ εὐχάρησῃ ... повѣдаѣти RIII RV; εже εὐχάρησῃ ... εὐχάρησῃ ... повѣдаѣти RIV;
 Δ ακουῦσαι ... Δ σποῦρη PH – infinitive; се εὐχарε ... ши се спешію PS сѣ εὐχарε ... сѣ спію PC1 PC2 – subjunctive;
- 2) 26:4 τοῦ θεωρεῖν με ... καὶ ἐπισκέπτεσθαι;
 ΔΔ зрѣѣ ... посѣщайѣ RI RII; зрѣѣти ... посѣщайѣ RIII RV; εже зрѣѣти ... посѣщайѣ RIV;
 Δ πρηνι міе ... Δ σοκοτη PH – infinitive; се εὐχарε ... ши се εὐχарε PS; сѣ εὐχарε ... сѣ εὐчаретъ PC1 PC2 – subjunctive;
- 3) 68:24 τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν;
 ΔΔ не видѣѣти RI RII; не видѣѣти RIII RV; εже не бляѣти RIV;
 Δ н8 ведеѣ PH – infinitive; се н8 вазѣ PS сѣ н8 вазѣ PC1 PC2 PCb – subjunctive;
- 4) 75:10 τοῦ σῶσαι;
 ΔΔ сѣпасетъ RI RII; сѣпасетъ RIII RV; εже сѣстъ RIV;

- Missing in PH; ce cпъcъckъ PS cъ cпъcъckъ PC1 PC2 PCb – subjunctive;
- 5) 79:3 εἰς τὸ σῶσαι ἡμᾶς;
 ΔΑ НЪІ СЪПАСЕШИ RI RII; СЪПАСТН НАСЪ RIII RV; ВЪ ЕЖЕ СЪПАСТН НАС RIV;
 ce cкoцн нoн PH ce cпececиn нoн PS cъ cпъcъcиn нoн PC1 PC2 PCb – subjunctive;
- 6) 100:8 τοῦ ἐξολεθρευθεῖσαι;
 ΔΑ ΠOΤΡЪБЛѢ RI RII; ΠOΤΡЪБНТН RIII RV; НЖЕ ΠOΤΡЪБНТН RIV;
 ce пѣpcoγ PH ce къpъ PS cъ ce къpe PC1 PCb ce пѣapъ PV – subjunctive; Δ къpa PC2 – infinitive;
- 7) 104:22 τοῦ παιδεῦσαι ... σοφίσαι;
 ΔΑ НΑΟΥГНТЪ ... ΟΥΜΠΔΡΗΤЪ RI; НАКАЖЕТЪ ... ΟΥΜΠΔΡΗΤЪ RII; НΑΟΥГНТН ... ΟΥΜΠΔΡΗΤН RIII; НАКАЗАТН ... ΟΥΜΠΔΡΗΤН RV; ЕЖЕ НАКАЗАТН ... СПРЪМΠΔΡΗТН RIV;
 Δ ФВЪЦА ... Δ Н ФЦЕЛЕПЦН PH – infinitive; ce ФВЪЦЕ ... ФМΠНΔΡЪCCKЪ PS cъ ФВЪЦЕ ... cъ ФМΠНΔΡЪCCKЪ PC1 PC2 PCb – subjunctive;
- 8) 104:39 τοῦ φωτίσαι;
 ΔΑ ΠPOCЪBТHTЪ RI RII; ΠPOCЪBТHTН RIII RV; ЕЖЕ ΠOCЪBТHTН RIV;
 ΛOУMНHРЪ PH – simple past; ce ΛBМНHЪCE PS cъ ΛOУMНHЪCE PC1 PCb cъ ΛOУMНHCE PC2 – subjunctive;
- 9) 105:8 τοῦ γνωρίσαι;
 ΔΑ CKAЖETЪ RI RII; CKAЗАТН RIII; ΠOЗНАТН RV; ЕЖЕ CKAЗАТĪ RIV;
 Δ ΔPЪBТA PH – infinitive, ‘to show’⁵; ce cпвнѣ PS cъ cпвe PC1 PCb кa cъ ce cпoγe PC2 – subjunctive;
- 10) 105:23 τοῦ ἐξολεθρευθεῖσαι αὐτούς;
 ΔΑ ІА ΠOΤΡЪБЛѢ RI RII; ΠOΤΡЪБНТН RIII RV; ЕЖЕ ΠOΤΡЪБНТН RIV;
 Δ Н ПѢAPΔE PH – infinitive; ce къмплeн PS cъ къмплe PC1 PCb cъ пѣapъзъ PC2 – subjunctive;
- 11) 105:47 τοῦ ἐξομολογήσασθαι ... τοῦ ἐγκανχᾶσθαι;
 ΔΑ НCΠOВЪБМЪ CА ... ХВАЛHМЪ CА RI RII; НCΠOВЪДАТН CА ... ХВАЛHТН CА RIII RV;
 ЕЖЕ НCΠOВЪДАТН CА ... ХВАЛHТН CА RIV;
 КA ce НЫ НCΠOВЪДHМЪ ... Δ ce ΛBОУДА PH – subjunctive and infinitive⁶; ce НCΠOВЪДHМHЪ ... ce ΛBОУΔЪMНЪ PS cъ HE НCΠOВEДHМ ... cъ HE ΛBΔЪMЪ PC1 PC2 PCb – subjunctive;
- 12) 112:8 τοῦ καθίσαι;
 ΔΑ ΠOCADHTЪ RI RII; ΠOCADHTН RIII RV; НЖЕ ΠOCADHTН RIV;
 cъ ΠOγE PH PC2 PCb ce ΠOγHѢ PS PC1 cъ ΠOγE PV – subjunctive;

⁵ показати is a particular reading present in MS 63 of the Russian State Library and in MS 117 of the Hilandar Monastery, which preserve Maksim Grek’s catena on the psalms (MacRobert 2018: 180). Here it is relevant for the translation present in PH, different from the other Romanian exemplars.

⁶ A parallel variation between finite verb and infinitive is attested in the Slavonic tradition as well – see MacRobert 2018: 180–181, in particular footnotes 20 and 22.

13) 118:173 τοῦ σῶσαι;

ДА СЪПАСЕТЪ RI RII; СЪПАСТН RIII RV; ЕЖЕ СП̄СѢТИ RIV;

Α ΜΑ ΣΚΟΔΤΕ PH – infinitive; СЕ СП̄КЪ МЕ PS СЪ М̄Н СПЪСѢСКЪ PC1 PC2 PCb СЕ СПЪСѢСКЪ PV – subjunctive.

Consequently, since the first examples showed that the infinitival Church Slavonic constructions were rendered in Old Romanian either by a parallel infinitival verb or by a subjunctive, the second group of examples add another bit of information. Here again the pattern is the same, that is, infinitival construction as a preferred option in PH and subjunctival constructions consistently in PS, PC1, PCb and often by PC2. This strongly suggests that the original source text had infinitival constructions in its turn, i.e. that it belonged to Redactions III, IV or V in Church Slavonic.

C. Final clauses in Redactions IV and V: later introduction of infinitival constructions in CS

Consequently, we should turn our attention to those instances where the verbal constructions of final clauses are different in Redactions III, IV and V. The replacement of finite verbs with infinitives continued during the 14th century, consequently, by the 15th century all the remaining instances of final clauses were rendered by infinitival constructions in Redactions IV and V. To a certain extent, therefore, Redaction III occupied an intermediate place between RI and II, on the one hand, and RIV and V on the other. The dichotomy present in the above examples disappears here and cedes place to subjunctival constructions in all Romanian exemplars of the psalter text. The textual examples of this section will make explicit the person and number of the subjunctival constructions in Romanian for a better comparison with the parallel Slavonic examples.

1) 22:6 τὸ κατοικεῖν με;

ДА ВЪСЕЛИѢ СѦ RI RII RIII; ВСЕЛАНТИ МН СѦ RV; ЕЖЕ ЖИТИ МН RIV;

СЕ ΜΟΥΤΟΥ ΜΑ PH СЕ ПТ̄Р̄S PS СЪ ПНТ̄Р̄S PC1 – subjunctive, 1st pr. sg.; СЪ СЕ ВСЕЛѢСКЪ PC2 – subjunctive, 3rd pr. sg./pl. In this instance, as in example 8, the Slavonic word is borrowed in Romanian, meaning however *to be married*, rather than *to move into*, consequently it might be that the translator/revisor mistook or encountered in its original source the Slavonic word ВСЕЛАНТИ СѦ.

2) 26:4 τοῦ κατοικεῖν με;

ДА ЖИВѢ RI RII RIII; ЕЖЕ ЖИТИ МН RV RIV;

СЕ ВІS PH PS PC1 СЪ ВІЕЦЪСЕКЪ PC2 – subjunctive, 1st pr. sg.;

3) 35:2 τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν;

ДА СЪГРѢШАДЕТЪ RI RII RIII; СЪГРѢШАТИ RV; ЕЖЕ СЪГРѢШАТИ RIV;

СЕ НS ГРѢШАСКЪ PH СЕ ГРЕШАСКЪ PS СЪ ГРЕШАСКЪ PC1 PC2 – subjunctive, 3rd pr. sg./pl.;

- 4) 35:4 τοῦ ἀγαθῶναι;
 ΔΔ ΟΥΒΛΑЖИТЪ RI RII RIII RV; еже ОУВЛАЖИТИ RIV;
 ce ꙗВ8НРЪСЕ PH ce фєРНУД8E PS cz фєРНУЪЗє PC1 PC2– subjunctive,
 3rd pr. sg./pl.;
- 5) 38:2 τοῦ μὴ ἀμαρτάνειν;
 ΔΔ НЕ СЪГРЪШ(Δ)Ѡ RI RII RIII; еже НЕ СЪГРЪШАТИ (МН) RIV RV;
 Missing in PH, ce н8 грешеск8 PS PC1 cz не грешескѠ PC2 – subjunctive,
 1st pr. sg.;
- 6) 66:3 τοῦ γνῶναι;
 ΔΔ ПОЗНАЕМЪ RI RII RIII; познати RV; еже познати RIV;
 ce КОУНОАЩЕМЪ PH ce к8НОАЩЕМ PS cz КОУНОАЩЕМЪ PC1 PC2 PCb – subjunc-
 tive, 1st pr. pl.;
- 7) 72:28 τοῦ ἐξαγγεῖλαι;
 ΔΔ НСПОВЪМЪ RI RII; вЪЗВЪЩѠ RIII; вЪЗВЪСТИТИ МН RV; еже НЗВЪСТИТИ МН
 RIV;
 cz сп8Ю PH ce сп8НѠ8 PS cz сп8Ю PC1 PC2 PCb ce сп8НѠ8 – subjunctive, 1st pr. sg.;
- 8) 93:13 τοῦ παραῖναι;
 ΔΔ ΟΥΚΡΟΤΗΣΗ RI RII RIII; ουκροτηти RV; еже ουκροτηти RIV;
 ce ꙗВЛЗН8ЕЩИ PH czлв ꙗВЛѠНЗЕШЪ PH PC1 PC2 ꙗМВЛѠН8ЕЩИ ЕЛЪ PCb –
 subjunctive, 2nd sg.;
- 9) 118:37 τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν;
 ΔΔ НЕ ВИДѠТИ RI RII RIII; не ВИДѠТИ RV; еже НЕ ВИДѠТИ RIV;
 ce НΟΥ ВАСИ PH – subjunctive, 2nd pr. sg.?; ce НΟΥ ВАСЪ PS cz н8 ВЛЗѠ PC1 PCb
 PC2 – subjunctive, 3rd pr. sg./pl.

[The examples here analysed are missing in PV.]

From here additional hypotheses can be formulated. It appears from these examples that PH is not based on Redaction IV or V, otherwise, as previously, the Church Slavonic infinitive verbs would be expected to be rendered by parallel infinitival constructions. It emerges, instead, that the subjunctive construction corresponds perfectly to the Church Slavonic ΔΔ + finite verb structure. In these examples, therefore, the three versions of the Romanian *Psalter* coincide, and they all present the same verbal forms. Additionally, it could be noted that the conjugation of verbs follows that of the Slavonic forms from Redactions I, II and III, and Redaction III in particular, as example 30 shows, where a Romanian verb conjugated in the 1st person singular corresponds to a Slavonic verb in the 1st person singular as well.

All in all, if the three groups of examples are taken together, it will be seen that Redaction III is the only redaction of the Slavonic psalter text to which the Romanian versions can be traced back (although the imperatives in Ps.30:3 and 70:3, which are not usual in RIII and yet are rendered as imperatives in Romanian, need further study). Furthermore, it is also evident that the *Hurmuzaki*

Psalter, by rendering the final clauses with infinitival verbal constructions, was imitating a similar construction in the original source.

SUBORDINATE CLAUSE

Another use of the nominalized infinitive in Greek is the circumstantial subordinate clause introduced by a preposition and a definite article in the appropriate case. In Church Slavonic the Greek construction is rendered in several different ways: with infinitives, subordinate clauses, verbal nouns and sometimes participial constructions. Here is a small group of examples where the infinitival Greek construction is rendered, in all five redactions, by the conjunction *вънегда* + an infinitive verb in Church Slavonic to convey hypothetical situations (MacRobert 2018: 182–183). In Old Romanian these hypothetical situations are expressed with *кѣндѣ* + future constructions mainly, even though on some occasions the *Hurmuzaki Psalter* presents an infinitival construction and PS and PC2 prefer a present but also a past periphrastic construction.

A. Subordinate clauses expressed by an infinitive construction in Church Slavonic

- 1) 9:4 ἐν τῷ ἀποστραφῆναι;
вънегда вѣзвратити сѧ RI RII RIII RIV RV;
кѣндѣ ѡтѡраѣ сѧ ва PH – future; *кѣндѣ тоарнѣ сѧ* PS *кѣндѣ тоатнѣ сѧ* PC1 – present; PC2 missing;
- 2) 18:12 ἐν τῷ φυλάσσειν;
вънегда + сѣхранѣти/сѣхранити RI RII RIII RV; *сѣхранитѣ* RII RIV;
кѣндѣ ле ва цнѡрѣ PH – future; *кѣндѣ фѣрѣще* PS *кѣндѣ хрѣнѣще* PC1 – present; *кѣндѣ пѣзи ва алѣ* PC2 – future;
- 3) 50:6 ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαι σε;
вънегда + сѣднѣти сѧ RI; *сѣднѣти ти* RII RIII RV; *сѣднѣти ти сѧ* RIV;
кѣндѣ вою ѡудѣка PH – future, 1st pr. sg.; *кѣндѣ вѣри ѡудѣка* PS PCb *кѣндѣ вѣри жѡудѣка* PC1 – future, 2nd pr.; *кѣндѣ жѡудѣкаци сѧ ва* PC2 – future, 2nd pr. pl. Interestingly, person and number in PH, PS PCb PC1, and PC2 are rendered differently across the textual witnesses;
- 4) 118:7 ἐν τῷ μεμαθηκέναι με;
вънегда ѡаѡγнѣти мѣ сѧ RI RII RIII RIV RV;
кѣндѣ а ма ѡвѣца PH – infinitive; *кѣндѣ ѡвѣцаю мѣ* PS PCb *кѣндѣ ѡвѣцан мѣ* PC1 – imperfect, 1st pr. sg.; *кѣндѣ ѡвѣца мѣ* PC2 – infinitive without the complementizer *a*;
- 5) 118:9 ἐν τῷ φυλάσσεσθαι;
вънегда сѣхранити RI RII RIII RIV RV;
кѣндѣ а цнѡрѣ PH – infinitive; *кѣндѣ фѣри вѣрѣ* PS *кѣндѣ фѣри вѣрѣ* PC1 PC2 PCb – conditional;

- 6) 123:2 ἐν τῷ ἐπαναστήναι ἀνθρώπους;
 ВЪНЕГДА ВЪСТАТИ УЕЛОВЕКОМЪ RI RII RIII RIV RV;
 КЪНДА8 А СТА УМЕННЛОРЬ PH – infinitive; КЪНДА8 СКОУЛА СЕ ВРЪ УАМННІИ PS
 КЪНДАЪ СКЛА СЕ ВРЪ УАМНІИ PC1 PC2 PCb – conditional;
- 7) 123:3 ἐν τῷ ὀργισθῆναι;
 ВЪНЕГДА ПРОГНѢВАТИ СА RI RII RIII RIV RV;
 КЪНДОУ СЕ8 ВРЪТЬ МЪНІА PH – compound past + infinitive (conditional construction) for *when they would have enraged*; КЪНДА8 МЪНІА СЕ МЪНІА ЛОР PS
 КЪНДАЪ МЪНІА СЕ ОУРЦНА ЛОРЬ PC1 PCb КЪНДАЪ МЪНІА СЕ ОУРЦНА СПРЕ НОН PC2
 – simple past.
 [The examples here analysed are missing in PV.]

From these examples it appears that the infinitive constructions in subordinate clauses were not rendered directly by an infinitive construction from Church Slavonic into Old Romanian, but readapted to the content of the sentence. The Church Slavonic conjunction ВЪНЕГДА is paralleled in Old Romanian by КЪНДАЪ + the verbal construction. It is possible to notice that when PC2 departs from the PC1 interpretations it is closer to PH, as happened on other occasions. Further, in three instances the *Hurmuzaki Psalter* presents an infinitival construction (examples 36, 37, and 38), which bring it even closer to the Slavonic text, although preference is given to future constructions as well (33, 34, 35). *Coresi's* and *Scheia Psalters* present instead either a conditional construction with the verb *a vrea* in the imperfect followed by an infinitive verb or a verbal construction in the present⁷. Consequently, it appears that Slavonic subordinate clauses expressing counterfactual or hypothetical events with ВЪНЕГДА + infinitive verb have no clear parallel in Old Romanian, for they can be expressed with a similar infinitival construction, but also with a future or a conditional one.

B. Subordinate clauses in Redaction III: substitution of finite with infinitive verbs

As happened in the final clause construction, the use of infinitives imitating the Greek original also expanded in subordinate clauses, especially in the 14th century. Redaction III, for example, usually follows the expected subordinate construction (conjunction + finite verb), however, there are three instances where an infinitive verb is substituted for the finite verbs of Redactions I and II. When compared to the Romanian *Psalters* the result varies depending on the conjunction in use in the clause:

- 1) 38:2 ἐν τῷ συστῆναι τὸν ἀμαρτωλόν;
 ВЪНЕГДА + ВЪСТАНЕТЪ ГРѢШНИКЪ RI RII; ВЪСТАТИ ГРѢШНОМОУ RIII RV;
 СЪСТАИЖИ ГРѢШНИКОУ RIV;
 КЪНДОУ А СЕ СТА ГРѢШНИУЛОРЬ PH – infinitive; КЪНДАЪ СКОЛАЪ СЕ ПЪКЪТОШІИ PS PC1 – present; КЪНДАЪ СКЛА СЕ ВА ПЪКЪТОСЛА PC2 – future construction;

⁷ Examples 37 and 38 in particular. Reference to Zafiu 2016: 23.

- 2) 57:10 πρὸ τοῦ συνίεναι;
 прѣжде даже + не разоумѣете RI RII; не разоумѣти RIII RIV; разоумѣти RV;
 маинтѣ де γε νοῦ σε πρεπεπρѣ PH – circumstantial construction, simple past;
 аинте де φινцелѣμε in PS – long infinitive; аинте де γε φцелѣме PC1 аинте
 де φцелѣме PCb – infinitive without complementizer *a*; аинте пѣнѣ ноῦ
 φинцелѣсерѣ PC2 – simple past;
- 3) 89:2 πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη γενηθῆναι ... καὶ πλασθῆναι τὴν γῆν καὶ τῆν οἰκουμένην;
 прѣжде даже + горѣи не бѣша н сѣзда са земля RI RII; горамѣ не бѣити н
 сѣздаати са земля RIII RV; прѣжде еже горамѣ быти н сѣздаати са земля RIV;
 аинте де γε аδ κρωΔηη ноῦ φογρѣ еη неге пѣмнѣтоулоу φѣге са in PH – circum-
 stantial construction, past perfect verb and simple past; аинте пѣрѣ вΔрѣиη н8
 ф8рѣ ши се факѣ се пѣмѣнтѣл PS аинте пѣнѣ коΔриη ноῦ φογрѣ ши сѣ се факѣ
 пѣмѣнтѣл PC1 PCb – simple past and subjunctive; аинте пѣнѣ коΔриη н8
 φογрѣ ши сѣ се зидѣскѣ пѣмѣнтѣл PC2 – the first part of the example is the
 same, while the second is altered to *să se zidească*, that is again a subjuncti-
 val construction but with change in vocabulary.

In 40 the dynamic is quite similar to the ones seen above, that is, the *Hurmuzaki Psalter* presents an infinitival construction, which then is rendered with a future one in PC2 and with a verb in the present in PC1. The other two examples, because they are introduced by the adverb *ainte*, translating the Church Slavonic прѣжде, present a different and more complex construction. *Ainte* – *înainte* in modern Romanian, ‘before’ – is grammatically defined as a connector, and is introduced to indicate an idea of posteriority. It can be followed by a complementizer, conjunction or relative construction (as in 41 with *de ce*). In 42 we have two connectors in PC1 and PS, i.e. *ainte* and *până*, standing for ‘before until (not)’, which usually are followed by a past or a future construction (Pană Dindelegan 2016: 494–497). Consequently, beside example 40, which might suggest an influence of Redaction III, the other two examples are harder to analyse and relate to the Slavonic constructions.

C. Subordinate clauses in Redaction IV: substitution of finite with infinitive verbs

If the replacement of finite verbs with infinitive forms in Redactions III is sporadic, Redactions IV and V present a substantial and constant introduction of infinitives, imitating the Greek pattern. Here, for instance, are the places where this replacement takes place in Redaction IV. Once more, in Old Romanian the outcome is either a future or a present construction, or structures rendered with a verb in the simple past.

- 1) 9:31 ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν κατακυριεῦσαι τῶν πενήτων;
 вѣнегда + оῦΔоВлѣлѣ бѣдетѣ оῦВогѣимѣ RI RII RIII – future perfect; оῦΔоЛѣт
 RV; емоу оῦΔоЛѣти RIV;
 кѣндѣ ва венѣе мншенлорѣ PH – future; кѣндѣ венѣе мншенлорѣ PS кѣндѣ
 вниѣе мншенлорѣ PC1 – present; кѣндѣ фвѣнкѣтѣ фн ва PC2 – future;

- 2) 16:15 ἐν τῷ ὀφθῆναι;
 ВЪНЕГДА + ЪВНТЪ МН СЛ RI RII RIII RV; ЪВНТН МН СЛ RIV;
 КЪНД8 ЮВН МН СЛ ВА PH – future; КЪНДЪ НВЪЩЕ МН СЕ PS, PC1 – present;
 ΔΡΠΤΑ ΜН СЕ ВА PC2 – future;
- 3) 27:2 ἐν τῷ δέεσθαι με;
 ВЪНЕГДА + ΜΟΛΛ СЛ RI RII RIII RV; ΜΟΛНТН МН СЛ RIV;
 КЪНД8 ΜΑ ΡΡΟΥΓЪ PH КЪНД8 ΡΟΥГ МΕ ΚЪΤΡЪ ТНΡΕ PS КЪНДЪ ΡΟΥГ ΜΠ ЦЇЕ PC1
 PC2 – present;
- 4) 30:23 ἐν τῷ κεκραγῆναι;
 ВЪНЕГДА + ВЪЗВАХЪ RI RII RV – aorist/imperfect?; ВЪЗВЪ RIII; ВЪЗВАТН МЇ
 RIV;
 КЪНД8 КЕМ8 PH КЪНД8 КЇЕМ8 PS КЪДЪ КЕМ PC1 PC2 – present;
- 5) 41:11 ἐν τῷ καταθλάσαι;
 ВЪНЕГДА + СЪΚΡΟΥШАХЪ СЛ ΚΟСТН RI RII RIII RV – imperfect; СЪΚΡΟΥШАТН СЛ
 ΚΟСТН RIV;
 КЪНДОУ ЗΔΡОВНН СЛ ΜΑСЕΛЕ PH КЪНДЪ ФРЪНЦЪ СЕ ΜΑСЕΛЕ PS PC1 PC2 –
 imperfect;
- 6) 42:2 ἐν τῷ ἐκθλίβειν τὸν ἐχθρόν;
 ВЪНЕГДА + СЪТЪЖΔΕΤЪ МН ВРАГЪ RI RII RIII RV; СЪТЪЖАТН ВРАГОУ RIV;
 КЪНД8 ΔΟΔΕΨЕ МН ВРЪЖΜΑШ8Л PH PC2 КЪНДЪ ΔΟΔΕΨЕ МН ΔΡΑΚ8Л PS
 PC1 – present;
- 7) 45:3 ἐν τῷ ταράσσεσθαι τὴν γῆν καὶ μετατίθεσθαι ὄρη;
 ВЪНЕГДА + СЪΜΠΩΔΕΤЪ СЛ ЗЕМΛИ Н ПРЪЛАΓΑΙЖЪ СЛ ГОРЪ RI RII RIII RV;
 СЪΜΠΩАТН СЛ ЗЕМНН ПРЪΔЛАГАЖЪ СЛ ГОРЪ RIV;
 КЪНД8 СЕ ВА СМЕНТН ПЪМЇТ8Л ШН СЛ ВОРЪ ВЪГА ΚΟΔΡЫН PH – future; КЪНДЪ
 СМННТЪЩЕ СЕ ПЪΜΠНТ8Л ШН СΚНМВЪ СЕ ПЪΔΟΥРΗΛЕ PS PC1 КЪНДЪ Τ8ΡΕ8ΡΠΣЕ
 ПЪΜΠНТ8Л ШН СЕ ΒΑΓΠ ΜΟΥΝЦЇН PC2 – present;
- 8) 60:3 ἐν τῷ ἀκηδιάσαι τὴν καρδίαν;
 ВЪНЕГДА + ΟΥΝЪΙ СРЪДЦЕ RI RII RIII RV – aorist; ΟΥΝЫТН СРЇЦΟΥ RIV;
 КЪНД8 ΜЪХНН СЕ ФРΗΜΑ ΜΑ PH КЪНДЪ ΜЪХНН СЕ ННΕΜΑ ΜЪА PS PC1 PC2 PCb
 – simple past;
- 9) 67:15 ἐν τῷ διαστῆλειν τὸν ἐπουράνιον βασιλεῖς;
 ВЪНЕГДА + ΡΑΖΔЪЛНТЪ НБСЪН ЦРЪ RI RII RIII RV; ΡΑΖСНЛАТН НЕБЕСНУМОУ ЦРЪ
 RIV;
 КЪНД8 ВА ΔЕСПНКА Δ ΥΕΡЮΛ8Н ФПЪРАТ8Л PH – future; КЪНДЪ ФПАΡΤЕ ΔΕ ΥΕΡЮ
 ФПЪРАЦЇН СПРННСЪ PS PC1 PCb – present; КЪНДЪ ВА ΔЕСΦΑΥЕ PC2 – future;
- 10) 91:8 ἐν τῷ ἀνατεῖλαι τοὺς ἀμαρτωλοὺς;
 ВЪНЕГДА + ΠΡΟΖΑΒΗΨΑ/ΠΡΟΖΑΒΟΨΑ ΓΡЪШЬННЦН RI RII RV – aorist;
 ΠΡΟΖΑΒΗЖЪ RIII; ΠΡΟΖΑΒНЖТН ΓΡЪШЬННКОМЪ RIV;
 КЪНДОУ РЪСЪРНРЪ ΓΡЪШННННН PH – simple past; КЪНД8 РЪСЪРН ВОРЪ ПЪКЪТОШЇН
 PS КЪНДЪ РЪСЪРН ВОРЪ ПЪКЪТОШЇН PC1 PCb PV – future; КЪНДЪ ΚΡΕСΚ8ΡΠ
 ПЪКЪТОШЇН – simple past PC2;

- 11) 105:44 ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν εἰσακοῦσαι;
 H OYCLBIWA RI RII RIII – aorist; BZHEΓΔA OYCLBIWASHE RV – imperfect; EMOU OYCLBIWATH RIV;
 KZHΔOY EAB AKOYATA PH SH ΛOYSH PS PCb KZHΔB (TBHJIA SH) ΛOYZH PC1 PC2 – simple past;
- 12) 118:67 πρὸ τοῦ με ταπεινωθῆναι;
 PpBbE ΔAJE HE CBMBPHXZ CA RI RII RIII RV – aorist; PpBbE EJE CBMBPHTH CA MHb RIV;
 MANTe ΔE YE H8 MA CBMBPHO PH ANHTe PZHb HOY CMEPIIO ME PS ANHTe PZHb H8 CBMBPHO Mh PC1 PC2 PCb – imperfect;
- 13) 119:1 ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με;
 BZHEΓΔA + BZCKpBbEXZ RI RII; CKpBbEXZ RIII RV – aorist/imperfect?;
 CBCKpBbETH MH RIV;
 KZHΔOY BZHOUHIO PH KZHΔB CKpBbIA PS PV KZHΔB CKpBbIA PC1 PCb PC2 – imperfect;
- 14) 125:1 ἐν τῷ ἐπιστρέψαι κύριον;
 BZHEΓΔA + BZBpATHTB Gb RI RII RIII RV; BZBpATHTH GbY RIV;
 KZHΔOY BA ATOAYE ΔOMHAB PH KZHΔB T8pHA BA ΔHbA PS KZHΔB T8pHA BA ΔOMHAB PC1 PC2 PCb – future;
- 15) 140:1 ἐν τῷ κεκραγένοι με;
 BZHEΓΔA + BZBOBh RI RII RIII RV; BZBIBATH MH RIV;
 KZHΔOY BOY KEA PH – future; KZHΔOY KEMOY PS PV KZHΔB KEb PC1 PC2Cb – present;
- 16) 141:4 ἐν τῷ ἐκλείπειν;
 BZHEΓΔA + HCTBZASH ΔXb MOH RI RII RIII – imperfect; HZYBZAE RV; HZTBZATH ΔXb MOH RIV;
 KZHΔOY CE KOYPLHA ΔE MEHpe ΔBOYpOY MIe8 PH KZHΔB PEPIA ΔE ΛA MHHE CBΦLETbA MIe8 PS PC1 PC2 PV PCb – imperfect.

Notably, there are no examples of infinitive constructions, even in the *Hurmuzaki Psalter*. There is a correspondence, instead, with the verbal tense present in Redaction I, II, III and V. That is, if the Church Slavonic *Psalter* has a present construction (being perfective or imperfective), the Old Romanian translation opts either for a present or a future construction, with the *Hurmuzaki Psalter* having a preference for the latter verb form. On the other hand, when the verb in Church Slavonic is in the past, the text in Old Romanian follows it rigorously, rendering it with a past construction as well (47, 50, 53, 54, 55) – usually the Slavonic aorist with a simple past, and the Slavonic imperfect with a corresponding imperfect in Romanian. As a consequence, it can be argued that it is unlikely that Redaction IV was used as a source text for the translation of the *Psalter* into Old Romanian. Further examples indicating in particular that Redaction III was the version of reference are 46 and to a

certain extent 52. In the last example PS, PC1 differ from PH and it seems that the *Hurmuzaki Psalter* followed a redaction which presents an aorist rather than a present form (as does RIII), which then is translated with a simple past construction in PH. However, it should also be mentioned that the Slavonic counterpart present in PC1 has $\mu\text{p}\rho\text{z}\alpha\text{b}\epsilon\text{n}\bar{\alpha}\text{w}\lambda\alpha$, which makes us think that some Slavonic *Psalters*, although belonging to RIII, in 91:8 may have presented a past-tense verb construction rather than a present one (such is the case of PC1, for example).

D. Subordinate clauses in Redactions IV and V: further substitution with infinitive verbs

There are some additional instances where finite verbs in subordinate clauses were replaced with infinitive verbal forms in Redaction IV and V. Similar to the analysis made above of Redaction IV, these examples can indicate whether Redaction V was used for the translation of the *Psalter* into Old Romanian. Additionally, considering the fact that there is a constant correspondence between the Slavonic and the Romanian verbal constructions, the following is an attempt to study this aspect further, and for this reason person and number will be indicated for the verbal construction in Romanian when necessary.

a. Subordinate clause: substitution of past verbs with infinitives in Redactions IV and V

- 1) 21:25 ἐν τῷ κερραγένοι με;
 $\text{v}\bar{\text{z}}\text{n}\epsilon\text{r}\Delta\alpha + \text{v}\bar{\text{z}}\text{z}\bar{\text{v}}\text{b}\alpha\chi\bar{\text{z}}$ RI RII RIII RV – aorist/imperfect?; $\text{v}\bar{\text{z}}\text{z}\bar{\text{v}}\text{b}\alpha\text{t}\text{h}$ MH RIV;
 $\text{k}\bar{\text{z}}\text{n}\Delta\sigma\gamma$ $\text{k}\epsilon\text{m}\alpha\text{i}\bar{\text{o}}$ PH $\text{k}\bar{\text{z}}\text{n}\Delta\delta$ $\text{k}\bar{\text{i}}\epsilon\text{m}\alpha\bar{\text{i}}\bar{\text{o}}$ PS $\text{k}\bar{\text{z}}\text{n}\Delta\delta$ $\text{k}\epsilon\text{m}\alpha\text{h}$ PC1 PC2 – simple past, 1st pr. sg.;
- 2) 30:14 ἐν τῷ ἐπισυναχθῆναι αὐτούς;
 $\text{v}\bar{\text{z}}\text{n}\epsilon\text{r}\Delta\alpha + \text{c}\bar{\text{z}}\text{b}\epsilon\text{r}\alpha\chi\bar{\text{z}}$ CA RI RII RIII – imperfect; $\text{c}\bar{\text{z}}\text{b}\epsilon\text{r}\alpha\text{t}\text{h}$ CA HMZ RIV RV;
 $\text{k}\bar{\text{z}}\text{n}\Delta\sigma\gamma$ $\alpha\Delta\delta\text{r}\alpha$ CA PH – imperfect; $\text{k}\bar{\text{z}}\text{n}\Delta\delta$ $\alpha\Delta\delta\text{r}\bar{\text{z}}$ CE PS $\text{k}\bar{\text{z}}\text{n}\Delta\delta$ $\alpha\Delta\sigma\gamma\text{n}\alpha\text{r}\bar{\text{z}}$ CE PC1 PC2 – imperfect, 3rd pr. sg./pl.;
- 3) 41:4 ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαί μοι;
 $\text{v}\bar{\text{z}}\text{n}\epsilon\text{r}\Delta\alpha + \text{r}\bar{\text{a}}\text{g}\text{o}\lambda\alpha\chi\bar{\text{z}}$ MZHT RI RII RIII – imperfect; $\text{r}\bar{\text{a}}\text{g}\text{o}\lambda\alpha\text{t}\text{h}$ MZHT RV
 $\text{r}\bar{\text{a}}\text{g}\text{o}\lambda\alpha\text{t}\text{h}$ CA MZHT RIV;
 $\text{k}\bar{\text{z}}\text{n}\Delta\delta$ $\text{r}\bar{\text{z}}\text{n}\alpha$ MIE PH $\text{k}\bar{\text{z}}\text{n}\Delta\delta$ $\text{m}\text{h}\bar{\text{z}}$ MIE PS $\text{k}\bar{\text{z}}\text{n}\Delta\delta$ $\text{z}\text{h}\bar{\text{z}}$ MIE PC1 PC2 – imperfect, 3rd pr. sg./pl.⁸;

⁸ The final -u, typical of the deletion of the imperfect 3rd pr. pl., is not yet established in 16th century Romanian, consequently the singular and the plural form of the third person are syncretic.

- 4) 41:11 ἐν τῷ λέγειν αὐτούς;
 вѣнегда + гл҃ахъ RI RII RIII – imperfect; гл҃ати нмъ RIV RV;
 кѣндѡу грѣна мїе PH PC2 кѣндѡ ѡнѣ мнен PS кѣндѣ знѣ мна PC1 –
 imperfect, 3rd pr. sg./pl.;
- 5) 80:6 ἐν τῷ ἐξελεθεῖν αὐτόν;
 вѣнегда + нзндѣ RI RII RIII – aorist; нзѡити емоу RIV RV;
 кѣндѡу еши PH кѣндѣ еши PS PC1 PC2 PCb – simple past, 3rd pr. sg.;
- 6) 104:12 ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτούς;
 занѣ + бѣша RI RII RIII – aorist; быти нмъ RV вѣнегда быти нмъ RIV;
 кѣ ера PH кѣ ера PS PC1 PCb кѣндѣ ера PC2 – imperfect, 3rd pr. sg./pl.;
- 7) 106:6, 13, 19, 28 ἐν τῷ θλιβεσθαι αὐτούς;
 вѣнегда + вѣсѡтѣжша RI RII RIII – aorist; крѡбѣти нмъ RIV RV;
 кѣндѡ тѣжнрѣ and кѣндѡ кнннрѣ for 106:13 PH, кѣндѡ тѣжїа PS кѣндѣ
 тѣжнрѣ PC1 PC2 – simple past, 3rd pr. pl.;
- [All examples are missing in PV.]

Overall, in all instances the texts in Old Romanian present a past construction, similar to the Church Slavonic Redactions I, II and III. It has been also argued that the presence of simple past constructions in the early Old Romanian translations imitates the aorist tense in Church Slavonic (Rosetti 1986: 523). Even though it is not possible to claim that there is always a systematic correspondence (see 64) between tenses in the source and target texts (Pană Dindelegan 2016: 35), the interesting aspect to note here is the regularity with which the Church Slavonic verbs in the pasts are rendered with simple past/imperfect verb forms in Old Romanian.

b. Subordinate clause: substitution of present verbs with infinitives in RIV and RV
 Similarly, there is a correspondence between the Church Slavonic subordinate clauses in the present and the Old Romanian translations:

- 1) 13:7 ἐν τῷ ἐπιστρέψαι κύριον;
 вѣнегда + вѣзвратитѣ г҃ъ RI RII RIII RV; вѣзвратити гоу RIV;
 кѣндѡу ва фн а тоарѣ PH кѣндѣ ва тоарна PS PC1 PC2 – future, 3rd pr. sg.;
- 2) 26:2 ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν ... κακοῦντας;
 вѣнегда + прнблнжѡтѣ сѡ зѡлобѡуїѡщн RI RII прнблнжѡхъ сѡ RIII –
 imperfect; прнблнжѡти сѡ зѡлобѡуїѡщнмъ RIV RV;
 кѣндѡу сѡ ворѣ апрѡпїа PH – future; кѣндѣ апрѡпїе сѣ PS PC1 – present;
 кѣндѣ апрѡпїе сѣ ворѣ PC2 – future.
- 3) 27:2 ἐν τῷ με αἶρειν;
 вѣнегда + вѣзѡбїѡвѣзѡждѡ RI RII RIII; вѣзѡбѡти мн RIV RV;
 кѣндѡу рѣзѡбѡу PH кѣндѣ тїмсѡ PS кѣндѣ рѣднхъ PC1 PC2 – present;
- 4) 36:34 ἐν τῷ ἐξολεθρευεσθαι ἁμαρτωλοῦς;

CONCLUSION

The brief analysis provided here contributes to the overall argument that Redaction III was employed for the translation of the psalter text into Old Romanian, especially if the constructions of the final clause are taken into account. Further, even though indirectly, it also shows that the later Redactions, IV and V, did not influence the Romanian text, although further textual research should be done on the connection between Redaction V and the Romanian 16th century psalter texts (see example 19).

From the point of view of textual genealogy, the study here presented is not enough to draw up a diagram linking the various Romanian texts. However, the punctual differences in rendering precise verbal constructions from Church Slavonic into Romanian point to the fact that PH on the one hand, and PS, PC1 and PCb on the other belong to two different textual traditions. Because these sources come all from a similar period in time, it is yet to be understood whether they can be traced back to one, ancestral translation or define two redactions of the psalter text in Romanian. The behaviour of PC2 is more difficult to determine, for although most of the time its readings are in line with PS, PC1 and PCb, sometimes it comes rather close to PH. This also implies that even towards the end of the 16th century, when many written and printed copies of the psalter text in Romanian were circulating already, the text was still undergoing revisions and corrections, and that no version of the text was yet considered authoritative. However, a further philological study of PC2 in comparison with PH, PC1 and PS could lead to a better understanding of the textual tradition of the psalter text in the 16th century.

LIST OF PRIMARY SOURCES

- PH The Hurmuzaki Psalter, early 16th century, MS 3077 of the Romanian Academy Library; facsimile edition published by Gheție and Teodorescu (2005).
- PV The Voroneț Psalter, mid-16th century, MS 693 of the Romanian Academy Library; digital copy available at <https://medievalia.com.ro/>.
- PS The Scheia Psalter, mid or later 16th century, MS 449 of the Romanian Academy Library; digital copy available at <https://medievalia.com.ro/>.

- PC First printed edition of the Psalms in Romanian: Braşov, deacon Coresi, 1570, 4°, [204] ff., printed space 146x96 mm, 18 lines; collation: I-LI⁴ Only four copies survived – two in Bucharest at the Romanian Academy Library (CRV 16 and 32) and two in Cluj-Napoca at the Central University Library (CN-U BRV 16 and 16/1).
- PC1 Second edition of the psalter text (bilingual Slavonic and Romanian): [Braşov], deacon Coresi, 1577, 4°, 316 ff., 180x135 mm, printed space 106 x 150 mm, 18 lines, collation: I-LXXIX⁴. Two copies survive at the Romanian Academy Library (CRV 19 and 19/1). Facsimile and critical edition published by Toma (1976).
- PC2 Second bilingual edition of the psalter: [Braşov, Şerban Coresi, 1588?], 4°, 337 + [?] ff., printed space 153x120 mm, 16 lines, collation: I-LXXXIV⁴, LXXXV¹ + ?. Two copies are present at the Romanian Academy Library (CRV 19A and 19A/1).
- PCb The Ciobanu Psalter, late 16th century, MS 3465 of the Romanian Academy Library; digital copy available at <https://medievalia.com.ro/>.

LITERATURE

- Camară, Ungureanu 2019 C a m a r ă , I., M. U n g u r e a n u. *The Sources of the Oldest Romanian Versions of the Psalter*. – In: Vernacular Psalters and the Early Rise of Linguistic Identities: The Romanian Case. Bucharest, 2019, p. 79–87.
- Candrea 1916 C a n d r e a, I. *Psaltirea Scheiană. Comparată cu celelalte Psaltiri din sec. XVI și XVII traduse din slavonește*. Bucharest, 1916.
- Diaconescu 1965 D i a c o n e s c u, I. *Unele aspecte ale înlocuirii înfinitivului cu conjunctivul în limba română din secolul al XVI-lea*. – In: Omagiu lui Alexandru Rosetti. Bucureşti, 1965, p. 167–170.
- Gheţie 1982 G h e Ț i e, I. *Contribuții la localizarea psaltirilor românești din secolul al XVI-lea*. – In: Cele mai vechi texte românești. Contribuții filologice și lingvistice. Bucharest, 1982, p. 147–181.
- Gheție, Teodorescu 2005 G h e Ț i e, I., M. T e o d o r e s c u. *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki: Studiu filologic, studiu lingvistic și ediție*. Vols. 2. Bucharest, 2005.

- Hill, Alboiu 2016 H i l l , V . , G . A l b o i u . *Verb Movement and Clause Structure in Old Romanian*. Oxford, 2016.
- MacRobert 1998 M a c R o b e r t , C . M . *The Textual Tradition of the Church Slavonic Psalter up to the Fifteenth Century*. – In: Krašovec, J. (ed.). *Interpretation of the Bible*. Ljubljana–Sheffield 1998, p. 921–942.
- MacRobert 2008 M a c R o b e r t , C . M . *On the Role of Memory and Oral Tradition in the Early Transmission of the Church Slavonic Psalter Text*. – In: Милтенова, А., Е. Томова, Р. Станкова (ред.). *Християнска агиология и народни вярвания*. Сборник в чест на ст.н.с. Елена Коцева. София, 2008, с. 340–355 [Miltenova, A., E. Tomova, R. Stankova (red.). *Hristiyanaska agiologia i narodni vyarvania*. Sbornik v chest na st.n.s. Elena Kotseva. Sofia, 2008, s. 340–355].
- MacRobert 2018 M a c R o b e r t , C . M . *Maksim Greek in linguistic context*. – In: Tomelleri, V.S., I.V. Verner (eds.). *Latinitas in the Slavic World (= Specimina Philologiae Slavicae, 192)*. Berlin, 2018, p. 173–205.
- Mareş 1982 M a r e ş , A . *Filiația psaltirilor din secolul al XVI-lea*. – In: *Cele mai vechi texte românești. Contribuții filologice și lingvistice*. Bucharest, 1982, p. 207–260.
- Pană Dindelegan 2016 P a n ă D i n d e l e g a n , G . *The Syntax of Old Romanian*. Oxford, 2016.
- Rosetti 1986 R o s e t t i , A . *Istoria limbii române de la origini până la începutul secolului al XVII-lea*. Bucharest, 1986.
- Thomson 1998 T h o m s o n , F . J . *The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament*. – In: Krašovec, J. (ed.). *Interpretation of the Bible*. Ljubljana–Sheffield, 1998, p. 797–831.
- Toma 1976 T o m a , S . *Coresi. Psaltirea slavo-română (1577) în comparație cu psaltirile coresiene din 1570 și din 1589*. Bucharest, 1976.
- Zafiu 2016 Z a f i u , R . *The Syntax of Moods and Tenses*. – In: Pană Dindelegan, G. (ed.). *The Syntax of Old Romanian*. Oxford UP, 2016, p. 14–52.

ПРЕДАВАНЕ НА ИНФИНИТИВНИТЕ КОНСТРУКЦИИ В ТЕКСТА НА ПСАЛТИРА:
ОТ ГРЪЦКИ НА СЛАВЯНСКИ И ОТ СЛАВЯНСКИ НА РУМЪНСКИ ЕЗИК

(Резюме)

Статията се основава на направения наскоро от М. МакРобърт текстологичен анализ на начините на предаване на гръцките субстантивирани инфинитиви в различните славянски редакции на псалтирния текст от XI до края на XV в. (MacRobert 2018) и разглежда същия проблем в псалтирни текстове от XVI в. на румънски

език. Материалът се използва в подкрепа на хипотезата, че румънската текстова традиция възхожда към славянска такава, която с голяма вероятност може да се идентифицира като третата редакция на Псалтира. На тази основа се правят предложения за по-нататъшни изследвания.

Ключови думи: Псалтир; старорумънски език; инфинитивни конструкции; XVI в.

*Констанца Бурлаку,
Оксфордски университет*