

Magdalena Charzyńska-Wójcik  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8789-8989>

*John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin*  
*Nanovic Institute for European Studies at the University of Notre Dame*

Jolanta Klimek-Grądzka  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6289-5634>

*John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin*

## New Light on the Psalter: A Rediscovered Manuscript of the *Żołtarz* and Its Consequences\*

### Abstract

The objective of this paper is to bring to light an important early 16<sup>th</sup>-century Polish rendition of the Psalter, *Żołtarz Dawidów*, translated by Walenty Wróbel and prepared for print by Andrzej Glaber. We argue that in spite of its unique position in the line of Psalter translations into Polish, the *Żołtarz* has not received a comprehensive and exhaustive treatment. While some detailed issues have been diligently addressed by individual scholars, research on the *Żołtarz* has generally been overshadowed by Brückner's (1902) pioneering study, to the extent that one of its two surviving manuscript copies has not received official recognition in the scholarly literature. In particular, alongside the Kórnik manuscript (from 1528) described by Brückner, there exists another 16<sup>th</sup>-century exemplar (1536), which has been in the possession of the Jagiellonian Library since 1928. Its rediscovery by the authors of the present paper has two important consequences. First of all, the Jagiellonian *Żołtarz* should become an object of study in its own right. Secondly, its existence requires a re-assessment of the current state of knowledge on the *Żołtarz* in the light of the data it contains.

### Keywords

history of the Polish language, Polish Biblical style, Psalter, translation, Walenty Wróbel, Andrzej Glaber

---

\* The authors would like to thank Professor Peter Trudgill for invaluable comments on this paper and the anonymous reviewers for helpful and inspiring suggestions.

### Abstrakt

Przedmiotem zainteresowania autorek jest jeden z najważniejszych polskich przekładów psalterza – *Żoltarz Dawidów* Walentego Wróbla (ok. 1528), znany dzięki Andrzejowi Glabierowi, który doprowadził do jego wydania w 1539 roku. Autorki referują literaturę przedmiotu dotyczącą istoty przekładu Wróbla (przekład, parafraza, traktat teologiczny), roli Glabera (wydawca, redaktor, autor opracowania) w wydaniu tekstu, różnic językowych i stylistycznych pomiędzy tekstami, zwracając szczególną uwagę na rolę, jaką odegrał w postrzeganiu *Żoltarza* Aleksander Brückner, który w 1902 roku jako pierwszy zbadał relację pomiędzy rękopisem a pierwodrukiem. Okazuje się, że wielu badaczy utożsamia wydanie Glabera z dziełem Wróbla, co jest niewłaściwe, czego dowodzi analiza porównawcza manuskryptu i pierwodruku. Ponowienie i pogłębienie badań nad *Żoltarzem* wydaje się konieczne, zwłaszcza, że istnieje drugi – nieopisany dotychczas w literaturze – jagielloński odpis rękopisu Wróbla. Ten, jak pokazują autorki, należy zbadać w relacji do znanego już rękopisu kórnickiego, a obydwa rękopisy w relacji do pierwodruku Glabera, by w ten sposób określić stopień pokrewieństwa druku i manuskryptów oraz ujawnić faktyczny wkład Glabera w ukształtowanie *Żoltarza*.

### Słowa kluczowe

historia języka polskiego, polski styl biblijny, psalterz, przekład, Walenty Wróbel, Andrzej Glaber

## 1. Introduction

The first translation of the Psalter into Polish was – at least ostensibly – intended to help women to overcome the language barrier constituted by Latin (cf. Brückner 1903: 5–6; Pietkiewicz 2016: 150).<sup>1</sup> In Poland, as in other parts of Europe, women were deprived of the educational opportunities available to men, hence their imperfect acquaintance with Latin prevented them from meaningful participation in religious practices and devotional life, where Latin was the norm. Based on hagiographical evidence, the oldest Polish rendition of the Psalter – known as Kinga’s Psalter or the *Sądecki* Psalter – is conjectured to have emerged in the late 13<sup>th</sup> century (Kuraszkiewicz 1990: 39; Pietkiewicz 2016: 150). Additional support for the existence of this now lost translation is provided by comparative analyses of the oldest extant Psalters in Polish, i.e. the *Floriański* and the *Puławski* Psalter, which represent copies of the lost

---

<sup>1</sup> While many early Psalter translations were dedicated to and/or owned by (noble)women, they were certainly not the only addressees of vernacularised psalms, both in Poland and in other European countries. As pointed out by Charzyńska-Wójcik (2016a) with respect to a 14<sup>th</sup>-century English translation of the Book of Psalms made by Richard Rolle for Margaret Kirkeby, the number of extant manuscripts of this Psalter and their ownership jointly indicate that Rolle’s Psalter was extremely popular not only among female clergy but was frequently owned by men including the religious. The same applies to the *Żoltarz* discussed here, whose eight printed editions testify to its immense popularity, far exceeding the purchasing power of female representatives of the clergy (cf. Charzyńska-Wójcik 2016a).

Kinga's Psalter (Brückner 1902: 1). The older of the two, the *Floriański* Psalter, is a trilingual codex (Latin-Polish-German) from the 14<sup>th</sup> century written by three different copyists. The *Puławski* Psalter is a significantly later copy, coming possibly from the 1520s, although it preserves a much more archaic language (Kuraszkiewicz 1990: 40). The novelty of the *Puławski* Psalter consists in offering an exposition of the Psalter in Polish in the form of arguments, i.e. allegorical introductions to individual psalms (Gustaw 1960: 302).<sup>2</sup> These oldest known translations of the Psalter have shaped the so-called Polish Biblical style (Kowalska 2018) characteristically recreating the features of its Latin source.<sup>3</sup>

The 16<sup>th</sup> century started the age of the printed Polish Psalter. The oldest such text – *Psalterz albo kościelne śpiewanie króla Dawida, nowo pilnie przełożony z łacińskiego języka w polski według szczerego tekstu...* (“Psalter or the songs of David newly translated from Latin according to the original text”) – was brought out in 1532 by Hieronim Wietor in Kraków, hence its appellation the *Krakowski* Psalter. Despite explicitly declaring in the title to offer a new translation, it continues the textual tradition known from the 13<sup>th</sup> century, as shown conclusively by Brückner (1902) and Woźniak (2002). Brückner (1902: 18) remarks that the affinity of the *Krakowski* Psalter to the 13<sup>th</sup>-century original is clear, both with respect to the Psalter as a whole and when individual psalms and even words are considered.<sup>4</sup> Thus, for Brückner (1902: 37) the title page of the *Krakowski* Psalterz announcing a new translation is a blatant lie and should be rephrased to reflect its status as a remaking of the old text.<sup>5</sup> Brückner (1902: 21) and Woźniak (2002: 145) show the *Krakowski* Psalter to share glosses and vocabulary with the *Floriański* Psalter, while its affinity with the *Puławski* Psalter concerns the presence of arguments<sup>6</sup> (Brückner 1902: 19). What distinguishes the *Krakowski* Psalter from its two predecessors is the psalm division (Brückner 1902: 19) and the treatment of archaisms which, Brückner (1902: 21) remarks, were not systematically eradicated by the editor or reviewer of the text.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>2</sup> “Brückner’s assessment of the *Puławski* Psalter’s originality is sceptical: he claims the *Puławski* Psalter was undeniably indebted to a Czech source (“z rozpatrywania argumentów puławskich wynika, jako fakt najistotniejszy, zawisłość niezaprzeczona od tekstu czeskiego”; Brückner 1902: 15).

<sup>3</sup> For features of the Polish Biblical style, see Kossowska (1962) and Kowalska (2018: 161).

<sup>4</sup> “Wszelkie zachowane teksty psalterza i całkowite i pojedynczych psalmów [...], wyszły z jednego starożytnego przekładu, sięgającego XIII wieku. Ten sam przekład dostał się w końcu i do druku”.

<sup>5</sup> “[T]ytuł wydania kłamie bezzwrotnie, nie ‘nowo pilnie przełożony,’ lecz ‘nowo pilnie przepisany’ brzmieć by powinien!”

<sup>6</sup> Albeit they refer to Christ in the latter case, while the arguments in the *Krakowski* Psalter refer exclusively to David.

<sup>7</sup> “[P]rzerabiacz czy poprawiacz, czy nad robotą zasypiał, czy się z nią spieszył, archaizmów doszczętnie nie wypleniał”.

However, neither the above-mentioned Psalters nor individual psalms circulating in vernacular prayer books<sup>8</sup> met the actual demands of the female readership who yearned for more than a translation of this Biblical book at the core of both monastic and lay devotions. What was needed was a text that could facilitate understanding the deeper meaning of the Psalter (Brückner 1902: 62).<sup>9</sup> And it is this demand that gave rise to the Psalter translation made by Walenty Wróbel, which is the focus of this contribution. Wróbel's *Żoltarz*<sup>10</sup> marks (at least) two important firsts in the history of Polish translations of the *Book of Psalms*. Not only does it offer a heavily glossed text with plenty of commentaries but it also presents a completely new rendition, thereby breaking with the textual tradition – represented by the *Floriański*, *Puławski*, and *Krakowski* Psalters – which had survived until the 16<sup>th</sup> century despite constant changes (Brückner 1902: 68).<sup>11</sup> The translation originally circulated in manuscript copies, of which two have come down to us: one in the Kórnik Library (MS 7) from 1528 and one in the Jagiellonian Library (MS 6785) from 1536. The demand for its text was so great that it was decided to send the *Żoltarz* to print. The task of preparing a heavily glossed text with plenty of comments circulating in manuscript for printing was commissioned to Andrzej Glaber from Kobylin. The first edition of the *Żoltarz* as prepared by Glaber came out in 1539 from the printing house of Helena Unglerowa. The production received at least seven re-editions in various printing houses in Kraków, including one within several weeks of the original publication, all of this testifying to the immense popularity of this newly translated Psalter with commentary.<sup>12</sup>

In what follows we are going to show that in spite of its unique position in the line of Psalter translations into Polish, the *Żoltarz* has not received a comprehensive and exhaustive treatment. The insufficiency of existing studies concerns, on the one hand, the type of research questions posed with respect to the *Żoltarz* and the way they are approached and, on the other hand, the textual data examined in an attempt to answer them. In Section 2, we will argue that the existing literature does not exhaustively and systematically address the issues relevant for the full understanding of the *Żoltarz*

<sup>8</sup> The text was found in psalms in *Modlitwy Wacława* (Brückner 1902; Woźniak 2002).

<sup>9</sup> “[P]ragnęły kobiety nie tylko głośownego przekładu psalterza, lecz przedewszystkiem i wykładu jego po polsku, objaśnienia jego tajemnic, o czym to mówi, dokąd się ściąga”.

<sup>10</sup> *Żoltarz* is a synonym of the word *psalterz* ‘psalter’, and while the latter is a recognisable borrowing from Latin, the former came to Polish via Czech.

<sup>11</sup> “[O]gółem tłumaczenie Wróblowe za całkiem nowe uważać należy, zrywające wreszcie z uprzywilejowanym owym prastarym tekstem, który mimo ciągłych zmian i modernizacyi do szesnastego wieku dotrwał”.

<sup>12</sup> It came out twice in 1540, in 1543, 1551, and 1567 and probably one in 1547. For more on that, see Lelewel (1826: 192) and Wiszniewski (1844: 483).

as a unique phenomenon in the history of the translations of the Psalter into Polish. Studies of the *Żoltarz* as a translational endeavour have mostly been based on the implicit assumption that the manuscript and the printed text can be analysed as one production (2.1). The role which Glaber assumed with respect to Wróbel's text has been described without recourse to the actual relationship between Wróbel's work and the printed text as prepared by Glaber's (2.2). Finally, research into the relationship between the manuscript version of the text and its printed edition has generally been overshadowed by the claims laid out in Brückner's (1902) pioneering study (2.3). While some detailed issues have been diligently addressed by individual researchers, these were based on the relationship between Glaber's version and the Kórnik manuscript exclusively, while the Jagiellonian manuscript has not been examined. In effect, the observations formulated so far require a re-assessment in view of the existence of the second manuscript, which – although in the possession of the Jagiellonian Library for over 95 years – has only been mentioned cursorily in a single source and no research into its text has ever been conducted. An analysis of its contents, a sample of which is shown in Section 3, manifests the need to address the *Żoltarz* in both of its existing manuscripts and many printed editions.

## 2. The *Żoltarz* in the literature

### 2.1 The relationship between the *Żoltarz* and the *Gallicanum*

Researchers differ when it comes to classifying Wróbel's work with respect to its Latin original, i.e. the Psalter of the Vulgate – the *Gallicanum*. Brückner (1902: 67) observes that the translation is very free, to the extent that in some places it cannot be called a translation but represents a paraphrase, a discussion on the original text, full of additions and interpolations intended to create a meaningful text.<sup>13</sup> Following in Brückner's footsteps, some researchers consider it a paraphrase modelled on Erasmus of Rotterdam's productions, which were free translations with plenty of clarifying interpolations (Gustaw 1960: 308;<sup>14</sup> cf. also Woźniak 2002: 13). Others call it a free translation (Bednarek 2018: 122<sup>15</sup>); still others view it as a translation verging on the

---

<sup>13</sup> “[P]rzekład sam odznacza się równą niemal swobodą, jest miejscami wcale nie przekładem, lecz parafrazą, wolnem omawianiem tekstu oryginalnego, obfitującym w dodatki i uzupełnienia, aby stworzyć jasny, zrozumiały sens”.

<sup>14</sup> “Sam przekład jest swobodny, jest to raczej parafraza według wzoru ówczesnych tłumaczy Erasma z Rotterdamu, dowolne omówienie tekstu oryginalnego, obfitujące w dodatki i uzupełnienia dla jasnego wyrażenia myśli”.

<sup>15</sup> “[S]wobodny przekład”.

paraphrase (Sawa 2011/2012: 29<sup>16</sup>), or a text oscillating between a translation and a paraphrase (Kossowska 1968: 113;<sup>17</sup> cf. also Pietkiewicz 2002: 85; 2010: 383). The most extreme opinion is represented by Kamieniecki, who considers the *Żoltarz* to be more of a theological treatise than a translation of the most popular of the Biblical book (Kamieniecki 2008: 147<sup>18</sup>). Very rarely is the *Żoltarz* simply referred to as a translation without any further modification (Kuraszkiewicz 1990: 43).

## 2.2 Glaber's role with respect to Wróbel's text

Echoing the lack of consensus concerning the classification of Wróbel's *Żoltarz* as a translation or a paraphrase, researchers differ with respect to the relationship between Wróbel's manuscript and Glaber's printed edition. Their assessments range from overlooking Glaber's contribution to the printed version of the translation,<sup>19</sup> through variously stated non-committal opinions, which, in effect – indirectly – belittle Glaber's involvement; or acknowledging some degree of Glaber's involvement; to considering the manuscript and the printed text sufficiently distant to speak of two different productions.

The first stance is represented by Chmielowski (1915: 178), who measures the success of *Wróbel's translation* in terms of its eight printed editions and mentions Glaber only as the author of the preface.<sup>20</sup> Rospond (1962) represents the same approach, in discussing the *Żoltarz* as exclusively Wróbel's production. Sawa (2011/2012: 29) merely states that Glaber prepared Wróbel's manuscript for print.<sup>21</sup> In a similar fashion, Kamieniecki (2009: 209<sup>22</sup>), Pietkiewicz (2013: 38) and Jarczykowa (2015: 48) refer to Glaber as

<sup>16</sup> “[T]łumaczenie [...] zbliżało się do parafrazy”.

<sup>17</sup> “[T]ekst oscylujący między przekładem a parafrazą”.

<sup>18</sup> “[W] znacznej części przypomina raczej traktat teologiczny niż przekład jednej z najpopularniejszych ksiąg biblijnych”.

<sup>19</sup> Wodecki (1998: 1206) mentions Wróbel's *Żoltarz* and its printed edition only cursorily and does so in a single paragraph within the context of a larger discussion devoted to Polish translations of the Bible. He relies on Brückner and Kossowska as his authorities but does not even mention Glaber in this context, which, in view of the scarcity of information presented there, is not surprising.

<sup>20</sup> “[N]ajwięcej jednak wziętości osiągnął przekład księdza *Walentego Wróbla* [emphasis original], wydany po raz pierwszy w r. 1539, a potem jeszcze w siedmiu wciąż poprawianych edycjach przedrukowywany z przedmową Andrzeja Glabera z Kobyłina”.

<sup>21</sup> “Glaber przygotował do druku *Żoltarz Dawidów* Walentego Wróbla. Glaber ingerował w oryginalną treść, choć nie zmienił charakteru utworu”.

<sup>22</sup> “[D]zielo, opublikowane prawie dziesięć lat później przez Andrzeja Glabera”. In other text Kamieniecki (2008: 147) refers to the *Żoltarz* as a text written by Wróbel and published and prepared for print by Andrzej Glaber (“*Żoltarz Dawida* napisany przez Walentego Wróbla, a wydany i opracowany przez Andrzeja Glabera”).

the publisher,<sup>23</sup> which raises the question of how they actually view his involvement, especially since Jarczykowa (2015: 50) uses the same term with reference to the printer Mikołaj Szarfenberg. Brückner's stance is equally hard to classify as he is not explicit in this respect, yet his choice of wording suggests that he considers Glaber an editor of the manuscript. He speaks of the Kraków theological authorities commissioning Glaber to work on the text and Glaber undertaking it (Brückner 1902: 68).<sup>24</sup> In contrast, Łoś (1915: vi) refers to the printed work as Glaber's *reworking*.<sup>25</sup> In the same vein, Wydra and Rzepka (1995: 79) speak of the *Żoltarz* circulating in manuscript in contrast to Glaber's *reworking* first printed in 1539.<sup>26</sup> Vrtel-Wierczyński (1977: 252) and Dudek-Wójcik (2004: 30) follow in their footsteps in referring to the printed work as Glaber's reworking of Wróbel.<sup>27</sup> Finally, Kowalski (2012: n.p.), speaking of translators of the Bible, singles out the pioneers who undertook the rendition of the psalms. Here he mentions Wróbel and Glaber alongside Murzynowski, Bielski, and Leopolda,<sup>28</sup> clearly implying that Wróbel's and Glaber's attempts are to be treated on a par with those of Murzynowski, Bielski, and Leopolda, while it is clear that these latter constitute separate translational endeavours. Finally, Charzyńska-Wójcik (2016b: 167) explicitly argues "against a common denotation for Walenty Wróbel's 16<sup>th</sup>-century translation of the Psalter into Polish and its printed version prepared by Andrzej Glaber".

While the above discussion is reminiscent of the very nature of medieval authorship, which represents a continuum (Taylor 2015) in contrast to the modern distinct categories of the author, editor, copyist, publisher, etc., where every participant in the publication process has a clearly delimited role to perform, there is more to this lack of consensus than the imperfect alignment of the available linguistic categories. What is equally striking is the perfunctory nature of the descriptions presented, unsupported by detailed arguments or analyses of the types of intervention Glaber performed on Wróbel's text. In other words, there does not seem to be any methodological approach behind these conceptualisations. Importantly, this is not caused

---

<sup>23</sup> "[W]ydawca".

<sup>24</sup> "[M]istrzowie krakowscy zlecili pracę", "podjął się Glaber tej pracy".

<sup>25</sup> "[P]rzeróbka Glabera".

<sup>26</sup> "Żoltarz krążył w odpisach, a w przeróbce Andrzeja Glabera z Kobyлина został wydany po raz pierwszy w 1539 r."

<sup>27</sup> "[P]rzeróbka Wróbla".

<sup>28</sup> "[P]rzekładów Biblii próbowali liczni autorzy, najpierw psalmów ('Psałterze'), potem całości. Do tych śmiałych należą: Walenty Wróbel, profesor Akademii Krakowskiej (1528), Andrzej Glaber z Kobyлина (1539), Stanisław Murzynowski (1551), Marcin Bielski (1556), Jan Leopolda (1561)".

by a research gap. On the contrary, there are works addressing the types of Glaber's interventions in Wróbel's text, as shown in Section 2.3 below.

### 2.3 The manuscript text and the printed version

The starting point of the discussion should be two observations formulated by Brückner (1902). The first of them deals with Wróbel's lack of involvement in Glaber's editing scheme. The other refers to the relationship between what was then known to be the only surviving manuscript copy and the presumed manuscript Glaber worked with.

Let us begin with Brückner's observations concerning Wróbel's lack of involvement in Glaber's editing scheme. This is uncontroversial, to the best of our knowledge. The work on the printed edition of the *Žoltarz* was undertaken only after Wróbel's death in 1537. This is reiterated in Kossowska (1968: 98), Michałowska (1995/2002: 580), Migdał (1999: 23), Cybulski (1996: 70; 2008: 35), and Badowska (2011: 102). It is clear, then, that Glaber's interventions were not the result of consultation with Wróbel at any stage. So, whether he would agree with them or not – we do not know.

The second issue is the manuscript Glaber worked on. Based on internal evidence, Brückner (1902: 71) concludes that the manuscript copy Glaber worked with must have been *identical* with what he calls the Poznań manuscript, which is MS 7 from Kórnik. In particular, where the manuscript copy lacks some text (Ps. 4.10), the passage is reported as missing in Glaber's edition (cf. Brückner 1902: 71).<sup>29</sup> In the commentary to 4.9 Glaber states: "Is versus sequens cum sua expositione desiderabatur in exemplari, cuius sensum ex probatis desumptum additimus". Kuraszkievicz (1990: 43) indirectly subscribes to this point of view. Another author who takes up the issue is Cybulski (1996: 70), who relies on Brückner's (1902) conclusion in this respect. Additionally, Cybulski (1996: 70) remarks that the prologue to the printed work indicates that Glaber himself was in possession of a manuscript copy of the *Žoltarz*, but worked with the copy held in the Kraków Academia. As for Wróbel's original manuscript, Cybulski (1996: 70) notes that it has been lost. No other works raise the issue, either because Brückner's statement is unanimously accepted or because it did not seem relevant to later researchers.

It needs to be pointed out that, as we have already stated, there are two extant manuscript copies of the *Žoltarz*, not one. Brückner was not aware of the existence of the second copy because it came into the possession of

---

<sup>29</sup> "Glabera rękopis Wróblów był identyczny z rękopisem poznańskim 1528 r., tego dowodzi każdy szczegół, nawet taki: w ps. 4 brak w rękopisie poznańskim wiersza ostatniego, 10".



the Jagiellonian Library in 1928.<sup>30</sup> This fact requires official recognition in the scholarly literature. Moreover, the Jagiellonian manuscript should be examined both as an object of study in its own right, and in order to assess the mutual affinity of the two manuscripts and the degree of indebtedness to them of the printed copy. One thing that we can state at this stage is that the missing verse reported by Glaber (*Quoniam tu domine singulariter in spe: constituisti me*), and used by Brückner to argue that Glaber's text must have been *identical* with the Kórnik manuscript, is also missing in the Jagiellonian copy, which – among other things – poses the question concerning the mutual relationship between the two manuscripts and forces a reassessment of Brückner's claim.

### 2.3.1 Glaber's interventions in Wróbel's text

As signalled in Section 1, research into the relationship between the manuscript version of the text and the printed edition of the *Żoltarz* is for the most part overshadowed by Brückner's claims. It is now time to move on to Brückner's (1902) description of Glaber's interventions in Wróbel's text. Brückner's work on the Polish translations of the Psalter constitutes a milestone in the discussion: later researchers rely on it almost exclusively, only occasionally adding comments resulting from their individual studies (cf. Kossowska, Migdał, Cybulski, and Pietkiewicz). This testifies to the perspicacious nature of Brückner's observations, especially in view of the fact that the *Żoltarz* was not the major focus of his research, being only one of the Psalters he discussed in his work.

The differences listed by Brückner (1902: 69–70) can be classified into two major types: (i) those affecting the form only and (ii) those affecting the text, with the former being much more consequential. Let us begin with differences affecting the form.

#### Type (i)

- a. The most obvious of Glaber's interventions is the supplying of the whole Latin text in the place of Wróbel's Latin incipits. This observation is repeated in later works dealing with the issue, e.g. Łoś (1915: 175),<sup>31</sup> Kossowska (1968: 98), Kuraszkiewicz (1990: 43), Michałowska (1995/2002: 581), Migdał (1991: 74), Pietkiewicz (2002: 135; 2010: 387), Sawa (2011/2012:

---

<sup>30</sup> As we learn from the note inscribed on the inside of the cover, the manuscript was purchased from Mr Meisels, the owner of the Kraków bookstore *Italica*, while the previous owner of the Jagiellonian copy was Zarzycki, an engineer. ("Ms. ten nabyty za 650 zł. 12.V.1928 od p. Meiselsa właściciela antykwariatu "Italica" w Krakowie. Uprzednio właścicielem tego ma. był inż. Zarzycki w Krakowie"). *Italica* was an academic bookstore selling rare and antiquarian books (cf. <https://fbc.pionier.net.pl/details/nnVvn3p>).

<sup>31</sup> Łoś (1915: 175–176) repeats the differences between the manuscript and the printed copy after Brückner almost *verbatim*.

- 29). Importantly, none of these researchers exhaustively addresses the implications of this major intervention into the contents of the text for the functionality of the book and its intended readership,<sup>32</sup> nor do they describe the particulars of the process, which required much more than the addition of the text, as we show in Charzyńska-Wójcik and Klimek-Grądzka (in prep.).
- b. The ferial divisions of the Psalter present in the manuscript are absent from the printed version. Pietkiewicz (2002: 85; 2013: 39), in his description of the manuscript, confirms the presence of liturgical instructions, and also observes (2002: 136) that Glaber's edition limited the liturgical function of the *Żoltarz*, since liturgical instructions are only retained beginning with Psalm 109. However, a few pages later Pietkiewicz (2002: 139), as the first and only researcher so far, observes that in Ungler's edition of the *Żoltarz* (1539), the function of the liturgical instructions is taken over by the form of the initials, so the original functionality of the manuscript is preserved there in full. The same view is repeated in Pietkiewicz (2010: 388).
  - c. Another aspect which differentiates the print from the manuscript concerns the spelling and morphological forms, which were corrected by Glaber, as Brückner (1902: 69)<sup>33</sup> observed. This is reiterated in Kuraszkiwicz (1990: 43), Gustaw (1960: 308),<sup>34</sup> and Pietkiewicz (2002: 135; 2010: 387), who refers to this intervention as modernisation of spelling and forms. In the same vein Cybulski (2008: 36) states that Glaber's corrections were editorial, did not affect the inherent properties of Wróbel's translation, and concerned orthography, phonetics and grammar.<sup>35</sup> Migdał (1991, 1999) offers an impressive and comprehensive survey of these changes, accompanied by a classification of the attested corrections into one of the three types. The first two types of correction proposed by Migdał show Glaber as a conscious and active participant in the process of language standardisation (in particular, he removes dialectal and archaic forms); the third type is represented by Glaber's stylistic interventions meant to

---

<sup>32</sup> Brückner (1902: 69) observes that the decision to present the Latin text in full was dictated by the needs of nuns and priests, who were obliged to recite the Psalter in Latin. Observe, however, that due to this precise requirement that the Psalms be read in Latin, both during the liturgy and while practising their daily devotions, the religious did have complete Psalters in Latin among their other liturgical books, so they could not constitute the primary target readership of the printed version.

<sup>33</sup> "[P]oprawił pisownię i formy".

<sup>34</sup> "[P]oprawił również pisownię i formy językowe".

<sup>35</sup> "Znamiennych cech przekładu nie zmieniły poprawki redakcyjne Glabera, dotyczyły bowiem elementów mniej istotnych lub obojętnych dla stylistycznego kształtu dzieła, a mianowicie ortografii, fonetyki i gramatyki".

adapt the text to the requirements of the Polish Biblical style.<sup>36</sup> Following Charzyńska-Wójcik (2016b), Kowalska (2018: 161) emphasises Glaber's interventions into Wróbel's text and notes that Glaber acutely felt the need to archaise the language, conscious of the exceptional character of the Psalter with its two and a half centuries of written tradition in Polish (Kowalska 2018: 161).<sup>37</sup>

- d. Glaber retained Wróbel's comments on the Psalter but relocated them from the margin and placed them below the translation, repeating the words which they comment on (Brückner 1902: 69).<sup>38</sup> The same is observed by Kossowska (1968: 98), who notes that Wróbel's comments were preserved in Glaber's edition.<sup>39</sup> Pietkiewicz (2002: 135; 2010: 387) repeats the same assertion. Kossowska (1968: 98)<sup>40</sup> is very appreciative of this intervention, noting that Wróbel's manuscript was chaotic and unclear,<sup>41</sup> in stark contrast to its printed edition. In addition to the relocations, (each of) the printed editions resorts to several font types and sizes in order to editorially differentiate the three text types: the Latin original, the Polish translation, and the exposition in Polish. The resulting clarity is a feature which cannot escape the notice of anybody familiar with the book (cf. Pietkiewicz 2002: 136 and 139). However, it is first noted by Kuraszkiwicz (1990: 43) that Glaber considerably expanded the arguments following each verse.<sup>42</sup> This is reiterated by Sawa (2011/2012: 29), who remarks that

---

<sup>36</sup> Note that while some of the corrections reported by Migdał fall into the type noted by Brückner, her study goes beyond these data and in that sense significantly broadens research on the *Żoltarz*.

<sup>37</sup> "[M]iał świadomość wyjątkowości Psalterza jako tekstu o 250-letniej tradycji w piśmiennictwie polskim i wyraźnie odczuwał potrzebę zastosowania specjalnych archaicznych środków językowych".

<sup>38</sup> "[P]ościgała noty wszystkie pod tekst, powtarzając słowa, do których się odnoszą".

<sup>39</sup> "[W]ydawca zachował przygotowane [...] komentarze do tekstu poszczególnych wersetów".

<sup>40</sup> Kossowska's (1968) extremely detailed and impressive study of the *Żoltarz* deserves a larger mention but it concentrates entirely on its printed version, offering a lot of new material yet not with respect to the issue pursued here, commenting on the translation style of the work. Also noteworthy is Kwilecka's (1978) study. Yet she concentrates almost exclusively on the translation style of the *Żoltarz* and does not discuss the relationship between the manuscript and the print so her findings do not contribute to the discussion at hand. In contrast, Badowska (2011), focuses exclusively on the manuscript in an attempt to identify the copyist of what she considers the only surviving manuscript of the *Żoltarz*. In effect, the author naturally does not compare the manuscript and the printed version, with the latter commented upon only cursorily.

<sup>41</sup> It has to be noted at this point that Kossowska's assessment of the Kórnik manuscript would certainly have been affected had she examined the Jagiellonian copy, with which the Kórnik manuscript's mise-en-page compares very favourably.

<sup>42</sup> "Glaber bardzo rozszerzył treść argumentów, które podaje po każdym wersie tekstu".

Glaber rephrased the arguments).<sup>43</sup> Yet these observations do not convey the genuine degree of Glaber's intervention into commentary. It is only Migdał's (1991) contribution that is of genuine impact in this respect. The author observes that Wróbel's comments often take the form of individual words placed on the margin and they needed to be reformulated and expanded (Migdał 1991: 74).<sup>44</sup> This is especially useful to a reader not familiar with the manuscript version as it clarifies that the edition of the comments required from Glaber much more than simple relocations (accompanied by expansions of at least potentially theological nature). The marginal comments had to be transformed by Glaber into an independent text in its own right. In effect, Glaber is not only an editor here: he gives these comments a linguistic shape which we are familiar with. So, we need to credit Wróbel (and his sources) with the theological content of the comments,<sup>45</sup> but it is Glaber exclusively who is responsible for their textual form. Here also belongs Glaber's occasional use of brackets in the Polish text to mark passages not representing translation *per se* but constituting (predominantly explanatory) additions to it. This intervention is reported by Pietkiewicz (2002: 138; 2013: 40). Other authors also comment on Glaber's alignment of Wróbel's text to the Latin, yet they do not do so with reference to syntax. In particular Migdał (1991: 91) is the first to note that Glaber compared the manuscript with the Vulgate and introduced corrections which brought Wróbel's text more in line with the Latin source. These are also corrections resulting from differences in the interpretation of grammatical forms. The following examples illustrate both types of interventions: 24.5: *seculo* DAT.SG 'century' > *wyekow* GEN.PL (Wróbel) > *wieku* GEN.SG (Glaber); 54.18: *clamavi* PERF.ACT.IND.1SG 'to call' > *wolam* PRES.IND.1SG (Wróbel) > *wolałem* PAST.IND.1SG.MASC (Glaber); 9.11: *habitat* PRES.ACT.IND.3SG 'to live' > *myeska* PRES.IND.3SG (Wróbel) > *mieszkanie* PRES.IND.2PL (Glaber); 53.2: *orationem meam* 'my prayer' ACC.SG > *modlitwą moją* ACC.SG (Wróbel) > *modlitwy moje* ACC.PL (Glaber). This observation is repeated in Cybulski (1996: 75), who presents examples which coincide with those of Migdał (1991), without, however, acknowledging Migdał as a source. Charzyńska-Wójcik's study (2016b) also shows Glaber's tendency to discipline Wróbel's text to match the source more clearly on the

<sup>43</sup> "[P]rzeredagował treść argumentów".

<sup>44</sup> "W rękopisie komentarz ten na ogół nie ma formy pełnych zdań, bardzo często są to pojedyncze słowa umieszczone na marginesie. Najważniejszą więc poprawką Glabera w tym zakresie jest przeformułowanie, a nawet poszerzenie takich komentarzy". Let us add that these originally telegraphic notes were linked with the items they commented upon by a system of marks.

<sup>45</sup> Such expansions entailed the addition of a lot of text, which could have resulted in theological modification of their content. This, however, is an issue which falls beyond the scope of this paper.

structural level: she reports – among other things – several relocations of non-scriptural matter from the translation to the section devoted to the commentary.

Type (ii)<sup>46</sup>

- a. Brückner (1902: 69) observes that in places Glaber added or omitted certain items.<sup>47</sup> Researchers generally do not tend to comment in detail upon Glaber's additions to or omissions from Wróbel's text, though a notable exception here are two remarks by Cybulski's (1996). Cybulski reports that Glaber *continues* Wróbel's tendency to add conjunctions to the Polish text (1996: 74) and that he occasionally simplifies Wróbel's text (1996: 75), which can be taken to indicate omissions at least in some cases. Scholars working on the translation as such focus on the additions and omissions as between the source and the translation (cf. Kossowska 1968; Cybulski 1996; 2008); but it is impossible to determine without a detailed study whether Wróbel's or Glaber's text is the basis of this research.
- b. Glaber occasionally softened some of Wróbel's expressions (Brückner 1902: 70),<sup>48</sup> which is reiterated by Gustaw (1960: 308).<sup>49</sup>
- c. The printed version replaced items which Glaber found unusual (the forms of the cardinal numerals which are typical of Wróbel (Brückner 1902: 71)<sup>50</sup> and some of Wróbel's phraseology.<sup>51</sup> However, as a rule Glaber repeats Wróbel's expressions *verbatim* (Brückner 1902: 70).<sup>52</sup> In sum, Glaber barely touched other aspects of Wróbel's text.<sup>53</sup> Kuraszkiewicz (1990: 43) agrees with that, stating that Glaber replaced some items and polished the text stylistically in some places.<sup>54</sup> Migdał (1991: 90) observes some syntactic interventions in Wróbel's text on the part of Glaber. She notes that there are eleven noun phrases in which Glaber aligns Wróbel's text to adhere to the word order typical of the Polish Biblical style. Unfortunately, these corrections are exemplified in Migdał (1991: 90) by only two instances:

---

<sup>46</sup> Pietkiewicz (2002, 2010) predominantly relies on Brückner (1902) with the classification of interventions of type (ii).

<sup>47</sup> "[T]u i ówdzie coś dodał" and "Glaber niejedno opuszcza".

<sup>48</sup> "[C]zasem złagodził wyrażenia Wróblowe".

<sup>49</sup> "[Z]łagodził niektóre wyrażenia".

<sup>50</sup> "[U]nika dziwnych liczebników porządkowych Wróbla".

<sup>51</sup> "[O]dmienia szczegóły wyślowienia".

<sup>52</sup> "[Z] reguły powtarza Glaber słowa Wróbla dosłownie".

<sup>53</sup> Michałowska (1995/2002), relying on Brückner (1902), claims that the differences between Wróbel's *translation* and its printed edition were minute, affecting only minor syntactic issues ("ingerując w przekład bardzo nieznacznie, np. poprzez retusze składnio[w]e"; Michałowska 1995/2002: 581). It has to be emphasised that Brückner continues his discussion of the differences, moving on to lexical replacements between the two texts, which are not reported in Michałowska in any way.

<sup>54</sup> "[N]iekiedy zmienił wyrazy i wygładził tekst stylistycznie".

9.15: *mogy nyeprzyaczele* ‘my enemies’ > *nieprziaciele moi* and 127.5: *nassa dussa* ‘our soul’ > *dusza nasza*. It is important to note that neither of the quoted examples represents *translation*, as the Polish noun phrases do not correspond to anything in the Latin text of these verses. They represent Wróbel’s additions to the text. This is not to say, however, that Migdał incorrectly classifies the interventions. On the contrary, her classification is correct but her discussion focuses on classifying Glaber’s interventions representing attempts to align the text with the requirements of the Polish Biblical style, while Migdał does not discuss interventions representing the opposite tendency, which clearly throw light on the matter at hand. More importantly still, Cybulski (1996: 76) also reports Glaber’s eleven changes to Wróbel’s placement of the possessive pronoun. Whether the author means exactly the same eleven cases as Migdał it is impossible to tell, in view of the absence of a reference to Migdał or an exhaustive list. Cybulski (1996) quotes only one example, which coincides with one of the two examples quoted by Migdał, i.e. *nasza dusza* > *dusza nasza* ‘our soul’ from 127.5). In contrast to Migdał, Cybulski (1996: 76) states that the eleven cases in the *Żoltarz* where Glaber corrects Wróbel’s text are intended to match the word order of the Vulgate.<sup>55</sup> The same stance is repeated by Cybulski (2008: 36-7) and illustrated with the same example. Charzyńska-Wójcik’s (2016b) study of these rearrangements in a sample of the *Żoltarz* text, as preserved in the Kórnik manuscript (K here) and in print (G), shows that Glaber is not consistent in this respect. In the sample examined he does not reverse any of Wróbel’s three prenominal orderings (2.3 *Gallicanum: vincula eorum* ‘their fetters’ > K: *gych przekowi* > G: *ich więzienie*; 2.3 *Gallicanum: iugum ipsorum* ‘their-refl. yoke’ > K: *gych yarzmo* > G: *ich iarzmo*; 2.7 *Gallicanum: filius meus* ‘my son’ > K: *moy myli shin* ‘my beloved son’ > G: *moy miły sin*) to match the requirements of the biblical style, a tendency he is credited with by Migdał (1991). What is more, an additional five of Wróbel’s postnominal orders are reversed to prenominal by Glaber (1.3 *Gallicanum: fructum suum* ‘their-refl. fruit’ > K: *owocz swoy* > G: *swoy owoc*; 2.13 *Gallicanum: ira eius* ‘his wrath’ > K: *gnyew yego* > G: *iego gniew*; 6.8 *Gallicanum: inimicos meos* ‘my enemies’ > K: *nyeprzyaczelmy mogomy* > G: *mymy nieprzjacielmi*; 7.17 *Gallicanum: verticem ipsius* ‘their-refl. crown-of-the-head’ > K: *shiyq yego* > G: *iego szyq*; 7.17 *Gallicanum: iniquitas eius* ‘his iniquity’ > K: *zloszcz yego* ‘his anger’ > G: *iego zlosc*). This represents a substantial number of relocations in the hitherto unreported direction in a relatively small sample of data, considering the total of eleven rearrangements in the opposite direction he is credited with by Migdał.

<sup>55</sup> “W zakresie składni przywracał właściwy *Wulgacie* szyk postpozytywny zaimka dzierżawczego”.

### 3. The other manuscript – a personal history

When we set out to perform what we had planned to be a detailed comparison between the Kórnik manuscript and the printed version of the *Żoltarz*, to reassess the true extent and nature of Glaber's involvement in Wróbel's production, we by chance came across a reference to the second manuscript, apparently in the possession of the Jagiellonian Library in Kraków. This was unexpected in view of the fact that all the specialist literature we were familiar with (cf. Section 2 above) was silent about it. All of the researchers mentioned the Kórnik copy as the only manuscript in existence, and identical with the one that Glaber had at his disposal when preparing the printed version. We immediately decided to examine the manuscript, and what we found in the Jagiellonian Library in Kraków surprised us even more.

The title page of MS 6785 states *Psalterius Davidis scriptu Anno d 1536 sum Ioannis a Wolsztyn* and the spine reads: *The Psalter of David. Polish manuscript from 1536*.<sup>56</sup> So, we were able to confirm the existence of the second manuscript. But its acquisition date was puzzling, in the context of the absence of this manuscript from the scholarly discourse. As it turned out, it was purchased by the Jagiellonian Library in 1928 on the recommendation of Jan Łoś, whose handwritten note dated May 11<sup>th</sup>, 1928 is preserved together with the manuscript. Upon examining the manuscript, which he described as the Psalter from 1536-8, Łoś explicitly recommended its purchase, provided that the Jagiellonian Library had the necessary funds.<sup>57</sup> How was it possible, then, that the researchers specialising in this period were not aware of its existence? Our question was answered by the borrowing-card: the only person to have requested the manuscript for examination was Wiesław Wydra – the co-author of *Chrestomatia staropolska* (Old Polish Chrestomathy). Wydra consulted the manuscript twice: in 1983 and 1992 and, while the first edition of the *Chrestomathy* issued in 1984 by Wydra and Rzepka mentions only the Kórnik manuscript, in its later editions (1995; 2004) the existing entry for the *Żoltarz* is supplied with the information that a second manuscript copy is in possession of the Jagiellonian Library, MS 6785. The manuscript is introduced there as being from 1536 and representing the work of rev. Stanisław Paluszek (Wydra and Rzepka 1995: 436).<sup>58</sup> What the source of this attribution is, we do not know, as there is no mention of a Stanisław Paluszek in the manuscript,

<sup>56</sup> "Psałterz Dawidow. Rękopism polski z r. 1536".

<sup>57</sup> "[J]estem zdania, że o ile Biblioteka Jagiellońska posiada fundusze, należałoby rękopis nabyć".

<sup>58</sup> "Inna kopia *Żoltarza* znajduje się w zbiorach Biblioteki Jagiellońskiej w Krakowie, sygn. 6785. Rękopis pochodzi z 1536 r. i jest dziełem księdza Stanisława Paluszka".

and the authors of the *Chrestomathy* do not expand on the matter any further. Moreover, nowhere do they mention Jan of Wolsztyn, whose name appears on the title page of the manuscript.

The unique character of the Jagiellonian manuscript is immediately evident, even upon a cursory examination of its text in relation to the Kórnik manuscript and the first printed copy.<sup>59</sup> Because limitations of space preclude a more detailed discussion of the matter at hand here, we illustrate these differences based on Psalm 8, which we give in the three Polish versions. They are preceded with the Latin text of the *Gallicanum* (which constituted the source text for Wróbel), quoted here *verbatim* after Glaber's printed edition (with the abbreviations expanded in italics). To facilitate analysis, we aligned the four texts with the Latin source and additionally used underlining to mark features which are shared by two versions but are absent from the third one. They are exemplified by 8.2: *panuyączy nass* / *panujący nass* found in the Kórnik manuscript (K) and Glaber's printed version (G) but absent from the Jagiellonian copy (J); or in 8.2 cont., where the two manuscripts show the adjective in the postnominal position: *dzyatek nyewynnich* and *dzyathek nyevynnych* in contrast to Glaber's *niewinnych dzietek*. Where a text contains an item which the other two texts lack, the item is presented in bold type, as in 8.4 below.

8.2<sup>60</sup>

L: Domine dominus noster, *quam* admirabile est nomen tuum  
 K: Panye panuyączy nass o yako dzywne yest yymyą twoye  
 J: Panye, o yako dzywne ymyą thwoye yesth  
 G: Panie panujący nass o iako dziwne iest imię twoe  
 L: in universa terra.  
 K: po wsitkim szwyeczye  
 J: powszythkym szwyeczye  
 G: po wszytkim swiecie.

'O Lord, our Lord! how admirable is Thy name over all the earth?'<sup>61</sup>

<sup>59</sup> As already noted above, Chmielowski (1915: 178) observes that the printed editions of the *Żoltarz* continually showed differences. What types of differences they are and what could be the guiding principle behind them has not been examined so far.

<sup>60</sup> Verse numbering is absent from the *Żoltarz* but we add it here after the Clementine Vulgate project (<http://vulsearch.sourceforge.net/html/Ps.html>) to enable easy reference. Importantly, we follow verse divisions as presented in the two manuscripts and the printed edition.

<sup>61</sup> All Modern English translations are drawn from Joseph Caryl and David Nairne's 1700 translation of the *Book of Psalms* based on the Vulgate. Their text is presented here *verbatim*, only capitalisations and spelling have been normalised to the present-day British standard.



## 8.2 cont.

L: Quoniam eleuata est  
 K: Atho przeto dzywne aboym podnyessyona y podwissona yest  
 J: A tho przetho aboyem podnyessyona  
 G: Abowiem podniesiona (y podwysszona) iest  
 L: magnificentia tua super celos.  
 K: wyelmosnosc ztwoya nad nyebyossa  
 J: vyelmosznosc thwoya pod nyebyossa  
 G: wielmożność twoia nad niebiosa.

‘For Thy magnificence is raised above the heavens.’

## 8.3

L: Ex ore infantum et lactantium<sup>62</sup> perfecisti  
 K: Z ust dzyatek nyewynnich y yeszcze szączich pyerssy poczwirdzyles y dokonales  
 J: Zusth dzyathek nyewynnych y yeszcze ssączych pyerszy pothwyerdzylesz  
 G: Z ust niewinnych dziatek y ieszcze sących dokonales (y potwierdziłeś)  
 L: laudem propter inimicos tuos: vt destruas inimicum  
 K: chwałą twoją dla nyeprzyacielow twoich abi skazył nyeprzyaczyela  
 J: chwałą thwoją dla nyeprzyaczelow thwych aby zkazył nyeprzyaczyelya  
 G: chwałę swą dla nieprzjaccioł twoich aby skazył nieprzijaaciela  
 L: et vltorem.  
 K: y pomszczyczyela  
 J: y pomszczyczelya  
 G: y pomsciciela.

‘Out of the mouths of infants and sucking babies Thou hast accomplished praise, for the confusion of Thy enemies; that Thou mayst destroy the foe, and the revengeful man.’

## 8.4

L: Quoniam videbo celos tuos opera digitorum tuorum  
 K: Aboym uyrzą y ogladam nyebyossa twoye uczinky palczow twoych  
 J: Aboyem uyrzą y oglydam nyebyossa thwoye uczynky palcow thwoych:  
 G: Abowiem wżrzę y ogładam niebiosa twoie y uczynki palczow twoich  
 L: lunam et stellas que tu fundasti.  
 K: myessyącz y gwyazdi ktores ti stworzil  
 J: Myessyącz y gwyaszdy kthoresz thy zthworzyl  
 G: miesiąc y gwiazdy ktores ty stworzyl.

‘When I consider Thy heavens, the works of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which Thou hast created.’

## 8.5

L: Quid est homo quod memor es eius:  
 K: Myli panye y czo yest człowiek is nan pamyątas  
 J: M[iły]: p[anie]: y czo yesth czlowyek ysz nany pamyethasz  
 G: Y czo iest człowiek iż nań **tak** pamiętasz (miły panie)

<sup>62</sup> The *Gallicanum* as presented in the Clementine Vulgate project has *lactentium* here.

## 8.5 cont.

L: aut                                        *filius hominis*        quoniam    visitas eum  
 K: albo y czo **yest**    ssin czlowyeczi    is            go nawyedzas  
 J: albo    czo            szyn czlowyeczy    y            go navyedzasz  
 G: albo y                syn czlowieczci    iż            go **tak** nawiedzasz.

‘What is man, that Thou should be mindful of him? Or the son of man, that Thou should visit him?’

## 8.6-7

L: Minuisti                *eum paulominus*    ab angelis    gloria *et* honore  
 K: Umnyeyssiles    yego    mało mnyey    od angolow    chwałą y dostoynosczyą  
 J: Umnyeyszylesz    yego    myey            od anyolow    chwałą y dosthoynosczyą  
 G: Umnieyszyles    go        mało mniey    od angiółow    chwałą y dostoynoscją  
 L: coronasti    *eum et*    constituisti    *eum super* opera    manuum tuarum.  
 K: okrassyles    yego    nad    uczinky    rąk twoych  
 J: oskraszylesz    yego    nad    uczynky    rąk thwoych  
 G: okrasiles    iego y    **ustawiłeś**    **go**    na    uczynkami    rąk twoich.

‘Thou hast made him but little inferior to the Angels; Thou hast crowned him with glory and honour; and placed him over the works of Thy hands.’

## 8.8

L: Omnia                subiecisti    sub pedibus    eius: oues *et* boues vniuersas  
 K: Wsitkoss    poddał    pod nogy    **y pod mocz**    yego    owcze y woli wsitky  
 J: Wszythkossz    poddał    pod nogy    yego    owcze y woly wszythkye  
 G: Wszytkos    poddał    pod nogi    iego    owcze y woły wszelkie  
 L: insuper    *et*    pecora *campi*  
 K: a nad to    y    wsitko bidło polne.  
 J: a nath tho    y    wszythko zthworzenye polne  
 G: a nad tho    y    wszythko stworzenie.

‘Thou hast made subject to him and put under his feet every creature, the sheep, the oxen, and all the beasts of the field.’

## 8.9

L: Volucres coeli                                        *et pisces maris:*    qui perambulant    semitas maris.  
 K: Ptastwo powietrzne    y ribi morzskye    ktore przepliwają    sczyeski morzskye.  
 J: Pthaszthwo powietrzne    y ryby morzskye    kthore przepliwają    brzegy morzskye  
 G: Ptastwo powietrzne    y ryby morzkie    ktore przepliwają    scieszki morzkie

‘The birds of the air, and the fishes of the sea, that walk in the paths of the deep.’

## 8.10

L:                                        Domine dominus noster:    quam admirabile    est    nomen tuum  
 K: **O myli**    panye    panuiaczi nass    yako    barzo dzywne yest    gymye twoye  
 J: M[i]ty    p[anie]    panuyaczy nassz    yako    barzo dzywne yesth ymye thwe  
 G:                                        Panie    panuiacy nasz    iako    barzo dziwne    iest    imię twoie  
 L: in vniuersa terra  
 K: po wsitkym swyeczye  
 J: powszem szwyeczye  
 G: po wszem swiecie

‘O Lord, our Lord! how admirable is Thy name over all the earth?’

Even a cursory examination of Psalm 8 reveals that the Jagiellonian manuscript is certainly not a direct copy of the Kórnik manuscript: the differences between them are too significant and concern spelling (more archaic in the Jagiellonian copy), possessive pronouns (*twoich* vs. *twych*), vocabulary (*stworzenie* vs. *bydło* in 8.8 and *ścieżki* vs. *brzegi* in 8.9), and word-order. Moreover, it cannot have constituted Glaber's own copy, nor even a copy he worked on while preparing the printed *Żoltarz*.

It is clear that the two manuscripts need to be thoroughly examined to assess the degree of their mutual indebtedness. While a comparison of the Kórnik and Jagiellonian copies with Glaber's edition might not throw much light on the nature of Wróbel's lost manuscript, it will certainly permit a detailed assessment of the printed text's affinity to each of the extant handwritten copies. The preservation of three different textual versions of the *Żoltarz*, produced over a span of 11 years, offers a unique glimpse not only into the nature of Glaber's corrections but also into the translation techniques of Wróbel and Glaber, and into the text's functionality as defined with respect to the projected needs of its prospective readers.

## 4. Conclusion

We have shown in the course of this paper that post-Brücknerian research into the *Żoltarz*, while comprehensively addressing some detailed issues, has remained fragmentary and that – in effect – our knowledge about this unique production remains insufficient. The Jagiellonian manuscript deserves a detailed study of its own, as a hitherto unknown and undeniably important early witness of the Polish Biblical style, and a text with its unique layout, purpose, audience, and relationship to the Latin original. All these aspects are also worth exploring in relation to the Kórnik manuscript. A full appreciation of Glaber's interventions and his programme of standardisation of Polish, in turn, requires that his text be systematically and exhaustively compared not only with the Kórnik copy, as has been done (in some respects) so far, but also in relation to the Jagiellonian text. The uniqueness of the *Żoltarz* as a fresh translation additionally accompanied by an exposition, its differing manuscript layouts and their printed equivalents additionally invite questions concerning the relationship between the manuscripts and printed productions and many others, while the wealth of data contained in the varying extant versions of the text promises a rewarding research adventure.

## References

- BADOWSKA Małgorzata (2011). Zagadka tożsamości szesnastowiecznego kopisty, czyli o Hieronimie, kapłanie z Poznania, słów kilka. *Kwartalnik Językoznawczy* 3(7), 97–105.
- BEDNAREK Bogusław (2018). W świecie drukowanych poloników szesnastowiecznych Biblioteki Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich. *Czasopismo Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich* 29, 91–125.
- BRÜCKNER Aleksander (1902). *Psalterze polskie do połowy XVI wieku*. Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności.
- BRÜCKNER Aleksander (1903). *Literatura religijna w Polsce średniowiecznej: Pismo święte i apokryfy. Szkice literackie i obyczajowe*. Warszawa: P. Laskauer.
- CHARZYŃSKA-WÓJCIK Magdalena (2016a). The anatomy of two medieval translations of the Psalter. In *Translation and Meaning*, Łukasz BOGUCCI, Barbara LEWANDOWSKA-TOMASZCZYK, Marcel THELEN (eds.), 189–208. Frankfurt a. Main: Peter Lang.
- CHARZYŃSKA-WÓJCIK Magdalena (2016b). Between the text and the page: “Żołtarz Dawidów” in manuscript and print. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 11(4), 167–187.
- CHARZYŃSKA-WÓJCIK Magdalena, KLIMEK-GRĄDZKA Jolanta (in prep.). Text in the service of mise-en-page. A study of editorial interventions in “Żołtarz Dawidów”.
- CHMIEŁOWSKI Piotr (1915). *Historia literatury polskiej: od czasów najdawniejszych do końca wieku XIX*. Vol. 1: *Od czasów najdawniejszych do wystąpienia Mickiewicza*. Lwów: H. Altenberg, Warszawa: E. Wende.
- CYBULSKI Marek (1996). Staropolskie przekłady psalterza. *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego* 41(2).
- CYBULSKI Marek (2008). O języku najstarszych psalterzy polskich. *Poradnik Językowy* 10, 23–40.
- DUDEK-WÓJCIK Małgorzata (2004). Odmienność “Psalmów” Tadeusza Nowaka. *Śpiewak Śląski* 1–2, 30–35. URL: [http://sbc.org.pl/Content/272301/iii4204-2003-01\\_02.pdf](http://sbc.org.pl/Content/272301/iii4204-2003-01_02.pdf). Accessed June 7, 2022.
- GUSTAW Romuald (1960). Polskie przekłady Pisma Świętego. In *Podręczna encyklopedia biblijna*. Vol. 2: M–Z, Eugeniusz DĄBROWSKI (ed.), 299–330. Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha.
- JARCZYKOWA Mariola (2015). Zalecenia staropolskich edycji przekładów Księgi Psalmów. In *Wypowiedzi zalecające w książce dawnej i współczesnej*, Mariola JARCZYKOWA, Bożena MAZURKOWA, Małgorzata MARCINKOWSKA-MALARA (eds.), 47–69. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- KAMIENIECKI Jan (2008). Osobliwości leksykalne “Żołtarza” Walentego Wróbla. In *Wyraz i zdanie w językach słowiańskich: opis, konfrontacja, przekład*. Vol. 6, Michał SARNOWSKI, Włodzimierz WYSOCZAŃSKI (eds.), 147–151. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego [*Slavica Wratislaviensia* 147].
- KAMIENIECKI Jan (2009). “Żołtarz Dawidów” Walentego Wróbla – filologiczne i teologiczne osobliwości. In *Język religijny dawniej i dziś (w kontekście teologicznym i kulturowym): materiały z konferencji*, Gniezno, 22–24 września, Paweł BORTKIEWICZ, Stanisław MIKOŁAJCZAK, Małgorzata RYBKA (eds.), 209–218. Poznań: Wydawnictwo “Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne” [*Biblioteczka Poznańskich Studiów Polonistycznych Serii Językoznawczej* 38].

- KOSSOWSKA Maria (1962). Z dziejów polskiego stylu psalterzowego. *Język Polski* 42(2), 135–148, 42(3), 194–212.
- KOSSOWSKA Maria (1968). *Biblia w języku polskim*. Poznań: Księgarnia Świętego Wojciecha.
- KOWALSKA Danuta (2018). Od Psalterza floriańskiego do Psalterza Wujka, czyli o trwałości polszczyzny biblijnej. *Wrocławski Przegląd Teologiczny* 26, 145–164.
- KOWALSKI Krzysztof (2012). Jakub Wujek – 415. rocznica śmierci. *Rzeczpospolita*, July 27th, 2012. <https://www.rp.pl/kraj/art13587151-jakub-wujek-415-rocznica-smierci>. Accessed July 31, 2021.
- KURASZKIEWICZ Władysław (1990). Zmiany redakcyjne w tekstach staropolskich. *Studia Warmińskie* 27, 37–49.
- KWILECKA Irena (1978). O swobodnych średniowiecznych przekładach biblijnych (na przykładzie tłumaczeń francuskich, czeskich i polskich). *Język Polski* 58, 87–98.
- LELEWEL Joachim (1826). *Bibliograficznych ksiąg dwoje*, w których rozebrane i pomnożone zostały dwa dzieła Jerzego Samuela Bandtke “Historia drukarni krakowskich” tudzież “Historia biblioteki Uniw. Jagiell. w Krakowie” a przydany katalog inkunabułów polskich. Vol. 2. Wilno: Józef Zawadzki.
- Łoś Jan (1915). *Przegląd językowych zabytków staropolskich do roku 1543*. Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności.
- MICHAŁOWSKA Teresa (1995/2002). *Średniowiecze*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- MIGDAŁ Jolanta (1991). Glaberowskie korektywy gramatyczne w “*Żoltarzu*” Walentego Wróbla. *Studia Polonistyczne* 16/17, 71–91.
- MIGDAŁ Jolanta (1999). *O języku Andrzeja Glabera z Kobylina. Studium normalizacji polszczyzny wczesnorenesansowej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo WiS.
- PIETKIEWICZ Rajmund (2002). *Pismo Święte w języku polskim w latach 1518–1638. Sytuacja wyznaniowa w Polsce a rozwój edytorstwa biblijnego*. PhD thesis. University of Wrocław.
- PIETKIEWICZ Rajmund (2010). *Żoltarz proroka Dawida w przekładzie Walentego Wróbla. Studium bibliograficzno-bibliologiczne*. In *Ex Oriente Lux. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Antoniego Troniny w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, Waldemar CHROSTOWSKI (ed.), 378–398. Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Biblistów Polskich.
- PIETKIEWICZ Rajmund (2013). Tradycja rękopiśmienna polskich przekładów biblijnych od XIII do XVI wieku. *Wrocławski Przegląd Teologiczny* 21(2), 29–50.
- PIETKIEWICZ Rajmund (2016). *Biblia Polonorum. Historia Biblii w języku polskim*. Vol. 1: *Od początku do 1638 roku*. Wrocław: Papieski Wydział Teologiczny we Wrocławiu; Poznań: Wydawnictwo Pallottinum.
- ROSPOND Stanisław (1962). Język renesansu a średniowiecza na podstawie literatury psalterzowo-biblijnej. In *Odrodzenie w Polsce*. Vol. 3: *Historia języka. Part 2*, Maria Renata MAYENOWA, Zenon KLEMENSIEWICZ (eds.), 61–181. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- SAWA Anna (2011/2012). Udział korektorów i zecerów w kształtowaniu tekstu drukowanego (na podstawie polskojęzycznych druków z XVI wieku). *Folia Bibliologica* 53/54, 25–37.

- TAYLOR Andrew (2015). Vernacular authorship and the control of manuscript production. In *The Medieval Manuscript Book Cultural Approaches*, Michael JOHNSTON, Michael VAN DEUSSEN (eds.), 199–214. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- VRTEL-WIERCZYŃSKI Stefan (1977). *Wybór tekstów staropolskich: czasy najdawniejsze do roku 1543*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- WISZNIEWSKI Michał (1844). *Historia literatury polskiej*. Vol. 6. Kraków: Stanisław Gieszkowski.
- WODECKI Bernard (1998). Polish translations of the Bible. In *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia*, Jože Krašovec (ed.), 1201–1233. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- WOŹNIAK Ewa (2002). *Słownictwo i frazeologia Psalterza krakowskiego (1532) na tle ówczesnych przekładów biblijnych*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. [Folia Linguistica 41]
- [WRÓBEL Walenty] (1528). *Żołtarz Dawida Proroka i kroniczka rodzinna Jana Wyleżynskiego*. The Kórnik Library of the Polish Academy of Sciences, BK MS 7.
- [WRÓBEL Walenty] (1536). *Psalterius Davidis*. The Jagiellonian Library, MS 6785.
- WRÓBEL Walenty (1539). *Psalterium Davidis, Żołtarz Dawidów przez Mistrza Walantego Wrobla z Poznania na rzecz polską wyłożony*. [Andrzej Glaber (ed.)], Kraków: Helena Unglerowa. <https://www.dbc.wroc.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=7028&from=FBC>. Accessed March 5, 2022.
- WYDRA Wiesław, RZEPKA Wojciech R. (eds.) (1995). *Chrestomatia staropolska: teksty do roku 1543*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Wrocław and Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- WYDRA Wiesław, RZEPKA Wojciech R. (eds.) (2004). *Chrestomatia staropolska: teksty do roku 1543*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Wrocław and Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Magdalena Charzyńska-Wójcik  
magdalena.charzynska-wojcik(at)kul.pl  
Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II  
Al. Raławickie 14  
20-950 Lublin

Nanovic Institute for European Studies  
Keough School of Global Affairs  
University of Notre Dame  
1060 Nanovic Hall  
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556-7000, USA

Jolanta Klimek-Grądzka  
jolanta.klimek-gradzka(at)kul.pl  
Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II  
Al. Raławickie 14  
20-950 Lublin