

MAGDALENA CHARZYŃSKA-WÓJCIK

ON THE CANVAS OF THE PSALTER
AND THE PSALTER ON THE CANVAS:
IN PRAISE OF INTERDISCIPLINARITY*

1. INTRODUCTION

Forget thine own people and thy father's house

The quotation presented above is a passage from the Psalter and it comes from a description of a picture featuring King James II and his daughter, Princess Louisa Maria with an open Book of Psalms. It is one of two joint portraits of King James II with the princess: one of them with the Psalter, the other—an apotheosis with the parted clouds. Both pictures are now lost.

The latter is described in some detail by Haile (514), Grew and Grew (117), Callow (932), Corp (*The King over the Water* 51–52 and *A Court in Exile* 323) and by Ingamells on the website of The Scottish National Portrait Gallery. It was commissioned by Queen Mary of Modena on the death of her daughter in 1712. Both James II and the princess are painted life-size (Grew and Grew), so the picture is sizeable: 7 x 9 ft (Haile). According to Haile,

Dr habil. MAGDALENA CHARZYŃSKA-WÓJCIK, Associate Professor and head of the Department of the History of English and Translation Studies in the Institute of Linguistics of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin; mailing address: The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Al. Raclawickie 14, 20-950 Lublin; e-mail: [magdalena.charzynska-wojcik@kul.pl](mailto:magdalenacharzyńska-wojcik@kul.pl); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8789-8989>.

* I would like to thank Professor Edward Corp for inspirational discussions and comments on an earlier draft of this paper, Professor Peter Trudgill for his invaluable encouragement, and Professor Edyta Kociubińska for supporting me with French and for her enthusiastic reaction to the project. Thanks are also due to Dr Kinga Lis, Dr Anna Głowa and Laurent Muller for all their help.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the Nanovic Institute for European Studies, Keough School of Global Affairs, University of Notre Dame for providing me with a research grant which enabled me to gather much of the data I rely on in this paper.

and Grew and Grew, the portrait was by Rigaud, while later researchers (Corp, *The King over the Water* and *A Court in Exile*; Ingamells) point to Gobert. Interestingly, Callow, who also describes the portrait, does not mention the name of the painter. We also know the picture was exhibited in the Convent of the Visitation at Chaillot near Paris (Corp, *The King over the Water* 51–52).

We do not have that much detail concerning the other joint portrait of the king with his beloved daughter. And it is this portrait which is the focus of this paper. What information we do have is not only incomplete, but it is also contradictory and is not in accordance with historical facts. Haile, Grew and Grew, and Callow suggest that the picture must have been started before 1695, i.e. when both James II and the Princess were still alive. The suggestion follows from the assumption that Mignard, who died in 1695, painted the heads. According to Grew and Grew, and Callow, the picture was completed after the death of the king in 1701, which tallies with Haile's claim that the picture was donated to Chaillot in 1701. Haile, Grew and Grew, and Callow all point to Gobert as the artist who completed the portrait.

However, there are several problems with the above account, as pointed out to me by Edward Corp (p.c.). First of all, in view of the fact that Gobert did not work for the Stuarts until 1713, it is unlikely that he completed the portrait in 1701. Secondly, the claim that Mignard painted the heads suggests that the Princess was presented in the picture as a three-year old, while it seems much more likely that Gobert would have shown her as she was in 1712, when she died. If he had needed to copy a portrait of the princess, because she had died, then he would have copied the most recent by Alexis-Simon Belle, or the missing one by François de Troy.¹

As we move on to the picture itself, more contradictions unfold. According to Haile (514), "James II is depicted [...] with an olive branch in one hand and the Princess Louise Marie on the other, to whom he shows a figure of Religion holding an open book with the following verse from the 44th Psalm [...]. Religion holds a crown of stars in her other hand." Grew and Grew (117) describe it as "a picture of James and his daughter, the Princess Louise Marie, who held in her hand an open book in which could be read the words from Psalm xlv [...]." Next comes Callow's description: "James was depicted at his prayers as his daughter turned over a page in her book of psalms, to emphasise a stern passage." In effect, each of these descriptions paints a different scene, though the actors coincide.

¹ I will return to these objections towards the end of Section 3.

Still further inconsistencies come to light when one compares how these descriptions present the passage from the Psalms allegedly visible in the picture. Every description offers a differing linguistic version of the psalm verse. This is what sparked my curiosity and inspired me to investigate the matter. This investigation has unveiled many delightful details. It has also made me acutely aware how an interdisciplinary approach can shed light on cultural phenomena so far interpreted from a unidisciplinary perspective or a series of unidisciplinary perspectives. An interdisciplinary framework not only enriches our understanding of the phenomenon in question and enables its full appreciation, but can also save us from otherwise seemingly innocent simplifications which inevitably grow into mistakes with every repetition.

2. BACKGROUND TO THE PICTURE—THE BARE ESSENTIALS

For reasons which will become clear in the course of the paper, this maximally brief overview of the historical context will start with King James I of England and Ireland and VI of Scotland, under whose rule the famous King James Bible was printed in 1611. Upon his death in 1625, King James I/VI was succeeded by his son, Charles I, who was beheaded in 1649. The short and tumultuous period of the Commonwealth, which was instated after the execution of the king, ended with the restoration of monarchy in 1660 under Charles I's eldest son—Charles II. Charles II died in 1685 without a legitimate heir, which led to his brother James's accession to the throne. James was crowned king of England and Ireland as James II, and king of Scotland as James VII. At that time, he had two surviving children, Mary and Anne, both raised Protestants on the orders of Charles II. They were offspring of James's first marriage with Anne Hyde, a commoner's daughter.² She died in 1671 after an open conversion to Catholicism, which earned her public disfavour:³ harsh records were made in contemporary diaries,⁴ and court mourn-

² The scandal associated with this liaison and the birth and death of their first-born son Charles is by Samuel Pepys, who upon the baby-prince's death made the following record in his journal for the date of May 6th: "I hear to-night that the Duke of York's son is this day dead, which I believe will please every body [sic]; and I hear that the Duke and his Lady themselves are not much troubled at it" (Whatley 412). As suggested by Somerset (7), this was due to the dubious circumstances of his conception, which would leave his legitimacy open to question.

³ John Evelyn in his poignant biography of Margaret Blagge vel Godolphin reports Margaret's sentiments upon the Duchess of York's death. Margaret was the duchess's maid of honour, a devout Protestant, who herself died young as a paragon of holiness. Evelyn ascribes to Margaret the following description of Anne Hyde's death: "she [...] died (poore creature) in doubt of her

ing for her was cut short so as not to interrupt King Charles II's birthday celebrations (Somerset 13–14). Soon afterwards, in 1673, James remarried and, while his first marriage was a misalliance due to the low birth of Anne Hyde, the second one was unsuitable on another count: his second wife, princess Mary of Modena, was a Catholic. Catholicism had been James's problem long before the death of Charles II. It is impossible to present within the confines of this paper the broader confessional context which had brought about hostility to Catholicism in England. Let me only draw a very brief outline of the most relevant aspects of this situation.

James's was a complicated accession: long before the death of Charles II, various arrangements were proposed to exclude James from the throne on account of his Catholicism, which posed a threat to the Anglican Church (and its representatives). These exclusionist attempts did not prevent James's succession, but they reverberated at the very beginning of his reign, when Charles II's eldest illegitimate (Protestant) son, the Duke of Monmouth, declared himself king and attempted to take the crown by force, supported by exclusionist rebels. He was defeated by King James II's army during the Battle of Sedgemoor, captured, and executed on the King's orders in June 1685.

But the issue of James's Catholicism in anti-Catholic England could not be resolved so easily. An extreme articulation of this anti-Catholic and pro-Anglican policy was the passing of the Test Act in 1673, whose full title was: "An Act for preventing Dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants" (Gibson). Effectively, the Act barred Catholics from holding civil, military and academic offices. As reported by Somerset (14), James could not comply with the requirement of the Test Act and in June 1673 was forced to resign from his position as Lord High Admiral. It became obvious then that he was a Catholic. (As already mentioned, several months later he married a Catholic princess, further aggravating the public).

To handle an initial obstacle that impacted on him at the outset of his reign, the Monmouth case outlined above, James II "enlarged the army to help him suppress the rebellion, and when doing so had given commissions to several Catholics, despite the fact that this contravened the Test Act of 1673" (Somerset 61). In this way not only did James II absolve individuals

Religion, without the Sacrament, or divine by her, like a poore wretch; none remembered her after one week, none sorry for her; she was tost, and flung about, and every one did what they would with that stately carcase" (Evelyn 13).

⁴ Somerset (13) reports Gilbert Burnet, the Bishop of Salisbury's comment on the death of the duchess: "the change of her religion made her friends reckon her death a blessing rather than a loss."

from the necessity of having to conform to the Test Act,⁵ in effect allowing Catholics to take military and political posts, but he also took measures against men who expressed opposition: army officers and Members of Parliament alike (Somerset 61–62). This resulted in conflict with the Parliament, which was prorogued in 1685 and never recalled in James's reign again. A further act against the Anglican Church was the Declaration of Indulgence (1687), which aimed at complete religious toleration.

If there was any relief in the prospect of James's Protestant daughter Mary succeeding him, all hope was gone when in June 1688 Queen Mary of Modena gave birth to a son, James Francis Edward, who—as a boy—naturally overtook Mary and Anne in the line of succession.⁶ To prevent imminent Catholicism, a group of the Protestant nobility appealed to William of Orange, the Protestant husband of James II's daughter Mary (and her first cousin at the same time: he was the only son of Charles II and James II's sister Mary). William's army landed in England in 1688 and received the promised military support, which forced King James II to flee the country with his family. The exiled king took refuge in Saint-Germain-en-Laye, while William and Mary were crowned joint monarchs. This extraordinary chain of events has come to be known as the Glorious Revolution; and it started James II's third and final exile. He had suffered the first in connection with his father's imprisonment. Then he was forced to leave England during the reign of his brother, on account of his Catholic sympathies. Now he established his court in exile, where his daughter Princess Louisa Maria was also born in 1692. This, in a nutshell, is the historical canvas underlying the actual portrait of King James II with his daughter.

The portrait was exhibited at Chaillot (Grew and Grew; Corp) in the Convent of the Visitation—"the cherished sanctuary of the exiled Queen [Mary of Modena]" (Grew and Grew 115). The convent, "[b]y a curious coincidence" (Grew and Grew 116), was founded by King James II's mother, Henrietta Maria in 1651, who had likewise found refuge in Saint-Germain after the execution of her husband, King Charles I. "[S]he had bequeathed her heart as a legacy to the convent, and it was piously guarded there among their most sacred relics" (Grew and Grew 116). According to *The Memoirs*

⁵ James II did not formally suspend the Act until he issued the Declaration of Indulgence in 1687.

⁶ The birth of the royal male heir after 15 years of marriage provoked allegations that the baby was a changeling (for details see Charzyńska-Wójcik, *The Psalms of David over the Water*). It needs to be emphasised that this was not the couple's first child (though none of the several children had lived) and the birth was attended by a large group of witnesses (Barclay 76–77). This, however, did not silence the rumours about the alleged illegitimacy of the prince.

of *King James II: Containing an Account of the Transactions of the Last Twelve Years of His Life, with the Circumstances of his Death* (Monastère de la Visitation Sainte Marie de Chaillot), King James II's heart was also enshrined there – supposedly at the expressed wish of the nuns of Chaillot (cf. Strickland 496, 501–2; Barclay 82). Following the practice of the day, Queen Mary of Modena's and Princess Louisa Maria's hearts were also both in due time deposited in the convent, as is clear from Marchesa Emilia Campana di Cavelli's⁷ (85) description of the chests enshrining them, listed among the treasures of Chaillot.

Nothing remains of the convent today. During the French Revolution it was suppressed⁸ and two official records of its possessions were made: one by the delegates of the municipal authorities, dated 14 November, 1790; the other by “Roard, commissioner and municipal officer of the administration of national ecclesiastical property,” dated 4 June, 1791 (Haile 514–15). According to Grew and Grew (117), the nuns themselves also made a list of their treasures.

Haile (516) reports that the two official inventories were burnt by the Commune in 1871⁹ together with the contents of the City Hall, but fortunately transcripts of the records had been made by Marchesa Campana di Cavelli¹⁰ (published in 1871). In effect, Campana di Cavelli is our source of information on the portrait discussed here.

3. THE PSALM IN THE PICTURE

Let us now return to the psalm verse allegedly portrayed in the picture itself. As indicated in the opening section of this paper, descriptions of the picture differ from author to author. But while this is (to some extent) natural, what I found intriguing and inspiring to an equal degree was the

⁷ Campana di Cavelli was “an English lady [...] by birth, though Italy is the country of her adoption, and French appears to be the language of her choice” (*The Edinburgh Review* 47). She was an accomplished linguist, speaking, apart from her native English, Italian, French, German and Latin (Morsolin).

⁸ The ultimate destruction of the place was brought about by Napoleon Bonaparte, who tore it down to make way for a grand palace which he intended for his son—an enterprise which never came to fruition in its original form.

⁹ I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer of the paper for correcting the date to 1871, while the original source (Haile 516) incorrectly presents it as 1870.

¹⁰ Grew and Grew (117) also observe that the contents of the inventories were preserved due to the efforts of Campana di Cavelli.

existence of the differences which are hard to account for, in particular when it comes to the quotation of the psalm. If the picture presents a Psalter, then its text cannot differ depending on who describes it. Let me demonstrate the psalm passages as found in Haile (514), shown in (1) below; Grew and Grew (118), given in (2); and Callow (932), quoted in (3).

- (1) Haile (514)
Listen, my daughter, and give ear, forget thy people and the house of thy father.
- (2) Grew and Grew (118)
Hearken, oh daughter, and consider: incline thine ear. Forget thine own people and thy father's house.
- (3) Callow (932)
Forget thine own people and thy father's house.

Haile (514) refers to the fragment he quotes as Psalm 44, and Grew and Grew (118) as Psalm 45, while Callow (932) only calls it “a stern passage.” Let me start by explaining the differing psalm numbers found in the two descriptions.

There are two major psalm numbering traditions: one associated with the original Hebrew Psalter, the other with the Septuagint. The difference between these two traditions which is relevant for the numbering of Psalm 44/45 consists in the collapse of two Hebrew Psalms—9 and 10—into Psalm 9 in the Greek translation. Because the Psalter of the Latin Bible of the Western Church is a translation of the Septuagint, the Catholic Church naturally followed the system in which Psalm 11 in the Hebrew Psalter is numbered as Psalm 10. In effect, Psalm 45 in the Hebrew Psalter and in translations based on it (or taking as the source text fresh Latin translations made directly from Hebrew, i.e. not mediated via the Septuagint) corresponds to Psalm 44 in the tradition of the Catholic Church.¹¹ Observe that with the Reformed Church's reliance on the source text of the Bible,¹² the Hebrew numbering was originally associated only with Protestant renditions. The differences in numbering were only levelled out with the Catholic Church's Latin retranslation of the Bible from the original languages, i.e. Nova Vulgata (followed with further vernacular renditions). This, however, did not happen till the 20th

¹¹ There are further differences in psalm divisions starting from Psalm 112/113. These produce a levelling of psalm numbers by Psalm 148.

¹² For a glaring contradiction of this principle when it came to versified psalm translations, cf. Charzyńska-Wójcik (“Perfectly imperfect—The Scottish Psalter of 1564”).

century. 20th-century editions often give the old (traditional) numbering in brackets next to the one based on the Hebrew original.

Upon examining the quoted text, it turns out that the passage presented comes from Psalm 44 according to the old numbering system. The fact that it is referred to as 45 by one of the researchers is easily explained by the alternative numbering. As for Callow, he does not give the psalm a number, but calls the passage “stern.” Let me quote the relevant part of Callow’s description in full: “James was depicted at his prayers as his daughter turned over a page in her book of psalms, to emphasise a stern passage that commanded her not to ‘Forget thine own people and thy father’s house’.”

Two comments are due here. First of all, the psalm verse urges the *completion* of the action not its negation. So, the addressee of the verse—the psalmic queen—is exhorted to forget her father’s house not warned against it. As will be shown below, the commissioner of the portrait, Queen Mary of Modena, may have had these words in mind when leaving her homeland to marry James.

My second objection with respect to Callow’s description is his use of the expression “stern”—an observation I owe to Edward Corp (p.c.). What exactly he means by that is not clear, because it is certainly not stern in the context of the whole psalm, which is an epithalamium, and the choice of a single verse for the king and princess to be portrayed with must have been made by somebody well-acquainted with the Psalter. It was most probably Queen Mary of Modena herself—a lover of the Psalter, who knew all the Latin psalms by heart (Strickland 499–500), as she had “passionately desired to take the veil” (Strickland 503; Haile 10). Her long resistance to the arranged marriage between her and James (cf. Section 2) was crushed only through the intervention of Pope Clement X himself: she was to marry James for the good of the Catholic Church in England (Haile 21; Somerset 22). Mary Beatrice of Modena was married as a fifteen-year old, by proxy, and was subsequently sent to England to join her husband. She was understandably upset at having to renounce her plans, leave her homeland and join her husband, whose daughters were only a few years younger than her (Anne was 11 and Mary 8 at the time). Strickland’s description of the journey of the young bride refers to the very passage we confront in the picture. Whether this is a coincidence or an allusion to some document or memoir which I am not aware of, I do not know. Strickland (233) says: “[v]ery frequently, no doubt, had the sorrowful bride to be reminded, during that journey, of the exhortation of the royal psalmist: “Hearken, O daughter, and consider; forget

also thine own people and thy father's house." This is the only link to the supposed sternness of this passage that I am able to propose.¹³

It is now time to try to return to the actual formulation of the quote as presented in the picture. It is clear that only one (if any) of the passages given in (1)–(3) can be correct. I decided to try to find the Psalter translation which the passage comes from by looking into the Catholic translations of the Psalter into English which were available at the time of the completion of the picture. It turns out that when the picture was completed there were two Catholic translations of the Psalter into English:

- (i) the Psalter translation made by members of the Douay-Rheims college (part of the translation of the entire Bible; the New Testament was printed in 1582; the Old Testament appeared in two volumes in 1609–1610, with the Book of Psalms published in the second volume, i.e. in 1610);
- (ii) the Psalter translated at the court of Saint-Germain by John Caryl and David Nairne (Corp, "Musical manuscripts of 'Copiste Z' [...]," *A Court in Exile and Sir David Nairne*); it was printed in 1700 (with a revised edition published in 1704)¹⁴ and was presented to the king and queen on October 14, 1700, as we can read in the Diary of David Nairne: "Mr Caryl presented to *the King* and *Queen* a book of psalms to each."¹⁵

Importantly, these Catholic translations, based on the Vulgate, were the only ones available, compared to the hundreds of translations associated with the Reformed Church, which could be not approved of by the devout Catholic queen. And here the plot thickens, as none of the quotes in (1)–(3) above shows the passage from either translation. Consider the data in (4), where (4a) shows the Douay-Rheims Bible text, i.e. the translation described in (i) above, and (4b), which quotes Caryl and Nairne's rendition, i.e. the one introduced in (ii).

¹³ For more on that see Charzyńska-Wójcik *The Psalms of David over the Water*.

¹⁴ Both publications were anonymous but they came to be associated in the literature with John Caryl already in the late 18th century, as shown in Charzyńska-Wójcik ("The Psalter over the water [...]"). As the discovery that David Nairne was the co-translator of the Psalter is relatively recent (Corp, "Musical manuscripts of 'Copiste Z' [...]"), the 1700 translation—if mentioned at all in the literature – is invariably ascribed to John Caryl.

¹⁵ The passage is transcribed directly from the Diary of David Nairne, which has not been edited so far. Italicisations (both here and elsewhere within quotations from the Diary) signal expanded abbreviations. This quotation and all others presented in this paper come from the original sources (i.e. a manuscript or original editions of the publications). In preparing the quotations I have preserved the spelling and all conventions. The same applies to (6), which gives a transcript of the words on the portrait. The transcript was made directly from the picture available for viewing on the website of the museum hosting the picture. Additionally, line divisions have been preserved in the transcript of the quotation from the portrait.

(4)

a. Douay-Rheims Bible (1610): 44.11¹⁶

Heare daughter, and see, and incline thyne eare: and forget thy people, and the house of thy father.

b. Caryll and Nairne's Psalter (1700): 44.12

Hearken daughter, and see, and be attentive with thy ears; And forget thy country, and the house of thy father.

This requires a change of approach: instead of verifying our assumptions concerning possible sources of the quote in the picture, we should now identify the translations which the quotes in (1)-(3) come from. Version (1) does not represent any Psalter translation known to me. As for (2) and (3), one thing is clear: (3) represents a shortened version of (2), without, however, indicating any abbreviation—an unfortunate oversight in the case of the quotes. But leaving the oversight aside, we can see that the passage comes from the King James Bible of 1611—a Protestant translation based on the original languages, mentioned at the outset of Section 2. The only differences between the wording of the King James Bible and the one given in (2) and (3) above have been marked in bold type and, as is clear, they are negligible.¹⁷

(5) King James Bible: 45.10¹⁸Hearken (O daughter) and consider, **and** incline thine eare; forget **also** thine owne people, and thy fathers house.

This explains the reference to Psalm 45, instead of the expected 44 but nothing else. Can a Catholic king deposed (to a great extent) on account of his Catholicism be portrayed as showing his daughter a Protestant Psalter? It does not seem very likely, though a possible motivation for this choice of the

¹⁶ The numbering of this verse ranges from 10 in (5) to 11 in (4a) and 12 in (4b). This is due to the fact that verse numbering is not an inherent part of the Psalter, being absent from the original Hebrew. The first Psalter with numbered verses was the *Psalterium Quincuplex* published in Paris in 1509 by Henry, father of Robert Stephanus. In 1527 or 1528 Sanctes Pagninus published his new translation of the Hebrew and Greek text into Latin, in which the verses are marked with Arabic numerals in the margin. The first complete Bible in which verses are numbered was Stephanus's Vulgate printed in Geneva in 1555, and the Old Testament verse division applied there follows that of Pagninus (Specht 89–90). The first English Bible with verse numbering was the Geneva Bible of 1560 (cf. Charzyńska-Wójcik, *Text and Context in Jerome's Psalters*).

¹⁷ Spelling and punctuation differences are ignored in this comparison as irrelevant at a stage when orthography and punctuation had not yet been fully standardised. The same comment is applicable to a comparison of (6) and (8).

¹⁸ The quotation from the original edition comes from the official website of King James Bible: www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Psalms-Chapter-45_Original-1611-KJV/.

Psalter version might be to indicate the historical lineage and the authenticity of James II's claim to the throne: King James I, as mentioned in Section 2, was James II's grandfather.

This interpretation sounds far-fetched on more than one count, but it does find support in the presence of another picture of Princess Louisa Maria—preserved and available for viewing (together with nine other of her surviving pictures) in the National Portrait Gallery (www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portraitZoom/mw142817/Princess-Louisa-Maria-Theresa-Stuart?LinkID=mp02801&role=sit&rNo=7). It shows the Princess with an open Bible. This time the text is that of Ecclesiastes 3.1. The passage in the picture goes as follows:

(6)
 To every thing there is a
 Season *and* a time to
 Purpose under *the* heauen
 a time to be born,
and a time to die:
 a time to plant, *and*
 a time to pluck up that
 which is planted:
 a time to kill, and
 a time to heal:
 a time to break down,
 and a time to build up
 a time to weep, and
 a time to laugh:

A comparison with the Douay-Rheims Bible excludes the possibility of this being represented in the picture:

(7) Douay-Rheims Bible (1610)
 All things haue a time, and their spaces al thinges passe vnder heaven
 A time to be borne, & a time to dye.
 A time to plant, & a time to pluck vp that which was planted.
 A time to kil, & a time to heal. A time to destroy, and a time to builde.
 A time to wepe, & a time to laugh.

However, the passage in the picture (cf. 6) agrees with the King James Bible, with only one minor difference marked here in bold:

(8) King James Bible (1611)
 To euery thing there is a season, and a time to **euery** purpose vnder the heauen.

A time to be borne, and a time to die: a time to plant, and a time to pluck vp that which is planted.
 A time to kill, and a time to heale: a time to breake downe, and a time to build vp.
 A time to weepe, and a time to laugh:

Admittedly, the data in (6)–(8) do offer support for the hypothesis that the Catholic king and his daughter might have been portrayed with a Psalter from the Protestant Bible linking King James II to his grandfather, King James I. But this hypothesis suffers from a major drawback. In particular, while it could justify the form of the quotes in (2) and (3), it does not explain the presence of a different linguistic formulation in the descriptions of the picture (cf. 1). It is now time to go deeper into the story.

As was noted in Section 2, the convent where the picture was exhibited was suppressed during the French Revolution and then torn down. The question that we have not asked so far is the one formulated for us by Campana di Cavelli (62):

“Où est allé tout cela? Les registres municipaux n’en disent rien. Toutes nos recherches en France et ailleurs sont jusqu’ici restées infructueuses.”

What happened to all of this [i.e. these possessions]? The municipal registers do not say anything about it. All our research in France and elsewhere has so far remained unsuccessful.

What follows from the above is that none of the authors describing the picture has actually seen it, and that all of them relied on Campana di Cavelli’s transcripts of the official documents and the records made by the nuns. This being so, Campana di Cavelli is the only source of information, albeit not even this was first-hand—her records being derived from earlier descriptions. As these have been burnt (cf. Section 2), Campana di Cavelli’s account seems the closest we can get to the picture itself. Let us then see how Campana di Cavelli (60–61) describes the picture:

Un des tableaux les plus remarquables (nous suivons toujours le récit des religieuses) représentait Jacques II : Le roi tient une branche d’olivier d’une main et de l’autre la princesse Louise-Marie sa fille, à laquelle il montre une figure représentant la religion. Celle-ci a dans ses mains un livre ouvert, dans les pages duquel on lit ces paroles du Psaume 44 : Ecoutez, ma fille, voyez et prêtez l’oreille, oubliez votre peuple et la maison de votre pere. Et puis cette autre passage des Proverbes, chapitre 21 : Le coeur du roi est dans la main du Seigneur comme un courant d’eau, il le conduira partout. La religion tient de l’autre main une couronne semée d’étoiles; on voit auprès d’elle un ange portant un calice, au-dessus duquel s’élève une hostie. Ces tableaux ont été commandés par Marie-

Béatrice d'Esté, ils sont peints sur toile et ont sept pieds de hauteur sur neuf de large, exécutés par Gobert, après la mort de Jacques II (1701). Les têtes de ces tableaux avaient été opérées par Mignard. Ce dernier détail prouve que ces peintures avaient été commencées avant 1695, Mignard n'ayant vécu que jusqu'à cette date.

One of the most remarkable paintings (we always follow the narrative of the nuns) represented James II: the king holds an olive branch with one hand and with the other¹⁹ the princess Louisa Maria,²⁰ his daughter, to whom he shows a figure representing religion. This figure has in her hands an open book, where we read these words of Psalm 44: Heare daughter, and see, and incline thyne eare: and forget thy people, and the house of thy father; and a passage from Proverbs, chapter 21: the heart of the king is in the hand of the Lord: whither soeuer he wil, he shal incline it. Religion holds in the other hand a crown adorned with stars; we see near her an angel carrying a chalice, with a host hovering above it. These paintings were commissioned by Marie-Béatrice d'Esté [i.e. Queen Mary of Modena], they are painted on canvas and are seven feet high by nine wide; executed by Gobert, after the death of James II (1701). The heads of these paintings had been painted by Mignard. This last detail proves that these paintings had been started before 1695, when Mignard died.²¹

It is now clear that all three descriptions discussed here rely entirely on Campana di Cavelli. None of them, however, hints in quoting the Psalter that the text of the psalm verse has been translated *by themselves*, or *supplied* from a randomly selected translation. Incidentally, this to some extent reflects Campana di Cavelli's approach: she does not say what language the psalm was in and in (not) doing so she may well be reflecting very closely the descriptions she is relying on.

From this perspective it seems wise to re-assess Corp's objection concerning the date of the completion of the picture. As noted in Section 1, Corp observes that Gobert was very unlikely to have been involved with this picture before 1713, when he started working for the Stuarts. If this is true, we need to ask how that squares with Haile's claim that the picture was donated to Chaillot in 1701. It becomes clear upon reflexion that Haile's view

¹⁹ As already noted, French was not Campana di Cavelli's native language. That is why some of her expressions are slightly imperfect. This concerns the passage where she describes the picture: "d'olivier d'une main et de l'autre la princesse Louise-Marie." In effect, having only her description of the picture to help us visualise the scene it depicted, we encounter problems of a purely linguistic nature.

²⁰ She was called *Louisa Maria* in English and *Louise Marie* in French.

²¹ Both translations from French are mine but their final shape benefitted greatly from the help of Professor Edyta Kociubińska. The English versions of both biblical fragments presented in the French passage, i.e. Psalm 44.11 and Proverbs 21.1, have been provided here after the original Douay-Rheims Bible (1610). As noted before, the original spelling has been preserved in the quoted material.

is a rephrasing of the information found in Campana di Cavelli, who merely says that the picture was executed by Gobert after the death of James II in 1701. This is a statement concerning the posthumous character of the portrait rather than an explicit stance concerning the time when the picture was completed, and that is how Campana di Cavelli's "exécutés [...] après la mort de Jacques II (1701)" should be interpreted.

Observe finally that neither Haile, nor Grew and Grew or Callow even allude to the other biblical passage presented in the picture which features in Campana di Cavelli's transcript (i.e. Proverbs 21.1). This oversight prevents a full understanding of the choice of text, and hence the message to be conveyed by the portrait. One passage—referring to the psalmic queen: "Heare daughter, and see, and incline thyne eare: and forget thy people, and the house of thy father" is clearly addressed at the princess, whether still alive, which is unlikely, or already dead. The other biblical fragment referred to the psalmic king: "the heart of the king is in the hand of the Lord: whither soeuer he wil, he shal incline it." It must have been meant to refer to the late King James II. It is not only the choice of each of the two passages but also their juxtaposition that jointly conveys the intended message of the portrait—an issue which (regrettably) falls beyond the scope of this paper.²²

4. ANOTHER LOOK AT THE PICTURE

The initial objective of this examination was to determine which version of the English Psalter King James II was showing to his daughter in their joint portrait. I believed this might be an important indication of the position of the Psalter translated at the exiled court by John Caryl, the joint secretary of the king and queen, and his undersecretary, David Nairne. However, I have completed this investigation knowing both rather less than at the outset and much more.

As for knowing less, it is the finding of this paper that *we do not know* what language the Psalter was written in. It has been pointed out to me by Edward Corp (p.c.) that a picture commissioned by the Queen for the French convent would not show the text in English, which they would not understand, but in Latin, which they used for the daily office. A related objection raised in this context by Corp is that—on the basis of existing descriptions in their current form—we are made to think that a French painter, producing

²² See Charzyńska-Wójcik (*The Psalms of David over the Water*) for a detailed discussion.

a work for a convent of French nuns, quoted the psalm in a language they neither used in this context (or any other for that matter) nor understood.

Initially, the suggestion that the picture showed the text in Latin did not appeal to me. As a linguist, I respect the actual linguistic forms, even if they are seemingly erroneous. Having worked with medieval manuscripts and edited every single peculiarity of spelling or even abbreviation within a transcribed text with utmost caution, I took it for granted that the linguistic material contained in the descriptions was provided *verbatim*—if not in a diplomatic transcription, then at least in a shape very close to it. This is what gave strength to my initial conviction. I believed the text was in English because this is how it was presented in the English descriptions of the picture: none of the authors reports that what they present is a translation from French. As a rationalisation of the admittedly odd choice of language, I assumed that, even if the picture was meant for the convent, the queen in exile might still want the Psalter in the picture to be in English to convey a message, appealing to her late husband's legitimate claim to the English throne. Now I must confess I do not know.

The text might have been in Latin, as suggested by Corp,²³ but then why would Campana di Cavelli's description provide the French version? Is it possible that the officials who prepared the convent inventory did not know Latin and so resorted to French instead? In view of a possible linguistic deficiency, however, providing the French version of the Latin they did not know would have been even harder. If, on the other hand, Campana di Cavelli's description came from the notes left by the nuns, why would they translate the familiar Latin? And surely if they had done this (for whatever reason), they would have provided the accepted Catholic translation from the Bible de Port-Royal—the Catholic translation of the Bible from the 17th century, which enjoyed tremendous popularity when it appeared and “has remained one of the most popular French translations” (Sayce 349; see also Crehan). A comparison of the two passages from the Bible de Port-Royal shown in (9a) and (10a) excludes this possibility. For the convenience of the reader, the relevant fragments of Campana di Cavelli's text are juxtaposed in (9b) and (10b) below.

²³ The circulating Latin text of this passage in the Catholic context was the Vulgate Psalter, i.e. *Psalterium Gallicanum*. With possible minor discrepancies, it represents the text as shown in Hetzenauer's edition of the Sixto-Clementine: Audi filia, et vide, et inclina aurem tuam: et obliviscere populum tuum, et domum patris tui.

(9) Proverbs 21.1

a. Bible de Port-Royal²⁴

Le cœur du Roy²⁵ est dans la main du Seigneur comme une eau courante, il le fait tourner

b. text as presented in Campana di Cavelli

Le coeur du roi est dans la main du Seigneur comme un courant d'eau, il le conduira partout

(10) Psalm 44

a. Bible de Port-Royal

Ecoutez, *ma* fille, ouvrez vos yeux, & ayez l'oreille attentive; & oubliez votre peuple & la maison de votre pere

b. text as presented in Campana di Cavelli

Ecoutes, ma fille, voyez et prêtez l'oreille, oublies votre peuple et la maison de votre pere

As is clear, Campana di Cavelli does not quote from the Bible de Port-Royal. What is more, the biblical passages given in French look like her own translations, with some grammatical imperfections because she was a non-native speaker.

On the strength of the same data, i.e. (9)–(10), we may assess the possibility that the passage was originally (i.e. in the picture) in French as remote. Let me add that the biblical passages in Campana di Cavelli's text do not represent any mainstream version of the French Bible known to me. Yet another possibility is that the text was originally in English and was translated in the initial, pre-Cavellian description of the picture. Each of the three scenarios has its strong and weak points.

5. CONCLUSION

The discovery that the picture is described in French and therefore that accounts of it in English did not aspire to any linguistic statement in this respect came to me—a linguist specialising in Psalter translations—as a surprise. As noted above, I began this investigation with a view to determining which English translation was represented in the picture, but I have completed it not even knowing what the language of the Psalter in the picture was! The linguistic confusion that drew me towards the picture resulted in a cor-

²⁴ The passage from the Proverbs is given here exactly as represented in the edition of the Proverbs from 1681 (being part of the complete Bible translation), while the psalm comes from the 1717 edition of the complete Bible.

²⁵ The 1717 edition of the Bible shows *Roi* in the place of *Roy* from 1681.

rection of a misleading description of the portrait of the English king and his daughter. I consider this the major achievement of the paper and an invitation to further investigations into the place of the Latin and vernacular Psalters at the exiled court, which was home both to Catholic and Protestant Jacobites.

On a more general plane, I witnessed interdisciplinarity at work: a full account of the lost picture is impossible without a good grasp of the historical context (only a snippet has been offered here), as shown by the contributions of Edward Corp, a renowned historian, whose comments proved invaluable. It is also necessary to rely on the knowledge of the history of biblical translations, and to have a grasp of the problem of linguistic versions—an inaccuracy which crept into the descriptions of the portrait of the king and his daughter due to a different placement of focus. A good command of historical sources concerning galleries and collections of art would confirm the completeness and correctness of the description.

So, while the story behind this picture and many others, offers enough scope for specialists to pursue fruitful individual investigations, single-handed efforts will never produce the three-dimensional pictures that can emerge as a result of the joint efforts of an interdisciplinary team.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- Bible de Port-Royal 1717 = Le Maistre de Sacy, Isaac Louis. *Le Sainte Bible en latin et en françois avec des notes litterales pour l'intelligence des endroits les plus difficiles: et la concorde de quatre evangelistes*. Paris, Guillaume Desprez and Jean Desessartz, 1717.
- Caryll, John, and David Nairne. *The Psalmes of David, Translated from the Vulgat*. Saint-Germain-en-Laye, W. Weston, 1700.
- Caryll, John, and David Nairne. *The Psalms of David, T[r]anslated from the Vulgat*. Saint-Germain-en-Laye, W. Weston, 1704.
- Douay-Rheims Bible = *The Holie Bible Faithfvlly Translated into English, ovt of the Avthenticall Latin Diligently Conferred with the Hebrew, Greeke, and Other Editions in Diuers Languages: with Argvments of the Bookes, and Chapters: Annotations: Tables: and Other Helpes, for Better Vnderstanding of the Text: for Discouerie of Corrvptions in Some Late Translations and for Clearing Controversies in Religion*. Vol. 2, Doway, Lavrence Kellam, 1609–1610.
- Hetzenauer, Michael P., editor. *Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ Editionis Sixti V Pont. Max. Iussu Recognita et Clementis VIII Auctoritate Edita. Ex Tribus Editionibus Clementinis Critice Descripsit Dispositionibus Logicis et Notis Exegeticis Illustravit, Appendice Lectionum Hebraicarum et Græcarum Auxit*. Friderici Pustet and Co., 1914.

- King James Bible = *The Holy Bible, Conteyning the Old Testament, and the New: Newly Translated out of the Originall Tongues: & with the Former Translations Diligently Compared and Reuised*. London, Robert Barker, 1611, www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Psalms-Chapter-45_Original-1611-KJV/. Accessed 6.07.2019.
- Les Proverbes = Le Maistre de Sacy, Isaac Louis. *Les Proverbes de Salomon traduits en françois. Avec une explication tirée des Saints Peres, et des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*. New ed., Eugene Henry Fricxs, Paris, Pierre le Petit, 1681.
- Nairne, David. *The Journal of David Nairne, 1655-1708*. Vol. I. MS 14266. National Library of Scotland.
- Whatley, Henry B., editor. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys M.A. F.R.S. Clerk of the Acts and Secretary to the Admiralty Transcribed from the Shorthand Manuscript in the Pepysian Library Magdalene College Cambridge by the Rev. Mynors Bright M.A. Late Fellow and President of the College (Unabridged) with Lord Braybrooke's Notes*. London, George Bell and Sons, and Deighton Bell and Co., 1893.

Secondary Sources

- Barclay, Andrew. "Mary Beatrice of Modena: the 'Second Bless'd of Woman-kind'?" *Queenship in Britain, 1660-1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture, and Dynastic Politics*, edited by Clarissa Campbell Orr, Manchester University Press, 2002, pp. 74–93.
- Callow, John. *King in Exile. James II: Warrior, King and Saint*, e-book ed., The History Press, 2014/2017.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, Magdalena. *Text and Context in Jerome's Psalters: Prose Translations into Old, Middle and Early Modern English*. Wydawnictwo KUL, 2013.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, Magdalena. "Perfectly imperfect – The Scottish Psalter of 1564." *Problems of Literary Genres*, vol. 60, no. 4, 2017, pp. 49–68.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, Magdalena. "The Psalter over the water—A multidisciplinary account of originality." *Linguistica Silesiana*, vol. 40, 2019, pp. 7–22.
- Charzyńska-Wójcik, Magdalena. *The Psalms of David over the Water. John Caryll and David Nairne's Translation 'from the Vulgat.' An Edition with Commentary*. In prep.
- Corp, Edward T. "Musical manuscripts of 'Copiste Z': David Nairne, François Couperin, and the Stuart Court at Saint-Germain-en-Laye." *Revue de Musicologie*, vol. 84, 1998, pp. 37–62.
- Corp, Edward T. *The King over the Water: Portraits of the Stuarts in Exile after 1689*. The Trustees of the National Galleries of Scotland, 2001.
- Corp, Edward T. *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689–1718. With Contributions by Edward Gregg, Howard Erskine-Hill, and Geoffrey Scott*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Corp, Edward T. *Sir David Nairne: The Life of a Scottish Jacobite at the Court of the Exiled Stuarts*. Peter Lang, 2017.
- Crehan, F.J. "The Bible in the Roman Catholic Church from Trent to the present day." *The Cambridge History of the Bible. The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, edited by Stanley Lawrence Greenslade, Cambridge University Press, 1963, pp. 199–237.
- Campana Di Cavelli, Emilia. *Les derniers Stuarts à Saint-Germain-en-Laye: Documents inédits et authentiques puisés aux archives publiques et privées par la Marquise Campana de Cavelli*. Paris, Didier et Compagnie, and Williams and Norgate, 1871.

- Evelyn, John. *The Life of Mrs. Godolphin*. London, Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts & Green, 1864.
- Gibson, Edmund. *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani, Or, The Statutes, Constitutions, Canons, Rubrics and Articles of the Church of England, Methodically Digested under their Proper Heads with the Commentary Historical and Juridical*. 2nd ed., Oxford, Clarendon press, 1761.
- Grew, Edwin, and Marion Sharpe Grew. *The English Court in Exile. James II at Saint-Germain*. Mills and Boon, 1911.
- Haile, Martin. *Queen Mary of Modena. Her Life and Letters*. J.M. Dent and Co, and E.P. Button and Co., 1905.
- Ingamells, John. *National Portrait Gallery: Later Stuart Portraits 1685–1714*. National Portrait Gallery, 2009, www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/personExtended/mp02391/king-james-ii?tab=iconography. Accessed 15.07.2019.
- Monastère de la Visitation Sainte Marie de Chaillot. *The Memoirs of King James II. Containing an Account of the Transactions of the Last Twelve Years of his Life: with the Circumstances of his Death. Translated from the French Original*. London, D. Edwards, 1702.
- Morsolin, Bernardo. “Emilia Campana Di Cavelli.” *Archivio Storico Italiano*, Serie Terza, vol. 24, no. 94, 1876, pp. 188–190.
- Sayce, Richard Anthony. “Continental versions from c. 1600 to the present day. French.” *The Cambridge History of the Bible. The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, edited by Stanley Lawrence Greenslade, Cambridge University Press, 1963, pp. 347–352.
- Somerset, Anne. *Queen Anne: The Politics of Passion. A Biography*. Harper Press, 2012.
- Specht, Walter Frederick. “Chapter and verse divisions.” *The Oxford Guide to Ideas and Issues of the Bible*, edited by Bruce Manning Metzger, and Michael David Coogan, Oxford University Press, 2001, pp. 87–90.
- Strickland, Agnes. *Lives of the Queens of England, from the Norman Conquest; with Anecdotes of their Courts, Now First Published from Official Records and Other Authentic Documents, Private as Well as Public*. Vol. 4, new ed., New York, James Miller, 1843.
- The Edinburgh Review* 1872 = Review of Les derniers Stuarts à Saint-Germain-en-Laye: Documents inédits et authentiques puisés aux archives publiques et privées par la Marquise Campana de Cavelli by Emilia Campana di Cavelli. *The Edinburgh Review*, vol. 136, 1872, pp. 47–82.

ON THE CANVAS OF THE PSALTER AND THE PSALTER ON THE CANVAS:
IN PRAISE OF INTERDISCIPLINARITY

Summary

The paper deals with a lost picture of King James II with his daughter, Princess Louisa Maria. They are portrayed with an open Psalter and the initial objective of my investigation was to figure out which Psalter version is presented in the portrait with a view to assessing the position of the Psalter translated in 1700 by John Caryll and David Nairne at James’s exiled court. In the course of the research it turned out that the available English accounts of the picture do not quote *verbatim* the passage supposedly visible in the portrait but instead silently translate a French description of the portrait, together with the French Psalm verse presented there. This discovery

shifted the focus of the investigation towards setting the record straight with recourse to and in full appreciation of interdisciplinarity.

Key words: Psalter; translation; interdisciplinarity; the Stuarts.

NA KANWIE PSAŁTERZA, CZY PSAŁTERZ NA KANWIE.
INTERDYSCYPLINARNOŚĆ W PRAKTYCE

Streszczenie

Artykuł dotyczy zaginionego portretu przedstawiającego króla Jakuba II Stuarta z córką, księżniczką Louisą Marią, na którym są przedstawieni z otwartym Psalterzem. W oryginalnym założeniu badanie miało ustalić, która wersja angielskiego przekładu Psalterza jest przedstawiona na portrecie. Miało to na celu ocenę pozycji Psalterza przetłumaczonego w 1700 r. przez Johna Carylla i Davida Nairne'a na dworze Króla Jakuba na wygnaniu. Podczas badania wyszło na jaw, że dostępne angielskie opisy obrazu nie cytują dosłownie fragmentu psalmu rzekomo widocznego na portrecie, lecz tłumaczą na angielski oryginalny francuski opis portretu, razem z zawartym w opisie francuskim wersem psalmu. Odkrycie to przesunęło punkt ciężkości badania w kierunku ustalenia faktycznego stanu rzeczy z zastosowaniem podejścia interdyscyplinarnego, którego zalety niniejszy tekst ukazuje w praktyce.

Słowa kluczowe: Psalterz; przekład; interdyscyplinarność; Stuartowie.