When publishing the *Cinquante Pseaumes* in 1543 (GE43), Marot revised the 30 Psalms once more. This revision, although by far not as drastic as the first one, is noteworthy since in some cases the interpretation of some Psalms has been affected, as we—in our general survey—already observed and as became apparent in the analysis of translation of Psalm 4. Even readings from AN41 make their reappearance in GE43. Since Defaux accepted the authority of GE43, while Mayer kept rejecting it as ‘suspect,’ ignoring the assessment of the Geneva origin by Labarthe, the differences between PA41 and GE43 have become ammunition in their différend. Both protagonists used examples to advance or downplay the authority of either version/revision, which is not very helpful for a true assessment of the purport of the changes. According to Mayer, it is unconceivable that Marot in 1543 returned to readings which he had rejected in PA41, and many of the other changes in GE43 are either ‘unworthy of Marot’ or negligible.¹ Defaux claimed the superiority of GE43 over PA41 and thus tried to show that PA41 is inferior. In their fixation on each other’s position they forgot to concentrate on the text they were publishing and did not hear what the text itself had to say.² Therefore, it is not

¹ E.g., concerning the changes in Psalm 7, Mayer (vol. 6 [Les Traductions], pp. 55–7) wrote: “Ces exemples sont caractéristiques. Même là où les innovations de 1543 sont importantes, on ne saurait guère y voir une élaboration poétique digne de Marot. Ce ne sont pas des corrections, des améliorations, ce sont pour la plupart des leçons corrompues… Ces vers sont indignes de Marot, et il me semble improbable au plus haut point qu’il ait pu les substituer à la version de 1541 si claire et si nette…. Bien qu’il soit impossible de faire des jugements absolus dans la question des corrections et changements effectués par Marot, il n’existe aucune raison, dans les exemples que je viens de citer, d’admettre que le poète ait écarté en 1543, la version de 1541 pour revenir à l’état original d’avant 1539. Après un ou deux ans, Marot aurait-il rejété sa dernière version pour revenir à un texte vieux de plus de cinq ans? Force est de conclure que l’auteur n’a pas présidé à cette édition de 1543.” See below for our assessment.

² In his *Cinquante pseaumes* Defaux published the text of GE43, providing the different readings of AN41 and PA41 (and, if present, other publications: ST39 and the variant readings of Psalm 6, although omitting the plaquette). In his edition Mayer published PA43 (= PA41 concerning the *Trente Pseaulmes*) and provided different
to assess their *différend* but because of the text itself that we will now scrutinise all more than superficial differences between PA41 and GE43. To us, considering GE43 a trustworthy edition does not necessarily imply that one has to downplay the quality of PA41; we do not believe in a strict linearity between the different editions. We simply ask what might have been imperative behind the revision of GE43. If we reformulate Mayer’s criticism we have to say he is of the opinion that many of the changes are a step backwards, both literally and poetically. His opinion that they are unworthy of Marot can be reformulated as: Did Marot make changes that cannot be explained by referring to the usual way he conceived his translations? This question coincides with Jeanneret’s conjecture that the changes in GE43 might have been influenced by opinions expressed by Calvin in his (later) Commentaries. Defaux accepted Jeanneret’s idea, but interpreted this as a sign of creative cooperation, whereas in Jeanneret’s view the ancient idea of Calvin interfering with Marot’s activity still shimmered through. A systematic analysis of this revision may shed light on these questions, to which we now add the question concerning the liturgical use of Marot’s Psalm paraphrases, since GE43 was edited in Geneva, where GE42 was the official hymnbook of the Church.

GE42 does not appear to be an augmented edition of ST39, but rather a slightly amended version of AN41: even with regard to the Psalm paraphrases already present in ST39, GE42 credited AN41 with more authority than ST39. Regarding the relation between GE42 and GE43 the lineage is—contrary to what one might have expected—not that of father-child. The three unique readings of GE42 (*vis à vis* AN41 and ST39) did not find their way into GE43. The same goes for the errata at the end of GE42; none have been implemented in GE43. Thus, it becomes very unlikely that Marot used GE42 as a starting point for his second revision. In those cases when a reading from Group I made it to GE43, Marot probably based himself on a manuscript of his own (Group I) or on AN41. The hybrid Ms. 2336 did not serve as an inter-

---

readings from other publications and a broad selection of manuscripts. The *différend* between Mayer and Defaux will be dealt with in the notes concerning Psalm 7 and 114, since it is in their discussion of these texts that they both bring in the heavy artillery.

3 For this, see the concluding assessment of GE43 in ch. 2.4.3.