Faulkner, 'The Eadwine Psalter and C12 English Vernacular Literary Culture', in Atkin & Leneghan (eds.), *The Psalms and Medieval English Literature* (D. S. Brewer, 2017), 72-107
Pre-Print

The Eadwine Psalter and Twelfth-Century English Vernacular Literary Culture

The Eadwine Psalter, produced at Canterbury in the 1150s, contains *inter alia – inter multa alia* – the only extant translation of the Psalms into English copied between 1100 and 1300, between the Salisbury Psalter, glossed at Shaftesbury in Dorset, and the Surtees Psalter, a metrical translation composed in Yorkshire around 1300.[1] The critical reception of its English gloss can be seen as a lightning rod for changing attitudes to twelfth-century English more generally, with longstanding complaints about its inaccuracy, inconsistency and probable incomprehensibility to its initial readership, replaced by revisionist views asserting its ready intelligibility. This paper treads a middle way between these two extremes, arguing that the gloss vacillates between archaic and contemporary modes and that this reflects a wider mid-twelfth-century conflict about how English could best function as a literary language.

The Psalter, now Trinity College Cambridge R. 17. 1, is one of the most lavish manuscripts to survive from twelfth-century Britain. It weighs nearly thirteen kilograms and, open, occupies almost one third of a square metre; each bifolium was formed from the skin of a single animal.[2] It contains the work of at least seventeen scribes, and five or more artists, all apparently working at Christ Church Canterbury around 1150.[3] The cost of its production must have been vast, but its patronage remains unknown. The most natural comparanda are deluxe twelfth-century books like the Albani Psalter and the Bury Bible.[4] The ambition of the project is also indicated by its contents. The psalter proper was originally prefixed by a calendar and an eight-leaf pictoral cycle of episodes from the Old and New Testaments.

The following abbreviations are used in this article:
AND: *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* ed. William Rothwell, Louise Stone and T. B. W. Reid (pubd online 2007), <http://www.anglo-norman.net/gate/>, accessed 29 January 2015.
B-T: *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth* ed. T. Northcote Toller (Oxford, 1898); *Supplement* ed. T. Northcote Toller (Oxford, 1921); *Revised and Enlarged Addenda* ed. Alistair Campbell (Oxford, 1972).
DOE: *Dictionary of Old English: A to G online* ed. Angus F. Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos and Antonette diPaolo Healey (pubd online 2007), <http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/doe/dict/index.html>, accessed 29 January 2015.
Gibson et al.: *The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image and Monastic Cultures in Twelfth-Century Canterbury* ed. Margaret Gibson, T. A. Heslop and Richard W. Pfaff (London, 1992).
LAEME: *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150–1325*, compiled by Margaret Laing <http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html>. Edinburgh: Version 3.2, 2013, © The University of Edinburgh, accessed 29 January 2015.
MED: *Middle English Dictionary* ed. Hans Kurath, Sherman M. Kuhn and Robert E. Lewis (pubd online 2001) <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>, accessed 29 January 2015.
OED: *OED online* (pubd online 2009) <www.oed.com>, accessed 29 January 2015.
Sawyer: *The Electronic Sawyer: online catalogue of Anglo-Saxon charters* (pubd online 2007) <http://www.esawyer.org.uk/index.html>, accessed 29 January 2015.
Old English texts are referred to according to the conventions established by Bruce Mitchell, Christopher Ball and Angus Cameron, 'Short Titles of Old English Texts', *Anglo-Saxon England* 4 (1975), 207-21.
[1] For the former, see *The Salisbury Psalter* ed. C. Sisam and K. Sisam, EETS o. s. 242 (London, 1959); for the latter, J. Stevenson, *Anglo-Saxon and Early English Psalter*, 2 vols., Surtees Society 16, 19 (London, 1843-47).
[2] For these physical details, see Elaine M. Treharne, *Living through Conquest: The Politics of Early English* (Oxford, 2012), 170-1. See further Nicholas Pickwoad, 'Codicology', in Gibson et al., pp. 4-12.
[3] This is my own count, based on the findings of Tessa Webber, 'The Script', in Gibson et al., pp. 13-24 and T. A. Heslop, 'Decoration and Illustration', in Gibson et al., pp. 24-61.
[4] For these manuscripts, see, most recently, *The St Albans Psalter: Facsimile and Commentary* ed. Jochen Belper, Jane Geddes and Peter Kidd (Simbach am Inn, 2008) and *The Bury Bible*, ed. R. M. Thomson (Cambridge, 2001). Note also the very useful online facsimile and edition of the St Albans Psalter, available online at http://www.abdn.ac.uk/stalbanspsalter/english/ (last accessed 28 January 2015).

In addition to the Psalms, the psalter contains Canticles 1-15 and the apocryphal Psalm 151. Each Psalm is preceded by a scholastic prologue, illustrated with a miniature and headed with a titulus; beneath is the text in the Hebraicum, Romanum and Gallicanum versions in three parallel columns. The Hebraicum is glossed in Anglo-Norman; the Romanum in English; and the Gallicanum with the *parva glosatura* attributed to Anselm of Laon. Each Psalm then concludes with a collect.

The English gloss to the Romanum, the principal focus of this essay, was, until recently, almost universally derided. Merritt characterised its glosses as 'among the most inaccurate in Old English', while Kuhn called the finished product 'a remarkable linguistic gallimaufry'.[5] More recently, Philip Pulsiano described the gloss as 'hodgepodge of morphological and phonological features' that even its scribes 'understood in places with difficulty', and Patrick O'Neill, at the end of a meticulous and indispensible analysis of the English version, concluded it was 'a project bungled in both planning and execution' and a 'poor quality, patchwork effort'.[6] In the last few years, however, as part the reappraisal of the afterlife of Old English driven by Elaine Treharne and Mary Swan, the reputation of the Eadwine Psalter's English gloss has improved greatly.[7] Treharne has herself suggested that the gloss 'may well be the most sustained example of a formal, but contemporary language in the period of the manuscript's compilation', and, in a brief treatment of Eadwine in the final chapter of her book on the Psalms in Anglo-Saxon England, Jane Toswell is likewise inclined to look on its English gloss with the eye of charity.[8] Moreover, while Sara Harris's discussion of the Eadwine Psalter in her fine Cambridge PhD thesis does not fail to acknowledge the gloss's eccentricities, it eventually concludes that its scribes felt 'a sense of security' at the 'mutual comprehensibility' of the older and newer forms of English that coexist within it.[9] While these revisionist conlusions are not without merit, since, as I show below, they could and did modernise as they copied, establishing the possible currency of Eadwine's gloss has, this paper will argue, come at the expense of ignoring the undeniable peculiarities of the gloss that struck previous generations of scholars so forcibily, and thereby misses the possible literary motivations of the Psalter's use of an archaic exemplar.[10]

The majority of the English gloss, probably the whole of the psalms and the first seven canticles, was copied from a source, conventionally known as *Ead, which deviated significantly from the norms of the Old English psalter gloss tradition.[11] To judge from the gloss in the Eadwine Psalter (no other manuscript of this translation survives), this gloss included idiosyncratic lexical choices, inaccurate translations of verbal moods, tenses and numbers, and a number of archaic orthographical features, most strikingly <b> for [v], which is otherwise found only in manuscripts written before 900. Working from these features, early-twentieth-century philologists favoured an eighth-century Mercian

[5] H. D. Merritt, *Fact and Lore about Old English Words* (Stanford, 1954), p. 20; S. M. Kuhn, 'The Vespasian Psalter Gloss: Original or Copy', *PMLA* 74 (1959), 161-77 at p. 168.
[6] Philip Pulsiano, 'The Old English Gloss of the *Eadwine Psalter*' in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century* ed. Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 166-194 at p. 166; Patrick O'Neill, 'The English Version', in Gibson et al., pp. 122-38 at pp. 133, 137.
[7] For an overview of this reappraisal, see Mark Faulkner, 'Rewriting English Literary History, 1042-1215', *Literature Compass* 9 (2012), 275-91.
[8] Treharne, *Living through Conquest*, p. 182; M. J. Toswell, *The Anglo-Saxon Psalter* (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 389-96. See the more sceptical comments of Jane Roberts in her contribution to this volume.
[9] Sara Harris, 'Twelfth-Century Perceptions of the History of Britain's Vernacular Languages', Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 2013, pp. 50-61 at p. 60.
[10] I suggest archaism was a productive literary style in this period in 'Archaism, Belatedness and Modernisation: 'Old' English in the Twelfth Century', *Review of English Studies* 63 (2012), 179-203.
[11] O'Neill, 'The English Version', pp. 127-8. Peter Kitson, 'Topography, Dialect, and the Relation of the Old English Psalter Glosses' *English Studies* 83 (2002), 474-503 and 84 (2003), 9-32 has argued that *Ead was in fact the Vespasian Psalter, a conclusion whch the evidence given below shows is untenable.

source for the English gloss.[12] However, the most exhaustive stemmatic analysis of the glossed psalters, conducted by Berghaus, has suggested that the Eadwine gloss is an A-type text, originating ultimately in the Vespasian Psalter, but derived most immediately from a manuscript related to Cambridge, University Library, Ff. 1. 23, produced sometime between the late-tenth and mid-eleventh century at an unknown centre, perhaps Canterbury or Ramsey.[13] However, Berghaus also counted almost 2500 independent glosses in Eadwine, and Philip Pulsiano's recent exhaustive analysis of Pss. 24-34 found that these independent glosses outnumbered those from the A(C) tradition by more than two to one.[14] Just how old *Ead was is therefore an open question, and while Berghaus's conclusions will not be overthrown until Pulsiano's critical edition of the Old English glossed psalters, now in the hands of Joe Trahern, is completed, it is possible that the C-type stratum in *Ead was not part of its original text but present as a result of independent innovation or its correction against an C-type manuscript, meaning it is possible that the English gloss's exemplar originated some years before the late tenth century.[15] This would find support from some additional oddities of the gloss, including its translation blunders resulting from the faulty reading Latin syllabification (implying, ultimately, an exemplar written in *scriptio continua* and therefore of eighth-century or earlier date), and the presence of some translations reflecting early Romanum readings.[16] These characteristics of *Ead present two important challenges for the revisionist position on the English gloss: first, Eadwine contains numerous undeniable errors which survived the extensive correction process. Second, since *Ead was perhaps 250 years old when it was copied into the Eadwine Psalter, it may well have presented some challenges of comprehension for mid-twelfth-century readers.

The scribes' handling of *Ead was, moreover, inconsistent. The language of the gloss to Psalm 1, copied by a scribe whose hand Webber was unable to definitively identify elsewhere in the manuscript but may be that of L1, putatively Eadwine himself, has been partly modernised.[17] O'Neill conjectures that this may have been necessary because of damage to the first leaf of the exemplar, but since the text generally agrees with what *Ead's gloss to Ps 1 can be inferred to have been, the modernisations are better seen as the product of volition rather than necessity.[18] The rest of the Psalms, copied by OE1, along with a collaborator with a very similar hand, occasional help from OE2 and more protracted contributions from OE3, show these features only sporadically, and it seems reasonable to infer that they are generally a faithful copy of *Ead, which is why the gloss contains many of the archaic features described above.[19] However, like the scribe who copied the gloss to Psalm 1, OE2, whose contribution to the manuscript is discussed in considerable detail below, modernised the language of *Ead, and did so increasingly as he went on. The gloss's already mixed

[12] Karl Wildhagen, *Der Psalter des Eadwine von Canterbury: die Sprache der altenglischen Glosse*, Studien zur Englischen Philologie 13 (Halle, 1905), pp. 191-207: see further the comments of O'Neill, 'The English Version', p. 125.
[13] F.-G. Berghaus, *Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der altenglischen Interlinearversionen des Psalters und der Cantica*, Palaestra 272 (Göttingen, 1979), esp. pp. 44-57, 63-4. For a consideration of its possible origins, see Michael Lapidge, 'Abbot Germanus, Winchcombe, Ramsey and the Cambridge Psalter', in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* ed. M. Korhammar (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 99-130, reprinted in Lapidge's *Anglo-Latin Literature 900-1066* (London, 1993), pp. 387-417.
[14] Berghaus, *Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse*, p. 58; Pulsiano, 'The Old English Gloss', p. 184.
[15] Phillip Pulsiano, *Old English Glossed Psalters: Psalms 1-50* (Toronto, 2001), a true *magnum opus* without which much of the analysis below would not have been possible.
[16] O'Neill, 'The English Version', pp. 126, 137-8. For the likely date of manuscripts written in *scriptio continua*, see Paul Saenger, *Space Between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading in the West* (Stanford, 2000), p. 41.
[17] Webber, 'The Script', p. 20. Treharne, *Living through Conquest*, pp. 181-2, accepts that it is the work of L1.
[18] O'Neill, 'The English Version', p. 132.
[19] For these scribes and their stints, see Webber, 'The Script', p. 19-20.

language was then further complicated by OE4's correction of the first half of the Psalter against a D-type gloss, probably that of the Regius Psalter itself.[20] This process of correction has loomed large in revisionist accounts of the gloss with Treharne asserting that it was intended to ensure 'a useful and accurate text' and Toswell taking it as evidence the manuscript was 'well used'.[21] Whether we can assume that this correction was designed to ensure linguistic intelligibility or not (and I argue below that it was not the case), it was only half completed: so at least half the psalter still suffered from the whatever deficiency the correction was intended to remedy.

It should by now be clear that any attempt to assess the cultural significance of Eadwine's English gloss involves manifold considerations of codicology, palaeography, and textual criticism, but above all of language. As Treharne has herself commented, 'twelfth-century English ... has never been the subject of a full study', and while O'Neill gives a detailed and cogent account of some of the more innovative forms of language in the Psalter, for its inheritance from *Ead all that is available is a handful of doctoral dissertations.[22] As a consequence, assessing where on the cline between the poles of archaic incomprehensibility and everyday twelfth-century speech the language of the gloss sits is a major challenge. The first two sections of this essay accordingly attempt to describe and contextualise two of the most sharply distinct varieties of language in the manuscript, that of *Ead, putatively early Mercian, and that of OE2, putatively Canterbury English of the 1150s, with a view to assessing what the experience of reading the finished English gloss would have been like.

Reconstructing the Language of *Ead

The English gloss to the Eadwine Psalter contains a sufficient number of lexical and orthographical features which are otherwise common only in early Old English to suggest that its ultimate exemplar, *Ead, dated from before c. 900. It can, moreover, be argued that the extent to which these features are preserved, which contrasts with the gradual effacement of early linguistic features from texts that were copied repeatedly during the Anglo-Saxon period, suggests that *Ead was the gloss's immediate exemplar. In this section, I attempt to reconstruct several features of *Ead, beginning with the digraph <io>, the early West Saxon shibboleth <ie> and <b> for [v],[23] before turning to some of the almost 2500 glosses found in the Psalter Gloss tradition only in Eadwine.

The digraph <io> appears 732 times in Eadwine, most frequently in the present third person singlar verb *biod* (x74), the noun *ðiod* (x64), 'people', the genitive plural pronoun *hioræ* and related forms (x52), the noun *fiond*, 'enemy' (x42), the imperative *bio* (x30), and the nouns *wiorc* (x30) and *lioht* (x21). This digraph is found in early Middle English texts more than an handful of times only towards the end of the period in works with a large number of French-derived nouns ending in *–ioun*. The closest comparanda for Eadwine's extensive use of this digraph in these words are therefore a series of Old Kentish texts: Ch 1500 (the will of Æthelnoth and his wife Gænberg, concerning arrangements for the disposition of land at Eythorne, Kent, 805x832), Ch 1188 (Oswulf, aldormonn, and his wife

[20] Treharne (*Living through Conquest*, pp. 183-4) suggests OE4 and OE1 are one and the same scribe but this identification is unconvincing for the reasons given by Webber, 'The Script', p. 19. For the Regius Psalter as the source of OE4's corrections, see Pulsiano, 'The Old English Gloss', p. 189; Kitson, 'Relation of OE Psalter-Glosses', §67.
[21] Treharne, *Living through Conquest*, p. 183; Toswell, *The Anglo-Saxon Psalter*, p. 391.
[22] Treharne, *Living through Conquest*, p. 181; O'Neill, 'The English Version', pp. 130-1, 132-3. The dissertations include Wildhagen, *Der Psalter*, and theses by two pupils of Merritt: C. D. Ludlum, 'A Critical Commentary on the Vocabulary of the Canterbury Psalter', Unpublished Dissertation, Stanford University, 1954 and B. L. Liles, 'The Canterbury Psalter: an Edition with Notes and Glossary', Unpublished Dissertation, Stanford University, 1967.
[23] These features are briefly mentioned by O'Neill, 'The English Version', p. 126.

Beornthryth to Christ Church Canterbury, grant of land at Stanhamstead, Kent, 805x815) and the Kentish Psalm and Kentish Hymn from Cotton Vespasian D. vi, and King Alfred's early West Saxon Preface to the Pastoral Care (the data underpinning these comparisons, and the methods of its collection, are given in Appendix 1, below).

Even more frequent is the digraph <ie>, which appears 1027 times, most frequently in the pronoun *hie* (x231), the subjunctives *sie* (x64) and *sien* (x31), the pronoun *hierœ* (x58), and the nouns *fiend* (x51), *ansiene* (x31), *an(d)giet* (x15) and *nieten* (x14) and the accusative singular masculine pronoun *hiene* (x8). While this digraph is found in South-Eastern Early Middle English texts as a French-derived spelling for [e:], this is not the context in which it is used in the Eadwine Psalter's English gloss, so it is natural to look to Old English orthographical tradition as the source of its use.[24] Here, ignoring the hiatus sequences *hie*, *sie* and *sien* which could be spelled with the digraph even in late West Saxon, and *hierœ* due to the challenge of obtaining robust comparative data, the texts to use the digraph with comparable frequency in the remaining forms are overwhelmingly early West Saxon, along with a handful of Mercian works.

The final orthographical feature considered here is one of the English gloss's most striking archaisms, its use of <b> for [v] in *ob*, 'of' (x32), *diobol*, 'devil' (x7), *ober*, 'over' (x3) and *wibod*, 'altar' (x2).[25] This spelling is not found in early Middle English, and according to the grammars, is a usage found in Old English only in the early Mercian glossaries and mid-ninth-century Kentish charters.[26] In the words in which it is found in the English gloss to Eadwine, it is most frequent in early texts, the Leiden Riddle, CollGl 40.1 (a ninth-century Continental copy of the Leiden Glossary), Ch 1276 (Swithulf, bishop of Rochester, to Beorhtwulf, grant of land at Haddun, A. D. 889: bounds), the Leiden glossary, and Ch 1195 (Ealhburg, Eadweald and Ealhhere to Christ Church, grant of renders from land at Burnan and Finglesham, Kent, A. D. 850).

The closest analogues for Eadwine's use of these three orthographical features are therefore universally early and almost all pre-900. When it is also noted that the gloss contains other orthographic archaisms (e. g. <u> for /w/ and the digraph <oe>), the conclusion that Eadwine's English gloss is ultimately dependent on a very old manuscript becomes unassailable.[27] Where dialectally the gloss's ultimate source was from is a more vexed question. The only texts which use all three features discussed above are the Vespasian Psalter, the Pastoral Care and Book V of the Old English Bede, that is two texts traditionally supposed to be from Mercia and one, the Pastoral Care, securely associated with Wessex. Ninth-century Kentish charters show <io> and <b> for [v], but tend to have <e> where early West Saxon texts have <ie>. More work will be needed before the issue of

[24] Richard Jordan, *Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology* trans. Eugene E. Crook, Janua Linguarum Series Practica 218 (The Hauge, 1974), §17.1 (greatly underestimating its extent). On the French context, see Ian Short, *A Manual of Anglo-Norman*, 2nd ed., Anglo-Norman Text Society, Occasional Publications 8 (London, 2013), §9, and for examples specifically from Eadwine, Dominique Markey, 'Le Psautier d'Eadwine: Edition Critique de la Version *Iuxta Hebraeos* et sa Traduction Interlinearaire Anglo-Normande', Unpublished PhD Thesis, 2 vols., University of Ghent, 1989, 1:290, 292.
[25] Kitson, 'Relation of the OE Psalter-Glosses', §72 argues that this spelling is not archaic but dialectal. However, given its total absence from LAEME and the small corpus of twelfth-century Canterbury English assembled below, the possibility of a spelling like <ob> reflecting actual Kentish pronunciation is very remote.
[26] For <b> for [v], see Wildhagen, *Der Psalter*, pp. 197-8, and, for its occurence elsewhere, Richard M. Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English*, vol. 1, *Phonology* (Oxford, 1992), §2.54, and Fran Colman, 'Kentish Old English <b>/<B>: Orthographic 'archaism' or Evidence of Kentish Phonology?', *English Language and Linguistics* 8 (2004), 171-205.
[27] Instances of <u> for /w/ are listed by Wildhagen, *Der Psalter des Eadwine*, p. 199. The digraph <oe> is found only in the present participle *doende* (x9).

*Ead's provenance can be resolved, but these comparanda strongly suggest that it was earlier than c. 900.

Further corroboration for this conclusion about the antiquity of *Ead lies in the almost 2500 glosses found in the Old English Psalter Gloss tradition only in the Eadwine Psalter. While there several partial lists of these glosses have been published, a full inventory is a major desideratum. The following comments are based upon glosses identified as unique to Eadwine by O'Neill, Pulsiano's list of independent glosses for Pss. 24-34, and my own analysis of Pss 1-5, 20, 31, 42, 50, plus of any other psalms or portions of psalms discussed for any other reason in this paper (e. g. those copied by OE2 examined below). In my analysis, I focus on glosses beginning with letters A-G, that is those covered by the portions of the Dictionary of Old English that have so far appeared, and for which there is therefore most lexicographical detail available. This comprises a total of thirty Latin-English word pairs.

This independent stratum of glosses falls into two major categories, those which occur with sufficient frequency to suggest that they were an integral part of *Ead, and those which occur only once or twice, and probably therefore represent *ad hoc* alterations, either by a corrector of *Ead or by the scribes of the Eadwine Psalter *calamo currente*. A particularly clear example of the latter type is the gloss 'abhominatur: amanseð ł onscuniað' (Ps 5.7). *Ead appears to have systematically glossed forms of *abominor* and *abominatio* with *fram (on)wealdend* (Pss 87.9, 105.40, 106.18, 118.163, Cant 6.16).[28] This was presumably also the original reading in Ps 5.7, which OE1 emended apparently *calamo currente* to 'amanseð', a verb more current in late Old English and Middle English than the period in which *Ead was putatively written.[29] To this, the corrector subsequently added, as he did throughout the first half of the Psalter, the D-type reading 'onscuniað'.

The majority of this independent stratum of glosses is however likely to go back to *Ead. Several of these glosses use words unattested outside the Eadwine Psalter, for example 'respicies: forelocæst þu' (Ps 34.17)[30] and 'coinquinauerunt: bæddon' (Ps 78.1),[31] and the translation of forms of the verb *tribulo* with *(ge)earfoþian*,[32] and of *liberator* as *freolsiend*.[33] Others, most obviously glosses of the type 'montem: dune' (Ps 2.6), where ACD generally have the Latin loanword *munt*, use words common in Old English, and which survive into Middle English and in some cases present day English.[34] Of most interest to determining the likely date of *Ead, however, are glosses which use words rare, but not unknown, in Old English. These are *ā-hwyrfan* (x18) and *ā-hweorfan* (Ps 43.24

[28] DOE **an-wealdan**, following B-T **an-wealdend**, suggests that the gloss is erroneous, and derives from misreading the lemma as a form of *dominatio*, 'rule, dominion'. Such confusion of <b> and <d> might suggest that the Latin text which *Ead originally glossed was written in a form of uncial.
[29] DOE **ā-mānsian**, 2 'to exclude, separate (someone from a community or an individual)', **ā-mānsumian**; MED **amansen**.
[30] Cf. gelocas ðu A gelocast þu C þu gelocast D, and cp. Pss 101.18, 105.44, 112.6. It is also possible that glosses like 'respicit: locæþ' (Ps 103.32) represent *ad hoc* aphetic adaptations of forms of *forelōcian* in *Ead. See DOE **fore-lōcian**, also inventorying instances where it glosses *aspicere* and *prospicere*.
[31] Cf. bismeotun A besmiton C besmiton D. DOE **bædan**, 'to defile (something)', suggesting as an alternative construing the gloss as a form of *bǣdan*, 'to command', the glossator having misread the lemma as a form of *coinquere*, 'to coerce'.
[32] DOE **earfoþian**, **ge·earfoþian**. Compare the glossing of *tribulatio* with *earfoþnes*, discussed below.
[33] For example, 'liberator: min friolsend ł alysend' (Ps 17.3, gefrigend A, alysynd C alysend D), also Pss 17.48, 69.6, 77.35, 143.2. See DOE **freolsiend**, and compare glosses of the form 'libera: gefriolsæ' (Ps 21.22), discussed in more detail below.
[34] See further the translation of *ecce* as *eallunga* (x34), for example 'ecce: eællengæ' (Ps 50.7, sehðe A, nu C on gesihðe D), and of forms of *delinquo* with *for-lǣtan* (Pss 33.22, 35.2, 38.2, 74.5, 118.67) where ACD generally have forms of *a-gyltan*.

only) glossing forms of *averto* (ACD generally *ā-cyrran*),[35] *ǣ-gylt* glossing *delictum* (x8, ACD generally *scyld*),[36] *æt-fæstan* glossing forms of *commendare* (Ps 30.6 only, ACD generally *be-bēodan*),[37] *blostmian* glossing forms of *(re)floreo* (x5, ACD generally *blōwan*),[38] *dēaþlicnes* glossing *mortalia*, 'corpses' (Ps 78.2 only, deadlican AC, lic ł þa deadlican D),[39] *ēstig* glossing forms of *benignus* (Pss 64.12, 84.13) and *ēstlice* glossing *benigne* (Ps 50.20 only, freamsumlice A fremsumlice C medomlice D),[40] *firen-full* glossing *peccator* (x35, ACD generally *syn-full*),[41] and *(ge·)frēolsian* glossing forms of *liberare* (x43, A generally *gefrean*, D *alysan*).[42] Surveying the other texts from which the Dictionary of Old English cites these ten Old English words further establishes that *Ead's closest affiliations are with texts composed before 900, as the table below shows.

Table 1: Texts cited by DOE for more than one word putatively found in *Ead, by type and token frequency

Text	**Types**	**Tokens**	**Words used**	**Weighted Similarity**[43]
Bede1 – Bede5	4	8	*a-hwyrfan, blostmian, dēaþlicnes, firen-full*	2.38
PPs	3	7	*ā-hweorfan, ā-hwyrfan, æt-fæstan*	0.59
CP	3	6	*ā-hwyrfan, æt-fæstan, ēstlīce*	1.53
And	3	3	*ā-hweorfan, æt-fæstan, ēstlīce*	0.20
LibSc	2	3	*ā-hweorfan, ēstlīce*	0.21
GuthA	2	2	*ā-hwyrfan, firen-full*	1.15
HlGl	2	2	*ā-hwyrfan, ǣ-gylt*	1.18
HomS 19	2	2	*firen-full, ge·frēolsian*	1.07
HomS 26	2	2	*ā-hwyrfan, frēolsian* 2	1.17
LS 30	2	2	*æt-fæstan, ge·frēolsian*	1.17
LS 35	2	2	*æt-fæstan, firen-full*	0.41

In terms of its use of these ten words, then, two of the closest comparanda for *Ead are the Old English Bede and the Pastoral Care, two of the only three texts identified above to share its use of <io>, <ie> and <b> for [v]. The currency of these words only in early Old English fundamentally undermines Peter Kitson's suggestion that the entirety of the independent stratum of glosses in Eadwine was introduced by modernising scrbes in the twelfth century.[44] (Kitson's suggestion that

[35] DOE **ā-hwyrfan**, vb., wk 1 (x40); **ā-hweorfan**, vb., st. 3 (x12), where second and third person singular present tense forms, ambiguously strong or weak, are treated.
[36] DOE **ǣ-gylt** (x11).
[37] DOE **æt-fæstan** (x17).
[38] DOE **blōstmian, blōsmian** (x8).
[39] DOE **dēaþlicnes** (x12), with sense 'corpses' here only (otherwise, 'condition of mortality', 'great loss of life', 'deadliness, 'the plague').
[40] DOE **ēstig** (x9, 'mainly in DurRit'), **ēstlīce** (x16). Note also **ēstignes** (x2, only in PsGlE Pss 64.12, 84.13).
[41] DOE **firen-full** (x100).
[42] DOE **ge·frēolsian** (x60), **frēolsian**, 2 'to set free, deliver' (the verb's primary meaning is 'to keep as a holy day, celebrate').
[43] This is a measure of how frequently the text uses words putatively found in *Ead, and also takes into account their relative frequency outside of the Eadwine Psalter; in corpus linguistic terms, a measure of keyness. It is calculated by multiplying the token frequency of each word by the proportion of a word's occurences in the Eadwine gloss to its overall frequency according in Old English to the DOE. Obviously the resulting number has purely relative and not absolute significance, but it does show that the similarity to *Andreas* flatters to deceive, since the three words it contains each occur only once in Eadwine.
[44] Kitson, 'The Relation of the Old English Psalter-Glosses', §68. Kitson's ultimate purpose here is to argue that Eadwine's gloss is not genetically distinct from the Vespasian Psalter, a point on which he may be correct. But whatever the merits of this argument, some of the independent stratum originated well before the twelfth century.

some of the older forms might have been introduced from a glossary is not out of the question, but is at odds with the consistency with which the idiosyncratic words are used to gloss particular lemmata.) Therefore, while there is unquestionably considerable research to be done on the character of *Ead, that research should begin with the premise that it is likely to have been a ninth-century manuscript at the latest.

There is, moreover, evidence that *Ead was not a distant antecedent of the English gloss in the Eadwine Psalter, but its immediate exemplar. This is the degree to which all three orthographical features discussed above occur in the Vespasian Psalter. In the contexts discussed above, aggregating the data from the psalms and the canticles, the Vespasian Psalter has 140 instances of <io>, 67 of <ie> and 5 of <b> for [v]. In everything except <ie>, these are significantly less than the figures for the Eadwine Psalter, which uses <io> 313 times, <ie> 120 times and <b> for [v] 44 times. Unfortunately, the Dictionary of Old English Corpus does not generally contain transcripts of multiple copies of early Old English texts like the Pastoral Care that would enable us to show how characteristically early orthographical features fared in transmission, but one exception to this rule is the psalter glosses themselves.[45] It is generally held that the gloss to the Vespasian Psalter is closely related to both the early-tenth-century Junius Psalter and the late-tenth or eleventh century Winchcombe Psalter, mentioned earlier, yet the former has only 103 such forms (98 of which are instances of <ie>) and the latter contains no instances of <io>, none of <ie> and only two of <b> for [v]. The comparison is even more striking if one is prepared to follow Kitson in positing that all the glossed psalters ultimately derive from a single archetype.[46] This strongly implies that a long transmission process would inevitably have led to the effacement of *Ead's early spellings and that *Ead was probably the direct exemplar for the scribes of the English gloss to the Eadwine Psalter in the mid-twelfth-century. Close textual and palaeographical study might in due course corroborate this conclusion by identifying errors in the English gloss that result from the misreading of ninth-century letter forms. While absolute proof is not for the moment possible, the best explanation for the linguistic 'gallimaufry' in Eadwine is thus that the gloss was copied from an ancient exemplar which had been sporadically corrected over the intervening centuries, and was subject to inconsistent *ad hoc* correction by the twelfth-century scribes who copied it.

Orthographical and lexical evidence therefore strongly suggest that the immediate exemplar of the Eadwine Psalter gloss dated from before 900, and may have been considerably older. This conclusion depends on the scribes' preservation a large number of these features when they copied *Ead. To suggest that the English gloss's language is 'contemporary', as Treharne does, is therefore wrong. The English gloss contains numerous traces of its early origins, and in many cases, these were at odds with the language of contemporary Canterbury.

Mid-Twelfth-Century Canterbury English

Whatever *Ead's origins, the scribes' decision to copy it, and development of strategies to do so, were made in mid-twelfth-century Canterbury. Any assessment of its archaism and its comprehensibility therefore has to rest on establishing what registers existed for writing English at this time. Beginning with an examination of the contribution of the scribe known as OE2 to the production of the English

[45] For two manual attempts, see Dorothy Horgan, 'The Old English *Pastoral Care*: the Scribal Contribution', *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose: Sixteen Original Contributions* ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Albany, 1986), pp. 109-27 and Christine Wallis, 'The Old English Bede: Transmission and Textual History in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts', Unpublished PhD Thesis, The University of Sheffield, 2013.
[46] See Table 7 in Appendix 1.

gloss, this section establishes that a range of styles for writing English were available, ranging from the *ad hoc* transcription of everyday spoken English to literary registers ultimately indebted to the late West Saxon *Schriftsprache*. It suggests that is against this range of registers, rather than any single notion of what constitutes twelfth-century English, that the stylistic choices of the scribes responsible for the English gloss must be assessed.

OE2 writes some of the most modern English in the Eadwine Psalter. All in all, he wrote just over 400 words of the English gloss to the Psalms and Canticles, including, at the end of Eadwine, the conclusion of the *Quicumque vult* (Canticle 15) and the whole of Psalm 151, which may be his own composition. Since no reliable edition is readily available for the English gloss to Psalms 51-151 and to the Canticles, I edit OE2's contributions here in broadly diplomatic fashion. Manuscript punctuation and capitalisation have been preserved, but word division is editorial and abbreviations have been silently expanded. Wavy underlining indicates a reading that has been corrected by a subsequent scribe. I present first the English gloss (transcribing wynn as <w> and yogh as <g>), then the corresponding Latin text, with Gallicanum readings given in brackets from the Vulgate where relevant. For the Psalms, I then provide an *apparatus criticus* containing the readings from A, C and D, taken from the Dictionary of Old English Corpus.

OE2's first stint in Eadwine is copying all of the English gloss found on fol. 141r, containing Ps 78.1-3 (*blod*):

> [78.1] God comen þioda on yrfeweærdnesse ðin bæddon temple hali ðin. Setton ierusalem oþþet æpla gehioldon
> [78.2] gesetton deæþlicnesse þeowa ðinræ mætas fuglas heuonas flesc haligra þinra wildordeora on þere eoðan
> [78.3] guten blod [...]
>
> [78.1] Deus uenerunt gentes in hęreditatem tuam coinquinauerunt [Gall. polluerunt] templum sanctum tuum. Posuerunt ierusalem uelut pomorum custodiarum[47] [Gall. in pomorum custodiam].
> [78.2] posuerunt mortalia [Gall. morticina] seruorum tuorum escas uolatilibus cęli carnes sanctorum tuorum bestiis terrę.
> [78.3] Effuderunt sanguinem [...]
>
> [78.1] God] God AC ø D; comen] cwomun A cwomon C comon D; þioda] ðeode A þeoda CD; on] in A on CD; yrfeweærdnesse] erfewordnisse A yrfeweardnysse C yrfeweardnisse D; ðin] ðine A þine CD; bæddon] bismeotun A besmiton C hy besmiton D; temple] tempel A tempyl C templ D; hali] halig ACD; setton] settun A settvn C hy setton D; ierusalem] ø ACD; oþþet] swe swe A swa swa CD; æpla] eappultun A æppyltun C apla D; gehioldon] gehaeld A gehyld C hordern D.
> [78.2] gesetton] settun AC ø D; deæþlicnesse] ða deadlican AC lic ł þa deadlican D; þeowa] ðiowa A þeowa CD; ðinræ] ðinra AC þinra D; mætas] mettas ACD; fuglas] fuglum AC fugelum D; heouenas] heofenes A hefonys C heofones D; flesc] 7 flæsc A flæsc CD; haligra] haligra AD halgra C; þinra] ðinra A þinra CD; wildordeora] wildeorum AC wilddeorum D; on þere eoðan] eorðan ACD.
> [78.3] guten] aguton AC hy aguton D.

OE2's second stint comes at the bottom of fol. 143r, a leaf on which he also corrects OE3's work. Here he copies Ps 79.3 (*awece*)-7 (first *us*):[48]

> [79.3] [...] Awece mihtte þine 7 cum þet hæle ðu do us.
> [79.4] Drihten god megen gehwyrfe us 7 atæuwa onsyne þinne 7 we gebeoð hihælede.

[47] Originally probably 'custodiarium' (the normal Romanum reading).
[48] OE2 was responsible for the glosses 'qui: se' and 'deducis: ge lædeþ' in Ps 79.1.

[79.5] Drithten god mægen oðþette yersaþ on gebede þeowes þines
[79.6] Mettas us hlaf tæra 7 dryng svlest us on tearum gemæte
[79.7] þu gesettes us [...]

[79.3] [...] Excita potentiam tuam et ueni ut saluos facias nos.
[79.4] Domine deus uirtutum converte nos. & ostende faciem tuam & salui erimus.
[79.5] Domine deus uirtutum quousque irasceris in orationem serui tui.
[79.6] cibabis nos pane lacrimarum & potum dabis nobis in lacrimis in mensura.
[79.7] Posuisti nos [...]

[79.3] mihtte] mæht A mihte C anwald D; þine] ðine A þine C þin D; cum] cym A cume C cum D; þet] ðæt A þæt CD; hæle] hale AD hæle C; ðu] ðu AC þu D; do] doe A gedo C do D; us] usic A us CD.
[79.4] Drithten] Dryhten A Drihtyn C ø D; megen] megna A mægyna C mægena D; gehwyrfe] gecer A gecyrr C gecyr D; us] usic A us CD; atæuwa] oteaw A ætyw C oðiew D; onsyne] onsiene A ansyne CD; þinne] ðine A þine CD; we gebeoð hihælede] hale we bioð A hale we beoð CD.
[79.5] Drithten] Drihten A Drihtyn C ø D; god] god AC ø D; mægen] megna A mægyna C ø D; oðþette] hu longe A hu lange CD; yersaþ] eorsas ðu A yrsast þu C eorsast þu D; on] in A on CD; gebede] gebed AD gebede C; þeowes] ðeowes A þeowys C þeowes D; þines] dines A þinys C þines D.
[79.6] mettas] ðu foedes A þu fedyst C þu metsast D; hlaf] hlafe AC of hlafe D; tæra] teara ACD; dryng] drync A scenc C drinc D; svlest] seles A sylyst C þu selst D; on] in A on CD; gemæte] in gemete A on gemete CD.
[79.7] þu] ðu AC þu D; gesettes] settes A gesettyst C settst D; us] usic A us CD.

His third stint comprises fol. 149r, which provides the text of Ps 83.2-4 (*megen*):

[83.2] Hu lufiende svnden erdungæ þine drythten megen
[83.3] gewilnað 7 aspring saulæ mine on akauertune drithten. heorte min 7 fleas min hyhtað on god lyuiendne
[83.4] 7 soðlicæ spearwa onuidæþ him hus & turlæ[49] nestð þer geseateð bryddas hys. Wiebed þin drythten megen [...]

[83.2] Quam amabilia sunt tabernacula tua domine uirtutum.
[83.3] concupiuit & defecit anima mea in atria domini. Cor meum et caro mea exultauerunt in deum uiuum.
[83.4] & enim passer inuenit sibi domum et turtur nidum ubi reponat pullos suos. Altaria tua domine uirtutum. [...]

[83.2] Hu] swiðe A hu CD; lufiende] lufiendlic A lufiyndlic C lufiendlicra D; svnden] sind A synd C ø D; geteld] erdungæ A geteld C eardunga D; þine] ðin A þin C þina D; dryhthen] dryht A drihtyn C ø D; megen] megna A mægna C mægena D.
[83.3] gewilnað] gewillade A gewilnode CD; aspring] asprong A asprang C geteorode D; saulæ] sawul A sawl C sawle D; mine] min ACD; on] in A on CD; akauertune] cearfurtune A cafyrtune C cæfertunas D; drithten] dryhŧ A dryhtyns C drihtnes D; fleas] flesc A flæsc CD; hyhtað] uphofun A upahofon C blissodon D; on] in A on CD; lyuiendne] ðone lifgendan A; lyfigyndne C lifiendne D.
[83.4] soðlicæ] soðlice AC soþlice D; spearwa] speara A spearwa CD; onuidæþ] gemoeted A gemetyð C gemette D; turlæ] turtur A turtle CD; nestð] nest ACD; þer] hwer A hwær C þær D; geseateð] gisetteð A gesetyð C heo sette D; bryddas] briddas ACD; hys] his AC hire D; Wiebed] wibed AC altras D; þin] din A þin C þine D; drythten] dryhten A drihtyn C ø D; megen] megna A mægyna C mægena D.

[49] r< n

His final stint in the Psalms is at the bottom of fol. 151v, comprising Ps 84.13 (second *7*) – 84.14.

> [84.13] [...] 7 eorðe ure selð wæstm hire.
> [84.14] ryhtwisnes beforan hine eode 7 sett on wege steppas his
>
> [84.13] [...] & terra nostra dabit fructum suum.
> [84.14] Iustitia ante eum ambulabit. & ponet in uia gressus suos.
>
> [84.13] ure] ur A ure CD; selð] seleð A sylyð C selð D; wæstm] westem A wæstm CD; hire] his AC hire D.
> [84.14] ryhtwisnes] rehtwisnis A rihtwisnys C ryhtwisnes D; beforan] biforan A beforan CD; hine] him AC hine D; eode] gongeð A gongyð C eode D; sett] seteð A gesetyð C sett D; on] in A on CD; steppas] gongas AC stæpas D.

It is notable that E's text here differs from D in only one minor variant here (steppas E stæpas D). This suggests either *Ead followed D almost verbatim here or, more likely given what has been argued about the origins of *Ead above, that OE2 was copying directly from D at this point. OE2's next contribution comes in the *Quicumque uult*, where he first copies the first five lines of fol. 280va, comprising Cant 15.24 (*sune*) – 15.25.

> [15.24] [...] sune nawith ðreo sunes an hali gast nawith ðreo halie gastes.
> [15.25] 7 on þissan þrinnesse nan þing hærest oððe læter nan þing mare oððe leasse
>
> [15.24] [...] filius non tres filii.' unus spiritus sanctus. non tres spiritus sancti.
> [15.25] Et in hac trinitate nichil prius aut posterius.' nichil maius aut minus.

O'Neill has suggested that the text of Canticle 15 was largely based on a D-type gloss though the source was not D itself, but that OE2 did not use this D-type source.[50] I would by contrast suggest that the evidence suggests that OE2 had access to D, but made only limited use of it. D's gloss to 15.24 is particularly thin, with only 'filii' (glossed 'suna') and 'spiritus sancti' (glossed 'halige gastas') translated, but it has a fuller version of Cant 15.25:

> [15.25] & on þisse þrynesse nan þing ær oððe æfter [nan þing] mare [oððe] læsse.

The lexical correspondences between E and D here strongly suggest that OE2 was basing his gloss on D, a conclusion borne out by his second contribution to this Canticle, its conclusion (15.38 (*þeolade*) – 15.42), occupying the top half of fol. 281r:

> [15.38] [...] þeolade pine for healðe hure lithte in to helle & on ðan þriddan deige aras off deaðe.
> [15.39] Asteh to heouenan sitt on þes feaderes godes swiððran hond almithtin 7 þeonan is to cumane 7 deman quican 7 deadan.
> [15.40] 7 to whæs tocuman alle menn sculen arisan mid heore lichoman 7 geouan antsweare off heore ahgen wercan mid sceadwisnesse.
> [15.41] 7 ða god duden sculen fearan to hechan liue 7 to seoðan ða ðe huuel duden into hechan fure.
> [15.42] Þis his ðe hilæua himeane ðe hwilc mann ne hileaueð festlice & treowlice ne meagen heo hiborhgen beon.
>
> [15.38] [...] passus est pro salute nostra.' descendit ad inferos tercia die resurrexit a mortuis.
> [15.39] Ascendit ad cęlos sedet ad dextram dei patris omnipotentis.' inde uenturus iudicare uiuos & mortuos.

[50] O'Neill, 'The English Version', 129-30

> [15.40] Ad cuius aduentum omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis & reddituri sunt de factis propriis rationem.
> [15.41] Et qui bona egerunt ibunt in uitam ęternam.' qui uero mala in ignem ęternum .
> [15.42] Hęc est fides catholica quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit.' saluus esse non poterit.

Here, there are numerous brief echoes of D's gloss, underlined for ease of comparison:

> [15.38] [...] þrowode for hælo ure he adune astah to helwarum þy ðriddan dæge he aras fram deadum
> [15.39] He astah to heofonum he gesæt to ðære swiþran godes fæderes ælmihtiges ł ealwealdendes þanon he toweard is deman cwice ł lifiende & deade
> [15.40] To þæs tocyme ealle menn arisað habbað mid limgesihðum hira & to agyldanne synd of weorcum agenum gescad
> [15.41] & ða þe god dydon hy gað on lif ece & þa ðe soþlice yfel on fyr ece
> [15.42] Þis is geleafa ciriclic þone nymðe hwylc getreowlice & trumlice gelyfe hal wesan na he mæg

Here the regular echoes of D suggest that OE2 had access to a D-type source, but chose to modernise it instead of following it verbatim. His language here is directly comparable with his final contribution to Eadwine, Ps. 151, which occupies the remainder of fol. 281r as well as fol. 281v:

> [151.0] þes ilca psalm is iwriten bi seoluan dauide 7 is wiðutan ðere tale of dan hundrede 7 fifti psalman. 7 ðeosne ilcan he machede ða he feath wið goliam. þes psalm nis nawiht on hebreisse bocan hach ða hundseouenti biqueðeres othðe latimeres hine habbað idon to þan heoðran & forþi he is to ascunianne.
> [151.1] Ic wes lest imog mine broððran 7 alra gugest in mines feader huse ic wes sceapheorda mines feader
> [151.2] Heodan mine warhten organan.' 7 fingras mine gearcaden psalterium.
> [151.3] 7 wha talde mine lauerde off me. Himseolf þe lauerd himseolf off allan hiheret.
> [151.4] Himseolf ansente his engel 7 nom me from mines feader sceapan & smirædæ me on þere miltse his smirælease
> [151.5] Mine broððre gode. 7 michelæ 7 ne wes on heom godwillendæ þe lauerd.
> [151.6] Ic heodæ ongean anan uncuððan 7 he me cursadæ on his godes anlitnesse.
> [151.7] Ic soðliches atæh from him his hagen sweord 7 achearf his heauod off 7 binom þet ædwit off israheles sunan

> [151.0] Hic psalmus proprie scribitur david & extra numerum cum pugnauit cvm goliath. hic psalmus in ebreis codicibus non habetur sed nec a septuaginta inquit interpretibus additus est & iccirco repudiandus .
> [151.1] Pusillus eram inter fratres meos.' & adolescentior in domo patris mei pascebam oues patris mei.
> [151.2] Manus meæ fecerunt organum.' et digiti mei aptaverunt psalterium.
> [151.3] Et quis annuntiauit domino meo de me.' Ipse dominus ipse omnium exaudiţor.
> [151.4] Ipse misit angelum suum.' & tulit me de ovibus patris mei & unxit me in misericordia unctionis suaę.
> [151.5] Fratres mei boni & magni.' & non fuit beneplacitum in eis domino.
> [151.6] Exiui obuiam alienigene.' & maledixit michi in simulacris suis.
> [151.7] Ego autem euaginato ab eo ipsius gladio. amputaui caput eius.' & abstuli opprobrium a filiis israel.

O'Neill argues on linguistic grounds that the translation of Ps 151 is 'near-contemporary', but that 'spelling errors' like 'imog' (Ps 151.1) for *imong*, 'heodan' (Ps 151.2) for *heondan*, and 'anlitnesse'

for *anlicnesse* (Ps 151.7) make it unlikely it was an *ex ingenio* composition by OE2.[51] However, since as I suggest below, the simplification of consonant clusters is a common feature of OE2's spelling, it is difficult to be sure that these are in fact 'spelling errors', so the probability is that Ps 151 is an original composition needs to be taken seriously.

OE2's approach in his contribution to the English gloss of the Eadwine Psalter was therefore to modernise the English that he found in his exemplars. This is particularly apparent from his handling of Canticle 15, but each of his contributions contains, at every linguistic level, features at odds with the conventions that had been used to write Old English, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and earlier.[52] (Though in what follows, I compare his language to 'Standard' Old English as the most widespread set of conventions for writing English in the preceding two centuries, all of these conventions also applied in the earlier Old English characteristic of *Ead) Innovative orthographical features include <u> for intervocalic [v] (cf. 'Standard' <f>);[53] <ch> for [tʃ] (cf. 'Standard' <c>) and also as a back spelling for [k];[54] endemic h-adding;[55] the use of <d, th> alongside <þ, ð> for [ð~θ];[56] <qu-> for [kw-] (cf. 'Standard' <cw->);[57] <s,ss> for [ʃ] (compare 'Standard' <sc>);[58] <hg> for [ɣ];[59] <th>for [x];[60] <eo> as a back spelling for OE <o>;[61] and the freer use of geminate consonants.[62] Spellings indicative of phonological change include <l-> as the reflex of [hl-] and <wh-> as the reflex of [hw-];[63] and <hi-> or more rarely <i-> as the reflex of the prefix <ge->.[64] There is also evidence for

[51] O'Neill, 'The English Version', 129-30.
[52] O'Neill offers an excellent analysis of OE2's language in 'The Old English Version', 130-1, 133, comparing his findings with a number of handbooks of Middle English. Less convincing are Treharne's brief comments on Ps 151.2 in *Living through Conquest*, 185.
[53] 'heuonas' (Ps 78.2); 'akauertune', 'lyuiendne' (Ps 83.3); 'onuidæþ' (Ps 83.4); 'heouenan' (Cant 15.39); 'geouan' (Cant 15.40); 'liue', 'huuel' (Cant 15.41); 'hilæua', 'hileaueð' (Cant 15.42); 'seoluan', 'hundseouenti' (Ps 151.0); 'lauerde', 'lauerd' (Ps 151.3); 'lauerd' (Ps 151.6); 'heauod' (Ps 151.7). Cf. 'lufiende' (Ps 83.2); 'beforan' (Ps 84.14). Harris, ''Twelfth-Century Perceptions', 59 intriguingly suggests that the erasure evident on fol. 281v above above the <u> of 'heauod' suggests that OE2 originally wrote 'Standard' <f> here, and corrected himself, but I do not think it is possible to be certain what the letter originally was (or indeed whether the erasure was part of a letter at all).
[54] 'hechan' (Cant 15.41 (x2)), 'michelæ' (Ps 151.5), 'soðliches' (Ps 151.7) and 'achearf' (Ps 151.7). Back spellings are 'machede (Ps 151.0), 'hach' (Ps 151.0);
[55] 'hure' (Cant 15.38); 'hechan', 'huuel' (Cant 15.41); 'hach', 'heoðran' (Ps 151.0); 'heodæ' (Ps 151.6); 'hagen' (Ps 151.7).
[56] 'dan' (Ps 151.0). Cp. also present tense 'hiheret' (Ps 151.3). For <th>, see 'nawith' (Cant 15.24), 'othðe' (Ps 150.1). Gospels: *wid, gelyfd, hæbbed, gad, spreced* etc. Both spellings are of course also found in early manuscripts, and some of the examples may conceivably have originated in *Ead, but the presence of back spellings with <ð> for <d> elsewhere in the gloss (e. g. OE4's 'Æði' glossing 'Beatus', the first word of Ps 1) strongly suggests that most originated when the gloss was copied in the mid-twelfth century.
[57] 'quican' (Cant 15.39). There are no instances of <cw> in OE2's stint.
[58] 'fleas' (Ps 83.3); hebreisse (Ps 151.0), but cf. 'flesc' (Ps 78.2); 'sculen', 'sceadwisnesse' (Cant 15.40); 'sculen' (Cant 15.41); 'ascunianne' (Ps 151.0); 'sceapheorda' (Ps 151.1); 'sceapan' (Ps 151.4).
[59] 'ahgen' (Cant 15:40) but cf. 'hagen' (Ps 151.7); 'geborhgen' (Cant 15.42).
[60] 'Drithten' (Ps 79.4, Ps 79.5, Ps 83.3); 'drythten' (Ps 83.2); 'lithte' (Cant 15.38); 'almithtin' (Cant 15.39). The spellings 'nawith' (Cant 15.24 (x2), OE *nawiht*) and 'feath' (Ps 151.0) probably also belong here.
[61] e. g. 'þeolade' (Cant 15.38); 'þeonon' (Cant 15.39).
[62] e. g. 'mihtte' (Ps 79.3); 'þinne' (Ps 79.4); 'steppas' (Ps 84.14); 'leasse' (Cant 15.25)]; 'off' (Cant 15.38, Ps 151.7 (x2)).
[63] 'lauerde', 'lauerd' (Ps 151.3); 'lauerd' (Ps 151.6) but 'hlaf' (Ps 79.6); 'whæs' (Cant 15.40); 'wha' (Ps 151.3), but cf. 'hwilc' (Cant 15.42).
[64] With <hi->: 'hihælede' (Ps 79.4); 'hilæua', 'himeane', 'hileaueð', 'hiborhgen' (Cant 15.42); 'hiheret' (Ps 151.3). With <i>: 'iwriten', 'idon' (Ps 151.0); 'imog' (Ps 151.1). Contrast the forms with <ge-> : 'gehioldon' (Ps 78.1); 'gesetton' (Ps 78.2); 'gehwyrfe', 'gebeoð' (Ps 79.4); 'gebede', 'gemæte' (Ps 79.6); 'gesettes' (Ps 79.7); 'gewilnað' (Ps 83.3); 'geseateð' (Ps 83.4).

the vocalisation of [j];[65] sporadic devoicing;[66] and (probably) the reduction of the preposition *on* to a clitic,[67] along perhaps with cluster simplification, particularly in the sequence [NC].[68] And this is without mentioning the evidence for morphophonological decay, which is too numerous to inventory.

Innovative morphosyntactic features include *of*-genitives;[69] *þe* as an invariant definite article with masculine nouns;[70] the freer use of the prefix <ge->;[71] and analogical levellings like genitive singular 'feaderes' (Cant 15.39).[72] OE2 does mark all elements of complex noun phrases for case, for example 'ðere tale of dan hundrede 7 fifti psalman' (Ps 151.0), where there is no case marking on 'fifti'. He uses SHALL as a future auxiliary,[73] and the definite article more frequently than it is found in earlier texts. Thus we find 'on þere eoðan' (Ps 78.2), 'on ðan þriddan deige' (Cant 15.39) and 'on þere miltse' (Ps 151.4). BY, not *fram*, introduces the principal agent of passive in 'is iwriten bi seoluan Dauide' (Ps 151.0). He often supplements OE prefixed verbs with a phrasal particle, e. g. '7 achearf his heauod off' (Ps 151.7).[74] 'Himseolf' (Ps 151.3,151.4) is twice used as a subject pronoun.[75] Lexical innovations include the French loan 'latimeres' (Ps 151.1) antedating the earliest citation in the OED which is from Lawman;[76] the emergent form 'almithtin' for ALMIGHTY (Ps 15.39);[77] and the Latinate 'psalterium' (Ps 151.2) instead of OE *sealtere*.[78]

It is thus clear that OE2 is writing what is essentially a variety of early Middle English. More questionable, and at least worth pausing to consider, is how far the language of any one individual can be taken as representative of Canterbury English of the 1150s. There is some evidence, for example, that he was not a native of Kent: he has several forms with <u> for historic [y(:)].[79] However, Canterbury was a highly cosmopolitan environment, so our sense of Canterbury English of the 1150s needs to take account of the probability that dialects other than Kentish were spoken there. While nothing directly contemporary with OE2's work survives for comparison, a considerable number of

[65] e. g. 'hali' (Ps 78.1); 'halie' (Cant 15.24); 'hundseouenti', 'fifti' (Ps 151.0), but cf. 'haligra' (Ps 78.2).
[66] e. g. 'antsware' (Cant 15:40); 'ansete' (Ps 151.4).
[67] If 'on akauertune' (Ps 83.3) is interpreted as dittography of *on*, with the second form cliticised. See the remarks in the Etymology section of OED[3] **on**, *prep*.: 'before 1200, unstressed *on* before a consonant was worn down to *o* or *a*. This form often coalesced with the following word'.
[68] 'eoðan' (Ps 78.2); 'turle', 'onuidæð' (Ps 83.4); 'imog', 'gugest' (Ps 151.1); 'heodan' (Ps 151.2)
[69] 'ðere tale of dan hundrede 7 fifti psalman' (Ps 151.0)
[70] 'ðe hilæua himeane' (Cant 15.42); 'þe lauerd' (Ps 151.3, 151.5).
[71] See the comments of O'Neill, 'The English Version', p. 133 on 'we gebeoð hihælede' (Ps 79.4), where MED's opinion (s. v. **iben**) that this is 'apparently a new formation in Middle English' is cited. If one instance in the Vespasian Psalter is discounted, the earliest usage appears to be ASC E s. a. 1096.
[72] Cf. 'in mines feader huse', 'sceapheorda mines feader' (Ps 151.1); 'mines feader sceapan' (Ps 151.4). Genitive singular in *–es* does occur, albeit rarely, in Old English: see Richard M. Hogg & R. D. Fulk, *A Grammar of Old English*, Volume 2, *Morphology* (Oxford, 2011), §3.68n3. O'Neill ('The OE Version', 133) identifies one further instance of levelling, suggesting that OE2 in Cant 15.38 'treats *liþan* as a weak verb, with preterite *lithte* rather than OE *laþ*'. However, 'lithte' is probably better taken as part of the weak verb *līhtan*, 'make light, alight', which came to mean 'descend' in Middle English (MED **lighten** (v.(2)), 3a).
[73] e. g. 'alle menn sculen arisan' (Cant 15.40); 'ða [ðe] god duden sculen fearan to hechan liue' (Cant 15.41).
[74] For a recent account of the desemantisation of the Old English prefixes, see Stefan Thim, *Phrasal Verbs: the English Verb-Particle Construction and its History* (Berlin, 2012), esp. pp. 158-164.
[75] OED[3] **himself**, *pron.* and *n.*, 3a, citing a questionable example from the Laws of Cnut (which apparently 'shows omission of the subjective pronoun after a verb in the subjunctive'), after which the next example is from the Trinity Homilies.
[76] OED[2] **latimer**.
[77] OED[3] † **almightin**, *adj.* ('apparently < Old English *ælmihtine* (variant of *ælmihtigne*, masculine accusative singular of ælmihtig), with the ending perhaps reanalysed as an adjectival suffix after *-en*, or perhaps remodelled after proper names in *–ine*'), where the next earliest attestation is from the Lambeth Homilies.
[78] See OED[3] **psalter** and compare OE *sealtere*.
[79] e. g. 'svlest' (Ps 79.6); 'huuel duden', 'fure' (Cant 15.41).

texts are available which were composed at Christ Church between approximately 1090 and 1130, a period of intensive textual production which I explore in more detail elsewhere.[80] To these can be added two further texts, the precise date of which is yet to be determined, but which can with differing degrees of certainty be identified as twelfth-century composition - a forged charter of Æthelræd and text supplied to remedy three lacunae in a copy of the West-Saxon Gospels – and a copy of the *Poema morale* written in the first half of the thirteenth century, perhaps in Western Kent.[81]

Table 2: Texts from Twelfth-Century Canterbury

Group	Short Title	Description	Date of Composition	Date of Manuscript	Source of Text
c.1090-1130	Chron (CaligA 15)	Canterbury Annals	s. xi^{2}-xii^{1}, but pre-1073 annals conceivably using earlier material	1073, maintained contemporaneously until 1109, with annal for 1130 also in English	DOEC ex Liebermann
	Ch 959	King Cnut to Christ Church, grant of port of Sandwich (purportedly 1023)	s. xi^{2} (?1089x1093), translated from Latin	s. xi^{2}	eSawyer
	LS 11 (James), Aug, LS 28 (Neot), LS 22 (InFestisSMarie), HomU 56, HomU 57, Eluc 1, Eluc 2	Selected items from the 'Canterbury Anthology' (Cotton Vespasian D. xiv)	c. 1100	c. 1150	DOEC ex Warner
	ChronA	Parker Chronicle, annal 1070	begun late eleventh century, completed late 1100s (?), first half translated from Latin	begun late eleventh century, completed late in first decade of twelfth century?	DOEC ex Bately
	Ch IHen (Birch)	King Henry I for Anselm and Christ Church, confirmation of legal rights	1100, but formulation partly based on S1088 (1052x1066)	1100	London, BL, Campbell Charter xxix.5
	ChronF	Domitian Bilingual,	first decade of twelfth	first decade of twelfth century	DOEC ex Baker

[80] Mark Faulkner, *Ignota lingua: English Literatures in the Long Twelfth Century* (forthcoming), ch. 6, giving full arguments for the dating of the texts used here.
[81] Two further Canterbury documents of the late-eleventh or early-twelfth century which survive only in post-medieval transcripts are omitted from consideration here. For these, see David A. E. Pelteret, *Catalogue of English Post-Conquest Vernacular Documents* (Woodbridge, 1990), nos. 44, 90.

Group	Short Title	Description	Date of Composition	Date of Manuscript	Source of Text
		annals 694, 796	century, translated from Latin		
	Ch 1636	King Æthelred to Christ Church, note of grant of land at Sandwich and Eastry, Kent (purportedly 979)	s. xi/xii- s. xii^{med}, but partly formulated on the basis of S959	s. xii$^{3/4}$	Oxford, St John's College, 194, fol. 2v
	Mk(WSR), Lk(WSR), Jn(WSR)	West-Saxon Gospels, Royal MS, Mk 16.14 (*þan*) - 16.20; Lk 24.51 (*þat*) - 24.53; Jn 21.25 (first *writene* - *boken*).	s. xii^{2}?[82]	s. xii^{2}	Liuzza, checked against Royal 1 A. xiv
s. xii/xiii	-	Digby 4 copy of *Poema morale*[83]	s. xii$^{4/4}$?[84]	s. xiii$^{1/4}$	LAEME

[82] R. M. Liuzza, *The Old English Version of the Gospels*, EETS o. s. 304, 314 (Oxford, 1994-2000), 2, p. 201 suggests 'the completions were probably composed for R and not copied from an earlier exemplar' on the grounds that 'the Latin texts they translate are written hastily in the margins, probably as a guide to the completor'. The orthography is however suspiciously conservative for such a spontaneous composition of this date, hence the question mark against the date above.

[83] The manuscript is from Christ Church Canterbury, but appears from Prior Eastrey's catalogue to have been given to the cathedral some years after its production by Thomas de Stureye (d. 1272). The manuscript is composite, but the *Poema morale* was certainly a part of the codex in the early fourteenth century when Eastrey catalogued it, since he includes among the contents a 'rithmus anglice' (M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903), no. 954). The language is nonetheless South-Eastern. Betty Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*, formerly the *Poema Morale* or *A Moral Ode*', *Leeds Studies in English* n. s. 9 (1977), 97-144 at p. 110 reports Samuels' suggestion 'that the language of D showed two layers of copying (Kent + London or London + Kent), or possibly a single scribe writing in the dialect of an area of Kent or Surrey bordering on London, i. e. North-West Kent or North-East Surrey'. This is followed by Margaret Laing, 'A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English: The Value of Texts Surviving in More Than One Version', in *History of Englishes: New Methods and Interpretations in Historical Linguistics* ed. M. Rissanen et al. (Berlin, 1992), pp. 566-81 at p. 571. In LAEME it is assigned to Western Kent. Production in or new Canterbury is thus a possibility. For further discussion of the manuscript, including the possibility that the severely fire-damaged copy of the *Proverbs of Alfred* in Cotton Galba A. xix was once part of the same codex, see Betty Hill, 'Early English Fragments and MSS Lambeth Palace Library 487, Bodleian Library Digby 4', *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society: Literary and Historical Section* 14 (1972), 271-80.

[84] Hill, 'Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*', p. 107 suggests the text 'was first written down during the reign of Henry II (1154-1189)'. Laing, 'Texts Surviving in More Than One Version', p. 569 suggests a date of c. 1170-1190.

The text which has most features in common with OE2's contributions to the English gloss is the Digby copy of the *Poema morale*, corroborating that he is essentially writing what we would call early Middle English. Orthographical similarities include the interchange of <d>and <ð>,[85] the use of <qu> for <kw>,[86] and <s> for [ʃ].[87] The text also contains some evidence for h-adding,[88] the reduction of consonant clusters,[89] and the reduced form of *on*.[90] The prefix *ge-* is usually *i-*, rarely *hi-*,[91] and the poem includes the characteristically Middle English *iben*, used by OE2 when he glossed 'salui erimus' as 'we gebeoð hihælede' in Ps 79.4.[92] Though the *Poema morale* does contain several features not found in OE2's work, for example <o> for <a> in words like LORD (indicating the sound change /a:/ >/o:/),[93] <v> in words like FOR implying initial voicing,[94] and <ie> for [e:],[95] it is also in certain respects more conservative than OE2, less extensively simplifiying initial [hC] clusters[96] and retaining 'Standard' <h> for [x] in words like MIGHT and RIGHT.[97]

However, what is immediately apparent from any comparison of OE2's language with the earlier texts is, proportionately, how much more modern his usage is. Only a few of the innovative features of his language described above are found in the early-twelfth-century texts. For example, <v> for [v] is categorical in Ch959 and the usual spelling for the scribe of the Domitian Bilingual, and <ch> for [k] is found once (but once only) in the *Elucidarium*. Ch959 also includes one instance of SHALL as a future auxiliary, and *aflote*, with the first element reduced from *on*. Annal 694 features BY introducing the principal agent of the passive.[98] Both Ch959 and the annals from the F-version of the Chronicle feature numerous *of*-genitives, but, despite these examples, OE2's language is in general far more innovative than that of these texts. Indeed, it shares only one or two features with the undated twelfth-century texts, principally <l-> as the reflex of OE [hl-], also found in Ch1636, and <d> for [ð, θ], which is very common in the Gospel passages. OE2's language therefore sits poised between the relatively traditional ('Old English') language of texts written in the first quarter of the twelfth century, and the more advanced forms of the Digby Poema Morale, but is considerably closer to the latter than the former: 'standard' Old English, let alone the form of the language in *Ead, would have sounded much older and much more formal than his spoken idiolect. It was not however incomprehensible to him.

[85] Examples include 'aider, eider' (< *ægðer*) and 'deade' (< *deað*). As there is no print edition of this version of the *Poema morale*, no line numbers are given and readers are directed to the LAEME text.
[86] 'iqueðe', 'quike' (x2), 'quenche', 'quenchen', 'iquemed', and see also 'ikuemde'.
[87] Most frequently in forms of SHALL like 'sulle', 'sal' etc.
[88] For instance, 'held' (< *yld*), 'herþan' (< *ær þan*), 'heȝhte' (< *æht*), 'hogen' (< *agen*), 'harue' (< *earfoþ*).
[89] Possible examples include 'huger' for HUNGER and 'ospreng ' for OFFSPRING.
[90] A feature that occurs twice, for example, in the second line of the poem, which begins 'Ic am elder þanne ic wes | a wintre & ec a lore'.
[91] The former is pervasive: for the latter, see, for example, 'hiwil' (< *gewill*).
[92] 'ic habbe child ibien'; 'he hedde þer ibie'.
[93] 'louerd' (x2) against no instances of 'lauerd'; 'ore' (x5) against no instances of 'are' etc.
[94] For example, 'uor' (< *for*, x6); 'uader' (< *fæder*); 'uele' (< *fela*).
[95] For instance, 'þieue' (< *þeof*), 'hierte' (< *heort*), 'þiestre' (< *þeostor*).
[96] Initial <hw> is generally preserved except in compound adverbs like 'þerwile'; <hl> and <hr> are both generally simplified (e. g. 'lauerd' and 'raðe'), but note the more conservative 'hlesten' (< *hlystan*).
[97] For MIGHT, the relevant forms are 'mihte' (x7), 'almihti' (x1); for RIGHT, 'rihte' (x2), 'rihtwisnesse', 'vnriht', 'rihte'.
[98] 'ða mynstra 7 ða cyrican, þa wæron giuene 7 becweðene Gode to wurðmynte be geleafulra cinga'

Contextualising the English Gloss

The preceding analysis has shown that the language of *Ead contained certain lexical and orthographical features typically found only in texts that predate c. 900. However, I have also suggested that readers in the mid-twelfth-century are likely to have been familiar with a range of registers of English and that we cannot therefore assume that it the English gloss was incomprehensible just because it was old. In this section, I look more closely at how the scribes handled some of *Ead's idiosyncratic features, arguing that though it is undeniable that they on occasion misunderstood what they were copying, *Ead was mostly comprehensible to them. It then addresses three major outstanding questions: why *Ead was chosen as the exemplar for the Eadwine Psalter, how it was handled by the scribes who copied it, and why the decision was made to correct it against the Regius Psalter.

It is undeniable that the language of *Ead would have been to some degree unfamiliar to those tasked with copying it. As I have shown, *Ead contained spellings and words that were, as far as the surviving evidence permits us to judge, not part of the active repertoires of twelfth-century scribes. Equally, as the generally successful modernisation of Ps 1 shows, *Ead cannot have been incomprehensible. Most of the obsolescent Old English words in *Ead are not simplexes, but rather derivational formations from bases that did survive into Middle English, which the gloss's copyists would have recognised. Thus, though the verb *fore-locian* is unattested in Middle English, when confronted with it in a gloss to 'respice', OE1 simply removed the prefix and wrote 'locæ' (Ps 24.16). This is not to deny, however, that the gloss presented considerable challenges to its scribes. Later in the Psalter, OE1 himself apparently failed to recognise the verb *ā-hwyrfan* as a gloss to 'avertas', writing 'æh hwirfe' (Ps 131.10). One of the most consistent difficulties he and other scribes had was with glosses to *lex*, 'law' that used Old English *ǣ*. The paradigm of ǣ historically included some morphophonemic variation, with genitive and dative plural *ǣwe*.[99] This led to a number of analogical forms, including nominative singular *ǣw* which in late West-Saxon arguably lexicalised as a separate word, meaning 'marriage'.[100] *Ead appears to have contained numerous forms of *ǣ* beginning *ǣw-*, and these seem to have given its scribes considerable difficulty. Thus OE1 produced a range of phonetically-inexplicable spellings for these forms, including 'gewe' (Ps 118.1), 'ecwe' (Ps 118.44) and 'ie' (Ps 118.85), which strongly suggest that he did not recognise them as forms of *ǣ*, itself in any case obsolescent. In his subsequent correction of the manuscript, OE4's invariable practice was to add the symbol for 'uel' and the D-type reading 'æ', suggesting that he too did not realise they were forms of the same word.[101] There can therefore be no denying that the language of *Ead presented its scribes with difficulties.

The scribes' general approach to copying *Ead seems to have been to modernise the language, at least to some extent. OE4's approach to Psalm 1 sets the tone in this regard, and OE1 is clearly making an effort to follow OE4's lead in Pss 2-5.[102] It may also be the case that the greater adherence of the gloss to Old English and not Latin word order in the first thirty or so Psalms was a product of this impulse,

[99] Hogg and Fulk, *Grammar of Old English: Morphology*, §§2.67n1, 3.93n5.
[100] Though treating it under ǣ DOE notes that 'in lWS the form *æw* tends to be restricted to sense 2, marriage'. Contrast the comments of Richard Dance, '*Ealde æ, niwæ laȝe*: Two Words for 'Law' in the Twelfth Century', *New Medieval Literatures* 13 (2012 for 2011), 149-82 at p. [149-]50n1.
[101] For example, Pss 39.9 ('legem: æe ł ewe'), 58.12 ('legis: æs ł ewe', the former described by DOE ǣ as 'mainly late North.'), 70.4 ('legem: æwe ł æ').
[102] Modernisations in the hand of OE1 in Pss 2-5 include 'constitutus sum: ic heom geseted' (Ps 2:6), with h- adding, and 'graves corde: heuie of heorten' (Ps 4.3, on erasure), with *of*-genitive. There are also numerous examples where the gloss follows English, rather than Latin, word order.

and not an original feature of *Ead.[103] Even later in the process of copying, more modern forms of the type favoured by OE2 seem to have slipped from the pen of OE1 *calamo currente*. Thus, starting with orthography, he glosses 'clamans' as 'chigende' in Ps 68.4, writes 'ðun ... ðun' for 'montem ... montem' in Ps 67.6 and frequently omits the <h> when reproducing forms of *Ead's favoured gloss to *averto, ā-hwyrfan* (Ps 28.1, 101.1, 103.29). He also adapts lexical features of *Ead on the fly, for example correcting the *Ead gloss to 'benignitatem', which we can infer to have been 'estinesse', to 'godnesse' in Ps 51.5,[104] and writing 'sinngiend' instead of 'firenful' for 'peccator' in Ps 111.10. In Ps 73.2, he glosses 'liberabit' with a *shall*-future as 'he scal gefreolsen'. Furthermore, following on from his treatment of the gloss to Ps 1, OE4 made efforts to modernise the original gloss while he was correcting it against the D-type gloss, updating both what the scribes of Psalter had written and what he found in the Regius Psalter.[105] Thus, in the process of supplementing the gloss to 'delictis' in Ps 67.22 with the D-type gloss 'on scyldum', OE4 also erased the first letter of the *Ead gloss *æ-gylt*, turning the rare and obsolescent compound into the common simplex 'giltum'.[106] Similarly, when confronted with what was very likely a form of the Latin loanword 'corona' as a gloss to 'coronam' in Ps 20.4, OE4 added the D-type gloss 'helm', but also erased and rewrote the last four letters of the original English gloss so that it read 'coruna', a more modern orthography, reflecting the reborrowing or reinforcement of 'crown' from French in the twelfth century.[107] OE4's attitude to the Regius Psalter is also to modernise. Thus, in Pss 56.4 and 76.16, instead of copying the D-type gloss 'alysde', he produces the aphetic 'lysde'. In Ps 56.3, instead of copying the gloss 'clypige' from the Regius Psalter, he wrote 'ic scel clypian' as the gloss to the future tense 'clamabo'. He likewise modernised the orthography of D as he copied, for example altering the gloss to 'averteret' in Ps 77.38 to 'he acherde', where the Regius Psalter had 'he acyrde'. It is thus clear that the two most important scribes involved in the English gloss, OE1 and OE4, were both predisposed, to some extent, to modernise what they found in their exemplars into more current forms of English. That they could strongly suggests that *Ead was not incomprehensible to them.

The subsequent decision to correct the English gloss against the Regius Psalter has sometimes been taken as evidence that the scribes came to regret their choice of *Ead as an exemplar and its archaic language. However, OE4's entry into the Eadwine gloss of the D-type readings should not primarily be seen as an act of correction. For one thing, when handling glosses that are part of Eadwine's independent stratum, OE4 preserves *Ead's reading approximately two-thirds of the time, either leaving it unmodified or supplying the D-type gloss as an alternative, as the table below shows.[108]

Table 3: OE4's treatment of selected *Ead glosses in Pss 1-77

Lemma	*Ead Gloss	D Gloss	*Ead	D	Both	Total
peccator	firenful	synfull	4	25	7	36
liberare	(ge·)frēolsian	alysan	12	8	8	28
liberator	frēolsend	alysend	1	1	3	5
delictum	ǣ-gylt	scyld	4	1	7	12

[103] This feature is briefly noted by O'Neill, 'The English Version', p. 125, but more work is needed to determine its extent and origin.
[104] For *ēstignes* glossing *benignitas*, see Pss 64.12, 84.13.
[105] Note also his addition, apparently *calamo currente*, of 'læge' as a supplementary gloss to 'lex', when supplying the English gloss to the first word of Ps 118.33 after the illuminated initial had been completed.
[106] See further Pss 18.13, 18.14, 68.6.
[107] OED[3] **crown**, 'Originally (i) < classical Latin *corōna* ... subsequently reinforced by (ii) Anglo-Norman *coroune*', and, for comparable Anglo-Norman spellings, AND **corone**[1].
[108] OE4's tendency to preserve the readings of *Ead is also noted by Harris, 'Twelfth-Century Perceptions', p. 56.

averto	ā-hwyrfan	acyrran	5	14	2	21
mons	dūn	mont	21	1	10	32
tribulatio	earfoþnes	geswinc	11	1	12	23
-	-	Total	58	53	49	160

It is therefore clear that OE4 regarded it as important to preserve readings that the English gloss had taken from *Ead. He moreover occasionally allowed himself to be influenced by the original gloss's pecularities, for example following it in construing 'clamavi' as present tense in Ps 26.7 and transposing the Regius Psalter's 'clypode' as 'clypie'.[109] OE4's respect for the authority of *Ead is further evident from the numerous cases where, even though changing a particular gloss, he preserves an original erroneous gloss. Thus, in Ps 30.7, where *Ead appears to have construed 'supervacue' as a two-word prepositional phrase rather than an adverb, OE4 maintains the original gloss 'ofer þæ emettgæn' and adds the D-type gloss 'unnytlice'. In Ps 34.4, where, by glossing it 'cirred(e)', *Ead apparently mistook *reuereantur*, 'let them be ashamed' as *revertentur*, 'they turned back', OE4 likewise left the original reading alone, adding the the D-type gloss 'wandien' as an alternative. His practice was similar where, as it often does, Eadwine had an English gloss that used a different tense, case or number from the corresponding Latin.[110] O'Neill's suggestion that OE4 'obviously disapproved' of *Ead is therefore untenable.[111] Rather, OE4's primary motivation in entering glosses from the Regius Psalter seems to have been to supplement it, with the intention of presenting and synthesising English vernacular scholarship on the Psalter more fully, just as the *parva glossatura* had done with patristic authorities.[112] OE4's decision, made as we saw approximately one third of the time, to efface the original reading of *Ead altogether seems to have been driven primarily by his concern, evident in his eagerness to modernise as he copied, that the Eadwine Psalter's English gloss should be comprehensible: thus he erases *firenfull*, unattested in Middle English, almost 70% of the time, but *dun*, which survives through to Present Day English, only once in thirty two occurences in the first 77 psalms.

OE4's respect for readings that originated in *Ead suggests that its use was neither a matter of convenience nor an error, but that it was deliberately selected from among the four Romanum psalters we know to have been available at Canterbury, despite its likely lacunose state.[113] One ready way of construing the choice of a perhaps three-hundred-year-old exemplar is to conjecture that twelfth-century readers shared the modern notion that archaism is efficacious in conveying the dignity of scripture. In this context, it is certainly striking that Old English biblical translations survived the Norman Conquest: the Old English Gospels were twice copied at Christ Church in the twelfth century,[114] the Old English Hexateuch was equipped with a modern scholastic apparatus derived from

[109] The similarity to the reading 'ic clypige' in the Salisbury Psalter gloss to this verse is presumably a coincidence.
[110] For example, 'liberavit: he alysde ł gefriolsæþ' (Ps 33.7) and 'peccatoris: firænfulra synfulles' (Ps 70.4).
[111] O'Neill, 'The English Version', p. 134.
[112] See, in general, Lesley Smith, *The Glossa Ordinaria: the making of a medieval Bible commentary* (Leiden, 2009).
[113] For these explanations for its choice, see O'Neill, 'The English Version', pp. 133, 134. Aside from *Ead and the Regius Psalter, both London, BL, Add. 37517 (s. x/xi, 'Bosworth Psalter'), London, BL, Harley 603 (s. x/xi or xi[1], 'Harley Psalter') appear to have been in Canterbury in the mid-twelfth century. A damaged exemplar is the best explanation of Eadwine's intermittent recourse to other sources, as set out by O'Neill, 'The English Version', pp. 127-32.
[114] London, British Library, Royal 1 A. xiv and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 38, discussed Liuzza, *OE Version of Gospels*, 1, pp. xxxiii-vi, xxxvii-xli; 2, 174-202.

Peter Comester at St Augustine's around 1180,[115] and the Tremulous Hand is found celebrating Old English biblical translation in the early years of the thirteenth century.[116] Clearly Old English biblical translations carried the weight of authority. Yet the Gospels and the Hexateuch were translated around the millennium, and, if a tenth or eleventh century text was needed, the Regius Psalter would have fitted the bill. This suggests other factors may have been involved, and one possibility is that an exemplar as old as *Ead was chosen as a deliberate challenge to the claims made by Christ Church's rival monastery, St Augustine's, that it and not Christ Church was the first Christian foundation in England.[117] In the fifteenth century, and possibly earlier, these claims were partly evidenced through a collection of books kept on the high altar in St Augustine's that the monks claimed had been brought to England by St Augustine.[118] Among these books was the Vespasian Psalter, and it may not be too far-fetched to conjecture that the Eadwine Psalter, itself large and lavish enough to be kept on an altar, was conceived of as a riposte to these claims, manifesting simultanoeusly the antiquity of biblical scholarship at Christ Church and, something an ancient book could never hope to show, its contemporary vigour.[119]

Conclusion: the uses of the past in twelfth-century Canterbury

The Eadwine Psalter's English gloss is, as this essay will have made abundantly clear, a complex text. Deliberately choosing an ancient exemplar that contained a form of English that would have been comprehensible but strange to its scribes and those monks familiar with the other English texts being copied in twelfth-century Canterbury, its scribes selectively and idiosyncratically modernised the language as they copied, before one of their number collated it against another gloss tradition, creating not only a partial *summa* of English vernacular biblical scholarship but also an assertion that this tradition lived on. The resulting bricolage of linguistic forms has more often than not created incomprehension and scorn, but the glossator's handling of their models is in fact paralleled in the Psalter's artistic programme. The miniatures that precede each psalm were modelled on the Carolingian Utrecht Psalter, produced in France in the first half of the ninth century and present at Christ Church since the millennium, where it served, on and off, as an artistic touchstone for five generations of artists.[120] This choice has been attributed to 'antiquarian zeal and love of ostentation',[121] and here, unlike in the Old English gloss, the balance between authority, on the one

[115] London, British Library, Cotton Claudius B. iv, discussed A. N. Doane & William P. Stoneman, *Purloined Letters: The Twelfth-Century Reception of the Anglo-Saxon Illustrated Hexateuch (British Library, Cotton Claudius B. iv)* (Tempe, 2011).
[116] In the poem *Sanctus Beda was iboren her* (edited by S. K. Brehe, 'Reassembling the *First Worcester Fragment*,' *Speculum* 65 (1990), 530-1), which praises '*Æ*lfric abbod', who 'þe fif bec wende: Genesis, Exodus, Leuiticus, Numerus, Vtronomius'.
[117] For the stormy relations between the two houses, see most recently Jean Truax, *Archbishops Ralph d'Escures, William of Corbeil and Theobald of Bec: heirs of Anselm and Ancestors of Becket* (Aldershot, 2012), pp. 64-5, 85-6, 169-71.
[118] The books are described by Thomas of Elmham, *Historia monasterii S. Augustini* ed. Charles Hardwick, Rolls Series 8 (London, 1858), pp. 96-9, re-edited by Bruce Barker-Benfield, *St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 13 (London, 2008), 3, pp. 1643-65.
[119] The Vespasian Psalter is identified as the 'aliud 'Psalterium' (Elmham, *Historia*, p. 98) by D. H. Wright & A. Campbell, *The Vespasian Psalter: British Museum Cotton Vespasian A. i*, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 14 (Copenhagen, 1967), pp. 37-41, an identification which Barker-Benfield supports (pp. 1652-3).
[120] T. A. Heslop, 'The Implication of the Utrecht Psalter on English Romanesque Art', in *Romanesque Art and Thought in the Twelfth Century: essays in honor of Walter Cahn* ed. Colum Hourihane (Princeton: Index of Christian Art, 2008), pp. 267-89.
[121] Heslop, 'Decoration and Illustration', p. 52.

hand, and invention and creativity, on the other, has been praised.[122] The miniatures, moreover, show the same vacillation between the imitation of older models and their modernisation to reflect more recent styles as the English gloss. It could be argued, in fact, that such inconsistency is vital to any act of appropriation, since – for the act of appropriation to be effective – the artefact must be recognised as at once other and familiar.

Art historians indeed have generally been more sensitive to the aesthetic possibilities of archaism and the reuse of past texts than literary critics. Another example that has recently come to light, like the Eadwine Psalter, from mid-twelfth-century Canterbury, is the use of calc-sinter, a material that formed as a deposit inside Roman aqueducts, in various building projects undertaken at this time, including for pillars in the infirmary cloister and the chapter house, and, as slabs fitted into frames, for a choir screen in the cathedral proper.[123] Though, as Christopher Wilson comments, we do no know 'the nature of the sales patter employed by the dealers' when trying to sell their clients the calc-sinter, as an ersatz marble it was unfamiliar and precious looking, and, by virtue of its source, had powerful associations with the Roman imperial past, associations reinforced by the broad diameter of the columns in the treasury-cum-gateway (another mid-twelfth-century building using calc-sinter), which were consequently reminiscent of classical columns.[124] Seen then in the context of the use of past artefacts and styles in other forms of cultural production both in Canterbury and elsewhere in the twelfth century - Romanesque has itself been characterised as a fundamentally historicist style[125] - the English gloss's scribes choice of an ancient exemplar becomes more intelligible.

Yet whatever the symbolic power such a choice gave to the project, its architects also wanted the English gloss to be comprehensible, and in this, they were fighting a losing battle against time. Even if they were not wholly incomprehensible, texts written in Old English were by the middle decades of the twelfth century, becoming increasingly difficult, as language change rendered their idioms increasingly obsolescent and the consequences of the Norman conquerors' takeover of monasteries and other religious houses, which in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries were still the primary guardians of and educators in the traditions of writing English, hit home as the immediate post-Conquest generation of monks died off. The Psalter provides an object lesson in the difficulty for scribes of consistently modernising the language of an old exemplar, and in OE2's eventual decision in Canticle 15 to cease copying and start freely adapting his exemplar, shows the moment at which one scribe began to regard recopying Old English was a dead-end. The copying and then recopying of the Old English Gospels at Christ Church in the following fifty years, not to mention the copying practices of the other scribes involved in producing the Eadwine Psalter, show that his was for the moment a controversial view. But it was with OE2 and 'less conservative writers who gradually promoted various forms of spoken English to the rank of a literary language' that the future lay, and then only when the prestige of English was sufficient for it to be a vehicle for biblical translation again.[126]

[122] Heslop, 'Decoration and Illustration', p. 34.
[123] For this and what follows, see Christopher Wilson, 'Canterbury Cathedral's Mystery "Marble": A Double Imposture Unmasked', in Peter Fergusson, *Canterbury Cathedral in the Age of Becket* (New Haven, 2011), pp. 156-60.
[124] Wilson, 'A Double Imposture Unmasked', p. 160.
[125] See, most recently, the papers in *Romanesque and the Past* ed. John McNeill and Richard Plant (Leeds, 2013).
[126] M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307*, 2nd edition (Oxford, 1993), p. 212; cf. Treharne, *Living through Conquest*, p. 187.

While another copy of the Eadwine Psalter was made towards the end of the twelfth century, it remains unfinished and only the most cursory attempt was made to enter the English gloss.[127] There may once have been another copy in Durham to judge from a late medieval library library catalogue, but there is no way of knowing what this did or did not contain and when it was made.[128] Other contemporary, and indeed subsequent deluxe psalters which admit vernacular material, like the Winchester Psalter produced for Henry of Blois, included only French.[129] Setting aside a few quotations from the psalms translated as part of sermons and devotional texts like the *Ancrene Wisse*, there is no English version of the psalms extant from the thirteenth century; no translation, in fact, until the Surtees Psalter, a metrical translation produced around 1300, probably in Yorkshire. While it has been argued that this translator made some use of an Early Middle English psalter gloss, itself a modernisation of an Old English psalter gloss, the evidence hitherto presented flatters to deceive.[130] The Eadwine Psalter thus marks the end of one tradition but also contains, in OE2's departure from the agreed exemplars, the seeds of the next contains the seeds of the next. Recognising the Eadwine Psalter's importance to twelfth century literary history is possible, paradoxically, only if we are prepared once again to acknowledge its inaccuracies, inconsistencies and challenges.

[127] Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 8846, discussed mostly recently by Matthew Hussey, 'The Canterbury Psalter, Christ Church, and the Last Old English Psalter Gloss', in *The Genesis of Books: Studies in the Scribal Culture of Medieval England in Honour of A. N. Doane* eds. M. T. Hussey and J. D. Niles (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 175-93.

[128] For the 'psalterium Eadwini anglice glosatum' at Durham, first drawn to scholarly attention by Christopher de Hamel in his review of Gibson et al. in *Medium Aevum* 63 (1994), 165-7, see Beriah Botfield, *Catalogi veteres librorum ecclesiae cathedralis Dunelmensis*, Surtees Society 7 (London, 1838), p. 6 (where 'anglice' is inadvertantly omitted from the description). The catalogue, found in the Durham Cantor's Book, is datable to the mid-twelfth century on palaeographical grounds.

[129] For this manuscript, see Kristine E. Haney, *The Winchester Psalter: An Iconographic Study* (Leicester, 1986).

[130] Henry Hargreaves, 'The Vocabulary of the Surtees Psalter', *Modern Languages Quarterly* 17 (1956), 326-39.

Appendix 1: The Orthography of *Ead

Traditionally, analyses of the language of medieval texts have been organised according to how the reflexes of particular pre-Old English sounds are represented in different phonetic environments, for example West Germanic *e* after a palatal consonant. While such *Lautlehre* approaches are the gold standard if one is interested in exhaustively mapping the phonological features of a particular text, they are very laborious, and one needs to consult other similar analyses or grammars to contextualise one’s findings. Here, because I wish to identify the closest comparanda for a linguistically very homogenous text, I have preferred to deploy a more quantitative methodology, using data from the Dictionary of Old English Corpus (DOEC).

Since it is not possible to extract from this corpus a structured list of all the words in which a particular spelling occurs, and running an open search for the spelling would produce data so fuzzy as to be unusable (e. g. searching for <ie> matches the place name *Hierusalem*), my approach was to build a concordance to the gloss to the psalms and the canticles in the Eadwine Psalter based on the DOEC text, and used this to identify the words which most frequently contained the three spellings examined here,<io>, <eo> and <ie>. Each of these words was then searched for in the relevant spelling in the corpus. This has the downside that it depends upon the text using the word in question, so it is possible that a text making heavy use of <io> would be overlooked just because it does not use the words *bioð*, *ðiod*, *hiorœ*, *fiond*, *bio*, *wiorc* or *lioht*. However, since these are high frequency words, this risk is minimal. The method does have one compensating advantage over traditional approaches, however, in that it is primarily geared towards orthographical variation, so it also can match texts on the basis of phonologically ‘incorrect’ spellings.

Where obvious spelling variants were available (e. g. *ðiod*, *þiod*) I searched for each possible spelling and combined the results. To keep data collection manageable when handling search strings that generated multiple hits (e. g. *hior** , yielding 1252 matches), a threshhold was set, in this case five or more, of the number of hits required before I would record a particular text. The DOEC also gives a each text’s length, and this enabled the calculation of the frequency of the relevent spellings per 1000 words for each text, and thus provide a way of comparing longer and shorter texts. In the tables below, I present the data for <ie>, <io> and <b> for [v], giving the five texts that use each spelling most frequently in the relevant forms, as well as the figure for the English gloss in the Eadwine Psalter and the six texts that are most similar to it.

Table 4: use of <io> in selected words, by frequency per 1000 words

Rank		**Word Count**	**bioð, bioþ**	**hior***	**ðiod*, þiod***	**bio**	**wiorc***	**fiond***	**lioht***	**Total Forms**	**Frequency of <io> / 1000 words**
	DOEC Total		470	1252	93	71	39	156	37		
	Threshold		≥5	≥5	≥2	≥2	≥1	≥3	≥1		
1	Ch1500	138		5						5	36.23
2	Ch1188	469		7						7	14.93
3	KtPs	846		5	3				4	12	14.18
4	CPLetWærf	874		10						10	11.44
5	**PsGlE + PsCaE**	**37156**	**74**	**52**	**64**	**30**	**30**	**42**	**21**	**313**	**8.42**
6	KtHy	232			1				1	2	8.62
7	HomU12.2	655	5							5	7.63
8	HomU 9	4061	22	7						29	7.14
9	OccGl 49	2139	10	5						15	7.01

Table 5: Frequency of <ie>, by occurences / 1000 words

Rank		**Word Count**	**fiend***	**hiene**	**sien**	**an(d)sien on(d)sien**	**an(d)giet on(d)giet**	**nieten**	**Total Forms**	**Frequency of <io> / 1000 words**
	DOEC Total		115	369	392	180	207	46		
	Threshold		≥2	≥4	≥3	≥2	≥1	≥1		
1	Or6	6932		53					53	7.65
2	Or5	6095		37				2	39	6.40
3	CP(Cotton)	2117		11			2		13	6.14
4	SolII	1196			6			1	7	5.85
5	LawAfRb	177						1	1	5.65
6	PsGlB	31215	51		54	45		2	152	4.87
7	Or3	10179		47					47	4.62
8	CP	67835	3	40	71	1	164	12	280	4.29
9	**PsGlE + PsCaE**	**37156**	**51**	**8**	**31**	**31**	**16**	**14**	**144**	**4.06**
10	PsGlA	32347	4		56	60			120	3.71
11	Or4	10350		33				1	34	3.29
12	PsGlL	5809	4		14				18	3.10

Table 6: Frequency of <b> for [v] per 1000 words

Rank		**Word Count**	**ob**	**ober***	**deob*, diob*, diub*, diabol***	**weob*, wib*, wieb*, wiob***	**Total Forms**	**Frequency of <io> / 1000 words**
	DOEC Total		135	24	36	72		
	Threshold		≥1	≥1	≥1	≥1		
1	LdGl	284		2			2	7.04
2	Ch 1195	166	1				1	6.02
3	Ch 1197	224	1				1	4.46
4	Ch283	260		1			1	3.85
5	CPCot	2117				8	8	3.78
13	LorGl 1	564		1			1	1.77
14	JnHeadGl(Li)	1440		2			2	1.39
15	PrudGl 1	1441				2	2	1.39
16	**PsGlE + PsCaE**	**37156**	**32**	**3**	**7**	**2**	**44**	**1.18**
17	Bede 3 (O)	1021				1	1	0.98
18	EpGl	1074		1			1	0.93
19	HomM 4	1431				1	1	0.70

Table 7: Aggregated Data for <io>, <ie> and <b> for [v] in Anglo-Saxon Glossed Psalters

	<io>	<ie>	<b>	Features Present	Total Forms
PsGlE + PsCaE	313	120	44	3	477
PsGlA + PsCaA	140	67	5	3	212
PsGlB		98	5	2	103
PsGlH		14		1	14
PsGlL + PsCaL		5		1	5
PsGlD		1	2	2	3
PsGlC			2	1	2
PsGlI	1			1	1