Studies in the *Paris Psalter*, metrical version



by

M. Jane Toswell

Somerville College, Oxford

Thesis submitted for the degree of D.Phil.

Faculty of English Language and Literature

University of Oxford

Michaelmas Term 1990 [i.e. 1991]

ABSTRACT

M.J. Toswell
Somerville College

D.Phil. submission
Michaelmas Term 1990

Studies in the Paris Psalter, metrical version

The metrical version of the psalter in Old English is extant principally in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MS lat. 8824, but fragments from the text and parallel versions of verses appear in three other medieval manuscripts. Chapter One of this thesis describes the manuscript of the Paris Psalter, and discusses its compilation. Chapter Two looks at the other versions of the metrical psalter, in Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter, in the Menologium, and in the Benedictine Office. The changes made to the source by the translator in the course of transposing a sacred Latin text into the vernacular are considered in Chapter Three. These alterations include additions, omissions, the use of doublets and epithets, and rearrangements of material, especially those involving shifts of tense, person, case and aspect. The chapter attempts to identify when in the psalm verse the poet was likely to add to or delete from the source in his translation. In Chapter Four a word-by-word analysis of the Latin text studies the way in which individual parts of speech are handled by the poet in his rendition. While these chapters provide no conclusive answers, they reveal some of the methods used to render the Roman psalter into Old English.

How the metrical psalter can be compared to the glossed psalters of Anglo-Saxon England is considered in Chapter Five. In Chapter Six the text is compared to other works of Old English poetry. The syntactic, metrical and alliterative structures used by the psalter poet are explored. In particular, the chapter considers the occurrence of hapax legomena in the text, and compares their incidence here with the appearance and structure of coinages in several other Old English poems. The role of the Paris Psalter is considered; perhaps it is merely bad poetry, or it may be one of the few surviving examples of liturgical poetry--a kind of poetry concerned primarily with the transmission and comprehension of sacred texts in the vernacular, and not to be judged by neo-Romantic standards.

ABSTRACT

M.J. Toswell
Somerville College

D.Phil. submission
Trinity 1990

Studies in the Paris Psalter, metrical version

The metrical version of the psalter in Old English is extant principally in Paris, Bibliotheque nationale MS lat. 8824, but fragments from the text and parallel versions of verses appear in three other medieval manuscripts. Chapter One of this thesis describes the manuscript of the Paris Psalter, and discusses its compilation. Chapter Two looks at the other versions of the metrical psalter, in Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter, in the Menologium, and in the Benedictine Office. The changes made to the source by the translator in the course of transposing a sacred Latin text into the vernacular are considered in Chapter Three. These alterations include additions, omissions, the use of doublets and epithets, and rearrangements of material, especially those involving shifts of tense, person, case and aspect. The chapter attempts to identify when in the psalm verse the poet was likely to add to or delete from the source in his translation. In Chapter Four a word-by-word analysis of the Latin text studies the way in which individual parts of speech are handled by the poet in his rendition. While these chapters provide no conclusive answers, they reveal some of the methods used to render the Roman psalter into Old English.

How the metrical psalter can be compared to the glossed psalters of Anglo-Saxon England is considered in Chapter Five. In Chapter Six the text is compared to other works of Old English poetry. The syntactic, metrical and alliterative structures used by the psalter poet are explored. In particular, the chapter considers the occurrence of hapax legomena in the text, and compares their incidence here with the appearance and structure of coinages in

several other Old English poems. The role of the Paris Psalter is considered; perhaps it is merely bad poetry, or it may be one of the few surviving examples of liturgical poetry--a kind of poetry concerned primarily with the transmission and comprehension of sacred texts in the vernacular, and not to be judged by neo-Romantic standards.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	v
Citations	vi
List of Glossed Psalters	vii
Introduction	1
The Text and its Context	
Chapter One - The Manuscript	21
Chapter Two - Texts Parallel to the *Paris Psalter*	86
The Text as Translation	
Chapter Three - Method of Translation	155
Chapter Four - Lexicon and the Method of Translation	209
The Text as Old English	
Chapter Five - The Psalter Glosses and their relationship to the *Paris Psalter*	260
Chapter Six - The Text as Old English Poetry	299
Conclusion	364
Bibliography	372
Appendices	
One - Nine Latin Prayers from B.N. MS lat. 8824	392
Two - Collation of the *Benedictine Office* with the *Paris Psalter* psalm fragments	394
Three - Epithets for God in the *Paris Psalter*	396
Four - *Hapax Legomena* in the *Paris Psalter*	406
Five - Metrical Analysis of the *Paris Psalter*, Psalms 118-122	419

Acknowledgments

The only pleasant task of the final stages of presenting a thesis is the joy of recollecting those people without whom the work would have flagged along the way, or even stopped altogether. First of all, my parents and family have nobly refrained from asking what it is that I have been doing and when it will be finished. My supervisor, Professor E.G. Stanley, has with unstinting enthusiasm and careful attention read successive drafts of this material and of much that has fallen by the wayside, greeting me on both sides of the Atlantic with the cheerful enquiry, 'Have you got anything for me to read?'—and never once yawning (in my presence at least) over the resulting piles of script. I am also indebted to my first supervisor, Mr. Alan Ward, for help and encouragement at all times; to Mr. Malcolm Parkes for several long sessions discussing the vagaries of the *Paris Psalter* manuscript; to Miss Celia Sisam for reading a very preliminary version of this material and proffering much excellent advice; and to Dr. Mark Griffith for reading and commenting on a draft version, and for long alcoholic evenings spent comparing notes on the manifest idiocies of the psalter poet. To the colleagues of the two Departments of English with which I have been associated while finishing this thesis (University of New Brunswick, Fredericton and University of Western Ontario, London), I am very grateful for numerous favours, not least of which was the discovering of odd bits of money to pay for research trips. Similarly, the editors and staff of the Dictionary of Old English at the University of Toronto have been both helpful and sympathetic, and have made space for me in the workroom on numerous occasions. I owe a debt as well to my friends in Oxford who, after surviving the initial stages of this work, welcomed each successive return to the city with remarkable patience, offers of places to stay, and vast quantities of tea and brandy. Finally, this thesis would have balked irretrievably at the last stages if it were not for the skill and kindness of Dr. R.J. Shroyer, who took an antique word-processing program with strange symbols and inconsistent layout, and made a thing of beauty, a joy until it is read.

This thesis would not have been undertaken but for the Association of Commonwealth Universities, which through the British Council provided me with three years of funding in the form of a Commonwealth Scholarship. I am also grateful to the librarians and staff of the following institutions for permission to consult books and manuscripts in their collections: Bodleian Library, Oxford; Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; British Library, London; Robarts Research Library, Toronto; Harriet Irving Library, Fredericton; and D.B. Weldon Library, London, Ontario.

Citations

Citation of Old English texts by abbreviation follows the system in Bruce Mitchell, Christopher Ball, and Angus Cameron, 'Short Titles of Old English Texts' *ASE* 4 (1975), pp. 207-21, and 'Short Titles of Old English Texts: Addenda and Corrigenda' *ASE* 8 (1979), pp. 331-3. The abbreviations for journals and series are those which appear preceding the Bibliography in issues of *Anglo-Saxon England*, except that the Early English Text Society is abbreviated E.E.T.S., and o.s. marks the original series, s.s. the supplementary series. The abbreviation *PPs* is used throughout for the *Paris Psalter*, metrical version, except that when it is being compared with the glossed psalters it is referred to as P. The sigla for the glossed psalters, and full references to the standard editions, are listed on the ensuing pages for ease of reference. Full references are given to works when they are first mentioned; author and short-title forms are used for subsequent reference to the same work. Otherwise, the abbreviations are those in general use.

List of Glossed Psalters

This list includes the manuscript, date, relative length, editions, and important works exclusively about each Anglo-Saxon glossed psalter.

A Vespasian c. 875-900 B.L. MS Cotton Vespasian A i
approx. 32,500 words
Ed. Sherman M. Kuhn (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965). See the glossary by C. Grimm, *Glossar zum Vespasian-Psalter und den Hymnen.* (Heidelberg, 1906). The language, and comparisons to other psalter glosses, is also analyzed in H. Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglischen.* (Berlin, 1955). The facsimile is ed. D.H. Wright, E.E.M.F. 14 (Copenhagen, 1967).

B Junius c. 925 Bodleian MS Junius 27
approx. 32,500 words
Ed. E. Brenner, *Der altenglische Junius-Psalter.* Anglistische Forschungen 23 (Heidelberg, 1908).

C Cambridge c. 1025 C.U.L. MS Ff. 1. 23
approx. 33,000 words
very well edited, with references to other psalter glosses in the notes, K. Wildhagen, *Der Cambridger-Psalter.* Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 7 (Hamburg, 1910; rpr. Darmstadt, 1964).

D Royal or Regius c. 950 B.L. MS Royal 2 B v
approx. 32,500 words
F. Roeder, ed. *Der altenglische Regius-Psalter.* Studien zur englischen Philologie (Halle, 1904). See also William J. Davey, *An Edition of the Regius Psalter and Its Latin Commentary.* (Ph.D. diss., Ottawa, 1979).

E Eadwine or Canterbury c. 1150 Trinity College, Cambridge MS R. 17. 1
approx. 36,000 words
Most accessible edition is F. Harsley, *Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter.* E.E.T.S. o.s. 92 (1889), text only; commentary and introduction never published. See also the dissertation of B.L. Liles, *The Canterbury Psalter: An Edition with Notes and Glossary.* (Ph.D., Stanford, 1967) and of Frank-Gunter Berghaus (Göttingen, 1985), and the vocabulary study in Charles D. Ludlum, *A Critical Commentary on the Vocabulary of the Canterbury Psalter.* (Ph.D., Stanford, 1954). The facsimile (reduced) is ed. M.R. James, *The Canterbury Psalter.* (London, 1935).

F Stowe or Spelman c. 1050-75 manuscript lost; copy in B.L. MS Stowe 2
A. Kimmens, ed. *The Stowe Psalter.* (Toronto, 1979); John Spelman, ed. *Psalterium Davidis Latino-Saxonicum Vetus* (London: R. Badger, 1640); James Rosier, ed., 'The Stowe Canticles' *Anglia* 82 (1964), 397-432.

G Vitellius c. 1050 B.L. MS Cotton Vitellius E xviii
J.L. Rosier, ed., *The Vitellius Psalter.* Cornell Studies in English 42 (Ithaca, 1972).

H Tiberius c. 1050-75 B.L. MS Cotton Tiberius C vi
A.P. Campbell, ed. *The Tiberius Psalter.* (Ottawa, 1974).

I Lambeth c. 1025 Lambeth Palace (London) MS 427
38,000 words
well edited by U. Lindelöf, *Der Lambeth-Psalter.* Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae. (Helsingfors, 1909-14).

J Arundel c. 1050-75 B.L. MS Arundel 60
32,500 words
G. Oess, ed. *Der altenglische Arundel-Psalter.* Anglistische Forschungen 30. (Heidelberg, 1910).

K Salisbury c. 975 Salisbury Cathedral MS. 150
28,000 words
C. Sisam & K. Sisam, ed., *The Salisbury Psalter.* E.E.T.S. o.s. 242 (London, 1959).

L Bosworth c. 975-1000 B.L. MS Additional 37517
5,000 words
partial edition U. Lindelöf, *Die altenglischen Glossen im Bosworth-Psalter.* (Helsingfors, 1909). See also the dissertation of John M. Makothakat, *The Bosworth Psalter: A Critical Edition* (M.A. diss., Ottawa, 1972).

M Blickling or Lothian, also now called Pierpont Morgan.
Morgan Library, New York, MS 776
scattered glosses, some eighth century, ed. H. Sweet, *The Oldest English Texts.* E.E.T.S. o.s. 83 (1885) pp. 122-...; some eleventh century ed E. Brock in *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. R. Morris. E.E.T.S. o.s. 63 (1876), pp. 251-63. See also the dissertation of Phillip J. Pulsiano, *Materials for an Edition of 'The Blickling Psalter' (Latin Text).* (Ph.D. diss., SUNY, 1982).

P Paris c. 1025-50 Paris, B.N. MS lat. 8824
29,000 words in metrical version
See references to published editions in text; facsimile ed. B. Colgrave et al. E.E.M.F. 8 (Copenhagen, 1958). The prose portion is edited in two dissertations: Angela Pitt (M.A. thesis, Ottawa, 1971) and Patrick Paul O'Neill (Ph.D., Pennsylvania, 1980); the latter is now forthcoming in print with the Medieval Academy.

Q? Three fragments from a single eleventh-century psalter ed. Klaus Dietz, 'Die altenglische Psalterglossen der HS. Cambridge, Pembroke College 312,' *Anglia* 86 (1968) 273-9; and Rene Derolez, 'A New Psalter Fragment with O.E. Glosses,' *English Studies*, 53 (1972), 401-08.

Latin Versions of the Psalter:

R or RPs or Roman Roman psalter

Ga Gallican psalter, used later as the psalter in the Vulgate.

He Hebrew psalter

The critical edition of the Roman psalter *is* R. Weber, ed. *Le Psautier romain et les autres anciens psautiers latins.* Collectanea biblica Latina 10 (Rome, 1953).

An edition of the latter two versions is ed. Alberto Colunga & Laurentio Turrado. *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam clementinam.* Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos (Madrid, 1982). For all three see Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples, ed. *Quincuplex Psalterium* (Geneva, 1979; facsimile of edition of 1513).

Introduction

According to Bede, St. Augustine and his companions, upon their entry into Canterbury in 597, quickly found the church built in ancient times in honour of St. Martin, and:

> In hac ergo et ipsi primo conuenire psallere orare missas facere predicare et baptizare coeperunt.[1]

Their first concern was to to observe the fundamental practices of the faith—singing the psalms, praying, saying the Mass, preaching and baptizing. First on this list, whether by accident or design, is **psallere**, the recitation of the psalter.[2]

Elsewhere in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* Bede laments the passing of the Golden Age that existed in Northumbria under the aegis of another early leader of the Christian church, Aidan. Those were the glorious days when, in contrast to **nostri temporis segnitia**:

> omnes qui cum eo incedebant, siue adtonsi seu laici, meditari deberent, id est aut legendis scripturis aut psalmis discendis operam dare.[3]

All of the followers of Aidan were occupied in some form of study, whether reading the scriptures or learning the psalms. This meditation and study applied to both religious and secular followers; Bede lauds their industry.

In both of these cases the pre-eminent text, a primary devotional text of the

---

[1] Colgrave, Bertram and R.A.B. Mynors, ed. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People.* (Oxford, 1969), Book I, Chapter 26, p. 76.

[2] **psallere** could simply be 'to sing hymns'.

[3] *HE*, Bk. III, Ch. 5, p. 226.

Church, is the psalter. The psalms remain the basic text of the Christian faith, a reflection of piety and belief—the first, and in some ways the most important, item of Christian teaching. In the English church before the Norman Conquest, the psalter seems to have been widely available,[4] being glossed and even translated into Anglo-Saxon with a remarkable frequency.[5]

The desire to render necessary texts into the vernacular was a widespread one in Anglo-Saxon England. Bede on his deathbed was engaged in a translation of the Gospel of St. John, according to Cuthbert.[6] Two centuries later, Ælfric, despite his reservations, was persuaded to translate part of the first seven books of the Bible, which are collected in the *Heptateuch.*[7] All of his translation was concerned with the arrangement and

---

[4] See Minnie Cate Morrell, *A Manual of Old English Biblical Materials.* (Knoxville: Univ. of Tennessee Press, 1965) for a list and discussion of the psalter in Anglo-Saxon England. Morrell's book is intended in part to supersede Albert S. Cook, *Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers.* [First Series] (London: Macmillan, 1898), but does not really do so.

[5] See G.T. Shepherd, 'English Versions of the Scriptures before Wyclif' in *Cambridge History of the Bible.* Vol. 2, ed. G.W.H. Lampe. (Cambridge, 1969) pp. 362-87.

[6] Colgrave & Mynors, 'Epistola de Obitu Bedae', p. 582. See also Andre Crepin. 'Bede and the Vernacular' in *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede.* ed. G. Bonner. (London: SPCK, 1976), pp. 170-92.

[7] Crawford, S.J. ed. *The Old English Version of the Heptateuch.* E.E.T.S. o.s. 160 (Oxford, 1922; rep. 1969). For the distinction between the work of Ælfric and that of an anonymous translator, see C.R. Dodwell and P. Clemoes, ed. *The Old English Illustrated Hexateuch,* E.E.M.F. 18 (Copenhagen, 1974) pp. 42-53, following F. Dietrich, 'Abt AElfrik', *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie* 25 (1855) pp. 487-594; and 26 (1856) pp. 163-256. A glossary of the work of the anonymous translator is Andrea B. Smith, *The Anonymous Parts of the Old English Hexateuch: A Latin-Old English/Old English-Latin Glossary.* (Cambridge, 1985). See also Andrea B. Smith, *Old English Words for Old Testament Law: The Evidence of the Anonymous Parts of the Old English Hexateuch and other Literal Translations of Latin.* (Ph.D., Cambridge, 1987) and

explication of important biblical texts and doctrines for the laity. Such a concern with understanding these crucial texts in the vernacular must have been an overwhelming one, for it led such monks as the Northumbrian priest Aldred to write an interlinear gloss of the text between the lines of one of the greatest display manuscripts produced in Western Europe, the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (B.L. Cotton MS Nero D. iv).[8] Many other biblical manuscripts received similar treatment in England, including the Macregol Gospels (Rushworth Gospels, Bodleian, MS Auct. D.2.19) and the Vespasian Psalter (B.L. Cotton MS Vespasian A. i).[9] Other Anglo-Saxon translators were less literal, more concerned with explaining the meaning of the text than with reproducing its message word by word. Such, for example, was Alfred, who implemented a program of translation and paraphrase of a number of important works, both biblical and exegetical. This was the impetus for the translation of the *Dialogues* of Gregory by Bishop Wærferð, and for the versions of Gregory's *Pastoral Care*, Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy* (not strictly a Christian work but taken by the early church as a appropriate philosophical and ethical dialogue) and St. Augustine's *Soliloquies*. The Anglo-Saxons seem to have had few or no scruples about the possible difficulties of interpretation and understanding which the use of translations can precipitate. As Alfred says:

---

references there.

[8] Kendrick, T.D., R.L.S. Bruce-Mitford, H. Roosen-Runge, A.S.C. Ross, E.G. Stanley, A.E.A. Werner, ed. *Evangeliorum quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis: Musei Britannici Codex Cottonianus Nero D. iv.* 2 vols. (Lausanne, 1956-60).

[9] See Wright, D.H. and A. Campbell, ed. *The Vespasian Psalter.* EEMF 14 (Copenhagen, 1967). There is no facsimile of the Rushworth Gospels.

> Forðy me ðyncð betre, gif iow swæ ðyncð, ðæt we eac sume bec, ða ðe niedbeðearfosta sien eallum monnum to wiotonne, ðæt we ða on ðæt geðiode wenden ðe we ealle gecnawan mægen, ond gedon...ðætte eall sio gioguð ðe nu is on Angelcynne friora monna...ðe hie wel cunnen Englisc gewrit arædan. Lære mon siððan furður on Lædengeðiode ða ðe mon furðor læran wille ond to hierran hade don wille.[10]

That translations are, to the king and his circle, the only way to ensure literacy in England seems certain.[11] Young men of good family with sufficient funds are to be instructed first in their own language, and only those whom one wishes to teach further and who aspire to the higher calling of the clerical life will be taught Latin.[12] The assumption here, and throughout much of the four centuries of Anglo-Saxon rule in Christian England, seems to be that vernacular versions of scriptural and doctrinal texts are necessary adjuncts to understanding. They are not despised cribs, but valued tools.

The psalms, more than other biblical texts, held particular appeal for those interested in the vernacular.[13] Of the approximately 36 extant psalter manuscripts produced or owned in England up to 1100, fourteen are wholly or partly glossed in Old

---

[10] Bruce Mitchell & Fred C. Robinson, *A Guide to Old English.* Fourth Edition. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), p. 191.

[11] But see Jennifer J. Morrish, *An Examination of Literacy and Learning in England in the Ninth Century.* (D.Phil., Oxford, 1982) and 'King Alfred's Letter as a Source of Learning in England in the Ninth Century' in *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose.* ed. P.E. Szarmach (Albany, 1986) pp. 87-108. See also E.G. Stanley, 'King Alfred's Prefaces' *RES* n.s. 39 (1988) pp. 349-64.

[12] Compare, for instance Odo of Cluny's discussion of Gerald of Aurillac (written 909-942), in which Gerald studies letters only to the extent of going through his psalter; for an analysis of this as an instance of lay literacy see R. McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the written word.* (Cambridge, 1989) pp. 217-8.

[13] See, for instance, Patricia Hollahan, *The Anglo-Saxon Use of the Psalms: Liturgical Background and Poetic Use.* (Ph.D., Illinois, 1977).

English, and one is a complete translation.[14] Not quite one-half of the extant psalters, then, provide evidence of a concern with the vernacular. Since monks had to learn the Latin psalter as a matter of everyday routine, part at least of the interest in vernacular versions of the psalms was presumably secular.

Psalters, even in the earlier Middle Ages, tended to be elegant manuscripts, often produced for royalty or the higher nobility. They were the most common books for private devotions, not supplanted by Books of Hours until the fourteenth century.[15] Usually, they included the psalms, divided and ordered in one of a number of ways, and a set of canticles or a set of biblical passages for readings. They were often elaborately decorated books, with illuminated versals and illustrations following one of a number of programmes. For instance, the Werden Psalter (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, MS. theol. lat. fol. 358), written in Caroline minuscule at Werden ca. 1039, has six full-page miniatures, and 190 gold or silver initials. The Dagulf Psalter (Vienna, ONB MS. lat 1861), commissioned by Charlemagne as a gift for Hadrian at the end of the eighth century, has five ornamental pages on purple, and the whole text is written in gold letters. The ninth-century Athelstan Psalter (B.L. Cotton MS Galba A. xviii) is made more elaborate by the addition of miniatures at several strategic points in the manuscript after its arrival

---

[14] Gneuss, Helmut. 'A preliminary list of manuscripts written or owned in England up to 1100' *Anglo-Saxon England* 9 (1981), pp. 1-60. A supplement to this list is in preparation. More particularly, see H. Gneuss, 'Liturgical books in Anglo-Saxon England and their Old English terminology' in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England. Studies presented to Peter Clemoes.* Ed. M. Lapidge & H. Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985) pp. 91-141, at 114-6.

[15] See Robert G. Calkins, *Illuminated Books of the Middle Ages.* (London, 1983).

in England in the tenth century.[16] The Book of Cerne (C.U.L. Ll. 1. 10) is a ninth-century production including a breviate psalter, a manuscript often compared to the Lindisfarne Gospels (B.L. Cotton MS Nero D. iv) and the Book of Kells (Dublin, Trinity College MS 58) for its material, and to the Royal Bible (B.L. MS. Royal 1 E. vi) and other Canterbury manuscripts for its illustration and iconography. All of these examples predate the beautiful psalter manuscripts of East Anglia in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, and the later development of these manuscripts for private prayer and devotion—the spectacular Books of Hours produced in Flanders and northern France in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Some of these psalters were for liturgical purposes, but the greater number of them were used by pious secular individuals.

Monks, on the other hand, were enjoined by the dicta of their orders to know the psalms.[17] The Rule of St. Benedict, for instance, requires that the full complement of one hundred and fifty psalms and canticles must be maintained every week, although they may be arranged according to choice.[18] Benedict cites the early fathers as if they commonly recited the whole psalter in a single day, and imputes extreme indolence and lack of devotion to those who fail in the lesser task of repeating the psalter and customary canticles weekly:

---

[16] See Simon Keynes, 'King Athelstan's books' in *Learning and Literature*, pp. 143-201 at 193-6 for a discussion of how tenuous the link with Athelstan is here. See also *The Golden Age of Anglo-Saxon Art 966-1066.* ed. J. Backhouse, D.H. Turner & L. Webster. British Museum Publication. (London, 1984) pp. 20-4.

[17] See Ed. Timothy Fry *et al.* *The Rule of St. Benedict.* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1981) pp. 203-17 and Appendix 5 'Monastic Formation and Profession' pp. 437-66.

[18] *RB*, p. 214-5.

> Quia nimis inertem devotionis suae servitium ostendunt monachi qui minus a psalterio cum canticis consuetudinariis per septimanae circulum psallunt
> (*RB* Ch. 18.25, p. 214)

Oblates, of course, learned the psalter for two reasons: it taught the basic rules and methods of devotion to God, and provided the rudiments of Latin grammar and syntax. Since in the early Middle Ages the psalter was perceived first of all as prophecy, as a prefiguration in the Old Testament of Christ's coming, it remained an allegorical text of the greatest significance, the great guide for correct living. Furthermore, the psalms were the work of a single author, David—the prophet king, psalmist and direct ancestor of Christ—so they had great cumulative authority as words of praise and prophecy. In Anglo-Saxon England, this cumulative authority was especially significant, for the royal genealogies as a rule include Christ, and by implication his forefather David, as a direct ancestor to the present king.[19]

What seems remarkable about Anglo-Saxon England in this context is the extent to which, from the earliest moments of conversion, the secular world was involved in the study of devotional texts like the psalms, and in rumination concerning the fulfilment of the songs' prophecy. This concern is reflected both in the number of extant psalter manuscripts which contain vernacular glosses, and in the documented involvement of lay people in the explication and dissemination of Christian spirituality. From King Eadwine's conversion in Northumbria and the advice of the unnamed counsellor who preferred the hope of a future life to the continued winter storm that the traditional

---

[19] See K. Sisam, 'Anglo-Saxon Royal Genealogies' *PBA* 39 (1953) pp. 287-346 at 320-1. The direct source is Luke 3: 23-38.

metaphor of the sparrow evoked,[20] to Oswald's decision to set up the first cross in all of Bernicia at *Hefenfelth*, already named in the vernacular 'the heavenly field'[21] the noblemen of England were closely involved in the decision to convert and the method used for spreading the new religion.[22] In each case an appeal to the vernacular, to popular traditions and native knowledge, was made. Such an appeal was sanctioned by Pope Gregory, who recommended that Augustine and Mellitus use native holy places and beliefs wherever possible, adapting them to suit Christian purposes.[23] In England, the people themselves accomplished this transformation.

The lay brothers and ordinary converts to the Church participated in this practice of using and adapting the vernacular for Christian purposes. Bede is particularly impressed by the work of a lay brother in the double monastery of Streoneshealh in 664, who was gifted with the ability to turn Christian stories into Anglo-Saxon poetry of the native tradition.[24] This native verse has as its most striking and effective rhetorical technique that of variation, of repetition with slight shifts of emphasis or intent, of further enumeration of the material with added detail. This technique of variation parallels the

---

[20] Bede, *HE*, Bk. II, Ch. 13, pp. 182-4.

[21] Bk. III, Ch. 2, p. 215.

[22] See, for a basic account, Sir Frank Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1971) pp. 105-22. For further detail, see Henry Mayr-Harting, *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England*. (London: Batsford, 1972), pp. 13-128. This involvement in conversion was by no means exclusive Anglo-Saxon, but it is characteristic of English piety.

[23] *HE*, Bk. I, Ch. 30 'Letter to Mellitus', p. 106.

[24] *HE*, Bk. IV, Ch. 24, pp. 414-21.

process of meditation, in which the same material is repeated over and over, and studied from every possible angle to reveal every aspect of the fruit which can be drawn from it.[25] Cædmon's use of a similar technique is signalled by Bede's comment in his introduction to the story of this miraculous gift: *[Cædmon] æfter medmiclum fæce in scopgereorde.*[26] Bede suggests that the herdsman takes an appropriate length of time to consider each aspect of the material before rendering it into Anglo-Saxon verse. Similarly, the Old English translation describes his procedure at a later stage:

> þa he ða hæfde þa wisan onfongne, þa eode he ham to his huse, and cwom eft on morgenne, ond þy betstan leoðe geglenged him asong ond ageaf þæt him beboden wæs.[27]

Again, Cædmon takes time to go home and think about the material, to ruminate upon its meaning, before transforming it into Anglo-Saxon poetry. Bede notes this explicitly in the next lines, commenting that after Cædmon had proved himself, he was instructed in the whole course of sacred history and learned by **rememorando secum et quasi mundum animal ruminando.** He learned the material by memorizing it and ruminating upon it, and then turned it into verse. Part of this deliberation is obviously the result of the time it takes to do the translation and to make appropriate poetry, but the emphasis Bede places on Cædmon's carefully taking the material and pondering it for a given length of time, especially in the context of a miracle story in which the lay brother has

---

[25] See Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God.* tr. C. Misrahi. 3rd ed. (New York, 1982), pp. 15-17, 71-88 and *passim.*

[26] Mitchell & Robinson, *Guide*, p. 205.

[27] *Guide*, p. 207.

been granted a sudden magnificent gift which one might think would operate instantaneously, argues for a deliberate attempt to point out the meditative, as well as vernacular and secular, importance of the translation process in Cædmon's mind.

Within the context of this vernacular, secular, and meditative tradition, it is not surprising that the practice of glossing each word of the psalter might not suffice for some. A full poetic translation of the psalter was completed, probably in the middle or late years of the tenth century. Such a translation derives partly from the tradition of poetic paraphrase of books of the Bible, and partly is an extension of the systematic glossing being developed in the Anglo-Saxon glossed psalters. This poetic translation was circulated in late tenth and early eleventh century England, and appears in some form in four different manuscripts. Chief among these is Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MS lat. 8824, called by Anglo-Saxonists the *Paris Psalter*,[28] in which the last hundred psalms of this poetic translation are preserved. The manuscript is very long and very narrow, a peculiar shape; the poetic version of the psalms appears in a column down the right-hand side of each folio, facing the Latin text. The narrowness of the columns and the careful layout of the manuscript as a whole suggest that some particular purpose lay behind the production of the codex. A description of the manuscript and a consideration of its provenance appear in the next chapter.

Other manuscripts from late Anglo-Saxon England preserve parts of this poetic

---

[28] Two other manuscripts of the Bibliothèque nationale are known as the Paris Psalter in other fields: MS lat. 8846 is a display psalter of the early thirteenth century, also made in England, and often called the Paris Psalter by art historians; and MS Gr. 139 is a Byzantine copy of the psalter, an example of tenth century Greek art. All three manuscripts also have iconographical parallels with the Utrecht Psalter.

version, some parallel to the *Paris Psalter* text, and others representing fragments of the lost first quinquagene of the translation. Three lines from the text occur in the late tenth century poem known as the *Menologium*, found in British Library MS Cotton Tiberius B i, where the poem appears as prefatory material to the B version of the Chronicle. A longer passage substitutes for a lost portion of the Anglo-Saxon interlinear gloss in an early twelfth century display manuscript of the psalter known either as the *Canterbury Psalter* or the *Eadwine Psalter* (Cambridge, Trinity College R.17.1). The third, and in some ways the most interesting, of these parallel texts is the psalm fragments used in the Old English explanatory version of *The Benedictine Office*, produced at Worcester in the early eleventh century and preserved in a well-known Wulfstan manuscript, Bodleian Library MS Junius 121, ff. 42v-54r. The second chapter will consider these parallel texts, and will provide a new edition of the Benedictine fragments, which present interesting textual parallels to the *Paris Psalter* version, as well as representing parts of the translation not elsewhere preserved.

This poetic version of the psalter known traditionally as the *Paris Psalter* (henceforth abbreviated as *PPs*) has had four major editions. The most recent of these is in some ways the most useful, the facsimile edition in the *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile* series, published in 1958.[29] Owing to the chosen editor's illness, a panel of contributing editors wrote the introduction, resulting in perhaps greater lucidity in the individual sections, but less overall coherence. The facsimile edition remains the most

---

[29] Colgrave, Bertram, ed. with contributions by John I'a Bromwich, N.R. Ker, Francis Wormald, Kenneth Sisam and Celia Sisam. *The Paris Psalter.* E.E.M.F. 8 (Copenhagen, 1958).

important recent addition to studies of the metrical psalms and the *Paris Psalter* manuscript. The earliest edition of the text, by Benjamin Thorpe and published in 1835, is the only one to acknowledge the significance of the facing Latin text, and to print the *Paris Psalter* with the Latin and Old English texts side by side.[30] Unfortunately, there are serious errors in the Latin text, as Thorpe appears to have collated the manuscript against the Vulgate.[31] The second edition of the text, the first critical edition, is Grein's in the second volume of his *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie*, published in 1858.[32] Grein edited the metrical psalms with some care, suggesting liberal emendation, and collating against the manuscript and Thorpe's edition. He also considered the vocabulary of the metrical psalter in more detail than it has since been accorded in his excellent dictionary of the poetry.[33] In Wülker's revised version of the series, Bruno Assmann provided essentially the same edition, with a slightly more conservative policy of emendation, and the inclusion for the first time of the *Benedictine Office* fragments.[34] The standard critical edition of the text, however, is in Volume V of the *Anglo-Saxon*

---

[30] Thorpe, Benjamin, ed. *Libri Psalmorum Versio Antiqua Latina: cum Paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica.* (Oxford, 1835). One of the two copies in the Bodleian Library has annotations by Joseph Bosworth.

[31] See Gustav Tanger, 'Collation des Pariser altenglischen Psalters mit Thorpe's Ausgabe' *Anglia* 6 (1883) pp. 125-41 for a collation of Thorpe's text with the manuscript.

[32] Grein, C.W.M., ed. *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie.*Zweiter Band. Text II (Göttingen, 1858).

[33] C.W.M. Grein, rev. J.J. Köhler. *Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter.* (Heidelberg, 1912).

[34] Grein, C.W.M. and R.P. Wülker, ed. *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie.* III Band-2 Hälfte, ed. B. Assmann (Leipzig, 1898).

Poetic Records, edited by G.P. Krapp, and published in 1932.[35] Krapp's edition is extremely accurate, with only one copying error in the entire text.[36] His editorial policy is to keep 'faithfully to the MS. unless emendation is essential.'[37] Such a policy requires occasional revision and comment in light of later scholarship. Also, Krapp did not produce a glossary of the text. A new edition seems necessary.

This thesis began as that new edition of the metrical psalms, and to that end I transcribed the manuscript, collated it against the previous editions, annotated a large part of the text, and produced a glossary—all of which endeavour lies behind the rest of the present work, but has not been produced here for reasons of space. The production of a glossary, in particular, led to a number of questions about the poet's approach to translation and the techniques of rendering the Latin into Old English. Providing preliminary answers to those questions is the concern of the following three chapters. The last two chapters consider the text in its context as a work in Old English, and particularly its place in the Anglo-Saxon poetic tradition. Some of the considerations discussed in these chapters might best be introduced by way of an example.

---

[35] Krapp, George P., ed. *The Paris Psalter and the Metres of Boethius*. Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records Volume V (New York: Columbia, 1932).

[36] In 103.25.3a where the manuscript, Thorpe, Grein, and Grein-Wulker read *him bysmere* but Krapp has, without a note, *his bysmere*. See *Computers and Old English Concordances*. Ed. A. Cameron, R. Frank and J. Leyerle. Report of a Conference held in March 1969. (Toronto, 1970), p. 25, where it is mentioned that no errors in the reporting of manuscripts had been discovered to date in *ASPR*. J.C. Pope said he thought he had found one--probably this one.

[37] B. Colgrave rvw. of Krapp, ed. *The Paris Psalter* in *MLR* 28 (1933) pp. 495-6 at 495.

Psalm 69 is a useful choice for analysis, especially since its first verse became the versicle used at the beginning of each of the Offices and remains the verse most often recited in the Western Church. It invokes God's help as an opening versicle or antiphon throughout the liturgy:

1. Wes drihten god deore fultum;
   beheald, drihten, me and me hraðe syþþan
   gefultuma æt feorhþearfe.
2. Þonne beoð gescende and scame dreogað;
   þa þe mine fynd fæcne wæron
   and mine sawle sohton mid niðe.
3. Hi on hinderlincg hweorfað and cyrrað;
   ealle hiora scamien þe me yfel hogedon.
4. And heora æfstu eac ealle sceamien,
   þe me word cwædon: "Weg la, weg la!"
5. Habban þa mid wynne weorðe blisse;
   þa þe secean symble drihten
   and symble cweðen: "Sy þin miht, drihten!"
   and þine hælu holde lufigean.
6. Ic eom wædla and worldþearfa;
   gefultuma me, god, frea ælmihtig.
7. Þu me fultum eart fæste drihten
   eart alysend min; ne lata þu awiht.[38]

1. Deus in adiutorium meum intende: domine ad adiuuandum me festina.
2. Confundantur et reuereantur inimici mei: qui querunt animam meam.
3. Auertantur retrorsum et erubescant: qui cogitant mihi mala.
4. Auertantur statim erubescentes: qui dicunt mihi euge euge.
5. Exultent et laetentur qui querunt te domine et: dicant semper magnificetur dominus: qui diligunt salutare tuum.
6. Ego uero egenus et pauper sum: deus adiuua me.
(7.) Adiutor meus et liberator meus es tu: domine ne tardaueris.[39]

---

[38] This quotation, and all others from the *Paris Psalter*, is taken from Krapp's edition and checked against the facsimile and other editions. The punctuation, however, is substantially simplified from that which appears in Krapp. Punctuation of a psalter is quite formal, and it seems advisable to follow that convention here.

[39] This quotation, and all others from the Roman Psalter, is taken from the Vespasian Psalter and checked against the definitive edition: Dom Robert Weber, ed. *Le Psautier*

The poet translates phrase for phrase in the psalm, completing each *membrum* of the verse before moving on.[40] The first verse, for instance, sticks very closely both to the Latin and to the psalter glosses. Some difficulty with alliteration in the last line results in an addition to the Latin, the *hapax legomenon feorhþearfe*, or 'in mortal need.' The same technique, fuelled by the same difficulty, recurs in the sixth verse, where a compound with the same root—*worldþearfa*, 'in worldly need'—is produced for the same alliterative purpose.[41] The use of the same root provides some continuity of thought in the psalm, but the repetition does not noticeably add to the sense.

The poet also makes use of a standard Anglo-Saxon poetic technique in the first verse, and throughout the metrical psalms: the filler adverb or adjective. These stock words, used most commonly in the head stave of each line, do not add greatly to the meaning but simply provide necessary alliteration. In *PPs* these adverbs and adjectives can become almost bleached of their meanings, serving only as metrical and alliterative markers. For instance, *deore* occurs here, as it does twenty-four times elsewhere in the text, as an addition to the Latin, and translates as 'dear' or 'kind', a not unpleasant

---

romain et les autres psautiers latins, Collectanea Biblica Latina 10 (Rome, 1953).

[40] To avoid confusion of terms, this thesis will normally use the standard psalter term 'membrum' when referring to a clause of the Latin psalm verse. Each psalm verse of the Roman psalter usually consists of two 'membra' or two distinct, often parallel, clauses.

[41] See, for a detailed discussion of all the *hapax legomena* and unique occurrences in both the prose and poetry of the *Paris Psalter*, J.D. Tinkler, *Vocabulary and Syntax of the Old English Version in the* Paris Psalter. (The Hague, 1971) Janua Linguarum, Series Practica, 67. At the end of his analysis of the coinages, Tinkler devotes two short chapters to discussion of filler adverbs and stock phrases, and to syntactic analysis. Discussion of the *hapax legomena* mentioned here occurs on p. 49 and pp. 56-7.

elaboration of *fultum*, but not a necessary one. Rather than translating **festina** with a verb suggesting the need to hurry, the poet uses an adverb-verb combination, *hraðe...gefultuma*, which repeats, to no purpose, the *fultum* of l. 1, but allows for *h*-alliteration in the second line with *beheald*. *hraðe* is thus a necessary part of the translation here, but also provides alliteration. The same technique is clear in a number of other verses, including v. 2 *fæcne* (37 times in the text, primarily for alliteration), v. 5 *symble* (two occurrences in the psalm, one of which is signalled in the Latin, and 97 occurrences elsewhere in the whole psalter as an addition); v. 5 *holde*; and v. 7 *fæste* (as an added adverb, 57 occurrences).

The translation of the second verse is much closer to the practical tradition of A, the Vespasian Psalter. Where the D-gloss suggests such scholarly versions of **confundantur & reuereantur** as *forwandian*, 'to hesitate, to be ashamed', and even (in the next verse) *areoddian*, 'to blush, redden, to put to shame', the poet holds to the simple combination of *gescamian* and the adjective *scende*. The practical, liturgical text is easier to alliterate with and provides a simpler interpretation.

In the third verse the poet fails to elude a major difficulty. The first line is a problem, because no appropriate verb will alliterate with either A's *bec* or D's *cyrrað*; the psalter poet places the literal translation as the fourth stress of his line, producing the verb doublet *hweorfeð and cyrrað*. However, the alliteration still will not work with the available psalter gloss words, so the psalter poet makes use of another approach—the application of a new meaning, or at least the extension of meaning, of an already-existing word. Here, *hinderlincg*, a noun from the legal lexicon meaning, 'a mean, base or

contemptible person' is used to translate the Latin **retrorsum**, meaning 'backwards'.[42] The same meaning is applied to *hinderlincg* in 55.8 by the psalter poet, the only occurrences of the word with the meaning 'backwards, to the back' in Anglo-Saxon. Possibly the noun is a reformation from the adverb *hinder*, meaning 'back, behind, on the further side', but if this is so, a similar extension of meaning has taken place. It also seems likely that the play on meanings is deliberate here. In any case, in order to provide alliteration on *h* in 69.3.1, the poet adds a doublet verb and stretches the meaning of another word.

In verse four, the poet produces standard renditions of the Latin, except for the possibly onomatopoetic *weg la! weg la!* to translate **euge, euge.** This bears some resemblance to A's *weolga!*, meaning 'hail' in the glossaries, and to D's *egela*, which appears to be a reformation of the Latin with no explicit meaning in Anglo-Saxon.[43] The psalter poet's version is somewhere between the two gloss traditions. In verse six, as in verse one, the poet pads out the line with epithets not signalled by the source text: v. 6 *frea ælmihtig,* v. 1 *drihten god; deore fultum.* Such poetic additions are again features of both psalmic verse and Anglo-Saxon tradition. It is difficult to determine

---

[42] The Bosworth-Toller Supplement adds *on-hinderling* as an adverb meaning 'backwards' based on 55.8 and 69.3, and compares *on-bæcling* 113.5, three times in the Blickling Homilies, in the prose psalter at 43.19, and in *Christ and Satan* l. 698.

[43] The Gallican reading here is **euge euge**, and the Hebrew has **vahvah**. For a reliable edition of the Roman and Gallican psalters presented in a parallel text see *Biblia Vulgata*. ed. A. Colunga & L. Turrado. (Madrid, 1982). The best edition of the Gallican and Hebrew versions in a parallel text is R. Weber, ed. *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. (Stuttgart, 1983). For a less reliable text which usefully provides all three versions of the psalter and medieval commentary see Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples. *Quincuplex Psalterium*. Facsimile de l'édition de 1513 (Geneva: Droz, 1979).

which tradition bulked larger in the mind of the psalter poet as he constructed his verse, particularly since both poetic paradigms derive from an oral culture.

The last verse of the psalm accords very closely with the A-gloss of the Vespasian Psalter: *fultum min 7 alesend min ðu earð, dryhten ne leata ðu.* The only differences in the verse are the addition of *fæste* for alliteration, and *awiht* as a fourth stress in the second line, and the shift in word order so that *drihten*, which should be at the beginning of the second membrum, appears half-way through the translation of the first membrum, providing the fourth stress of the first line of the verse. Where the material is rearranged, the changes do not extend beyond the limit of the individual psalm verse, and the shifts remain minimal, always dictated by the need for literal translation. The relationship of the metrical psalter to its Latin source, and the details of the method of translation, will be considered in Chapters Three to Five.

Within each membrum, then, the psalter poet translated as literally as possible, often in agreement with the psalter gloss tradition. Whether psalter glosses were used and which in particular were consulted for the translation is an interesting problem.[44] Little certainty accrues to arguments about which tradition the poet more closely followed, if indeed one gloss seems to be more 'quoted' than any other. It is similarly unclear whether the poet was in possession of glossed psalter manuscripts, or simply remembered the glosses from a common stock of psalter translation and explication. Chapter Five will

---

[44] The problem has been considered by Sarah Larratt Keefer, *The Old English Metrical Psalter: An Annotated Set of Collation Lists with the Psalter Glosses.* (New York: Garland, 1979). Collations of many of the psalters, including *PPs*, also lie behind K. Wildhagen's edition of the Cambridge Psalter.

consider these questions more closely.

Finally, the thesis will study the extent to which the techniques of repetition, variation, the shifts in word order, the use of epithets, the extension of meanings, the appearance of *hapax legomena*, and the use of alliterative filler words affect the text. They detract from rather than add to the intensity of the poetry, but add somewhat to the content of the translation.[45] Analysis of Psalm 69 also reveals anomalies in the metre, although metrically the text is extremely regular, with a very low number of verses which do not scan.[46] Like other close translations, *PPs* has a preponderance of unstressed syllables, less variety in the use of verse types, more vowel alliteration, and more metrical dependence on words which would not ordinarily be stressed. In the eighteen lines of this psalm, for example, there are four lines alliterating on *f*; three each on *w*, *h*, and *s*; two lines of vowel alliteration; and one each on *d*, *l*, and *sc*. Thus, there is very little variety in alliteration in the psalm. Also, the adverb *ealle* is stressed and alliterated twice in consecutive lines here, as is the adverb *symble*, neither of which are called for in the

---

[45] Early analyses of this material in the metrical psalter are those of J.D. Bruce, *The Anglo-Saxon Version of the Book of Psalms commonly known as the 'Paris Psalter'*, *PMLA* 9 (1894), pp. 43-164; (reprinted Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1894) and Helen Bartlett, *The Metrical Division of the 'Paris Psalter'.* (Baltimore, 1896). The oral-formulaic approach to the metrical psalter is attempted in Robert E. Diamond, *The Diction of the Anglo-Saxon Metrical Psalms* Janua Linguarum, series practica 10 (The Hague: Mouton, 1963). Also, for an analysis of lines alliterating on 'b' see Robert S. Breitzer, *A Stylistic Study of the Old English Metrical Psalms.* (Ph.D., Iowa, 1970).

[46] For analyses of the metre of the *Paris Psalter*, see first B. Tschischwitz, *Die Metrik der altenglische Psalmenubersetzung.* (Breslau, 1908), and more recently M. S. Griffith, *The Method of Composition of Old English Verse Translation with Particular Reference to the Metres of Boethius, the Paris Psalter and Judgment Day II.* (D.Phil., Oxford, 1985) pp. 62-114.

Latin. The *f*-alliteration depends heavily on *fultum* and its associated prose verb *gefultumian*, for three of the four occurrences of these words in the psalm alliterate. The alliterative distinction between *s* and *sc* is maintained here in 69.2.1, where *gescende* and *scame* alliterate, so the poet was aware of and careful to follow some of the niceties of metrical structure. Chapter Six will look at a number of poetic techniques of the translator.

The metrical psalms are a useful and intriguing text of late Anglo-Saxon England. They were neither good poetry nor good translation, but the uneasy compromise that the psalter poet achieved between the requirements of the source text and the exigencies of the form into which he was transposing the psalter reveals something of the attitude to the psalms in Anglo-Saxon England, and of the attitude to translation of biblical texts into vernacular poetry in medieval Christianity as a whole. The metrical psalms may have been a popular text, a useful vernacular rendition of a primary devotional and meditative work. Such a text should not be mined only for occasional textual references, nor consigned to the world of poor Anglo-Saxon poetry without some consideration of why it was produced in the first place, how it was used, and where its merits may lie.

Chapter One — The Manuscript

i. Description of the Manuscript[1]

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS fonds latin 8824 is a Roman psalter with a facing translation into Old English, in prose for the first fifty psalms, in verse for the remainder. Following the psalter are a set of Latin canticles, a Litany, and a number of miscellaneous prayers. The manuscript, consisting of 186 leaves of text and nine fly-leaves, is now bound in the eighteenth-century red morocco leather typical of many of the manuscripts in this collection, formerly part of the Bibliothèque Royale.[2] The script used in the manuscript is an English Caroline minuscule of the type found in the mid to late eleventh century.[3] The sole scribe identifies himself in

---

[1] For full descriptions see N.R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), **367**; and *The Paris Psalter*, ed. B. Colgrave, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile, Volume 8 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1958) pp. 12-14. Descriptive material also appears in J.D. Bruce, *The Anglo-Saxon Version of the Book of Psalms commonly known as the 'Paris Psalter'*, (Baltimore, 1894); M. Forster, 'Die altenglischen Texte der Pariser Nationalbibliothek' *Englische Studien*, 62 (1926-8) 129-30, who strangely describes the format as that of a 'schmale, taschenbuchartige' text; and G.P. Krapp, ed., *The Paris Psalter and the Meters of Boethius, The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.* Volume 5 (New York, 1932), pp. vii-xix. For a description focusing on the illuminations see Elzbieta Temple, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts 900-1066.* A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles. Gen. ed. J.J.G. Alexander. Vol. II (London, 1976), **83**, pp. 99-100.

[2] See Léopold Delisle. *Inventaires des manuscrits latins conservés à la bibliothèque nationale sous les numéros 8823-18613, et faisant suite à la serie dont le catalogue a été publiée en 1744.* Tome I (Paris: Durand, 1863).

[3] See T.A.M. Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford, 1971).

the colophon as one Wulfwinus Cada. No successful attempt has been made to identify him[4] but it is most likely that he produced this elegant work in the middle years of the eleventh century in southern England.[5]

The manuscript consists of twenty-four quires of eight leaves and one quire of six leaves at the end. The sheets are arranged in the Continental pattern of hair-flesh-flesh-hair, a pattern which gradually became accepted in England in the late tenth century.[6] The leaves measure approximately 526 X 186 mm. Perhaps because of the unusual dimensions of the page, scribal practices vary somewhat from what might be expected of a mid-eleventh century Anglo-Saxon scriptorium.[7] My examination of the manuscript revealed some fuller information about these practices

---

[4] J.D. Bruce, *Anglo-Saxon Version*, pp. 9-12 attempts to identify the scribe with the Wulfwi of the Gospel of St. John in British Library MS Cotton Otho C.i. but the objections raised by K. Sisam, 'An Old English Translation of a Letter from Wynfrith to Eadburga (A.D. 716-7) in Cotton MS. Otho C i' *MLR*, 18 (1923) 253-72 at 253 are decisive. For further references see Krapp, p. xiii.

[5] Ker, **367** dates the manuscript as s. XI med. but in the introduction to the facsimile describes the hand as a 'type of caroline minuscule found commonly in English manuscripts of the middle and second half of the eleventh century', and argues that a date before 1030 is unlikely (p. 13). F. Wormald in the same introduction suggests a more specific and slightly earlier date from the style of the drawings, which lies between 1023-1035 and 1050 (p. 15). Temple suggests the second quarter of the eleventh century.

[6] See M.B. Parkes, 'The Palaeography of the Parker manuscript of the *Chronicle*, laws and Sedulius, and historiography at Winchester in the late ninth and tenth centuries', *ASE* 5 (1976), p. 161 and T.A.M. Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford, 1971), p. xii.

[7] See Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. xxiii-xlviii.

in this manuscript.[8] The quality of parchment used varies widely from a very thick and heavy type of a yellowish-beige colour with a suede finish to very fragile white membrane. The manuscript is pricked and ruled throughout—with a rotulus wheel and drypoint stylus—in the insular manner in single sheets on the hair side of the bifolium.[9] Gaps in this pattern occur at the places in the manuscript previously identified by Ker and Krapp as missing pages.[10] Ruling of the page is done in two stages from the bottom to the top of each leaf, as evidenced by the two occasions in the manuscript when the centre line runs crooked midway up the page and is re-drawn: f. 49r and f. 144r. The materials available to the scribe did not adjust themselves easily to the preparation of parchment of such an unusual shape.

Furthermore, the quires appear to have been prepared separately. The first appearance of a third line in the centre of the page, for positioning the versals properly, occurs on f. 16, the first of the third quire, and such a centre line continues for the rest of the manuscript (except for folios 166 to 173, comprising the twenty-third quire, which has only two lines in the centre of the page). Also, the parchment varies, if any difference can be discerned, according to the quire. The

---

[8] I examined the *Paris Psalter* manuscript during three separate trips to the Bibliothèque Nationale in January 1984, May 1985 and March 1986. I am grateful to the custodians of the manuscript collection for not only allowing me to look at the manuscript, but also for providing me with several different kinds of lecterns—in the hope that it might make examination of the codex easier for me.

[9] The only exceptions to this rule are f. 7 and the bifolium of f. 181 and f. 186.

[10] See Ker's foliation of the manuscript for details of the missing pages.

clearest example of this is the very thin parchment found at the end of the fifteenth quire (especially f. 112) in comparison to the very thick parchment of the entire sixteenth quire (ff. 113-18) and continuing to the end of the twentieth quire.

The last quire of the manuscript presents some difficulties. Ker states that this was originally a quire of eight but that two leaves are now missing.[11] It is more likely, however, that the quire was arranged in its present state of six leaves. The quire contains five canticles (in continuation from the twenty-fourth quire), a Litany and nine Latin prayers. Two bifolia (ff. 182-5, and 183-4), matching in size and texture of parchment, were prepared in the same fashion as the rest of the manuscript. A third bifolium, ff. 181 and 186, is of a much thinner and darker (possibly discoloured) parchment, with more holes and jagged edges than any other folio in the manuscript, except the end-leaves. This condition is not restricted to f. 186, which might originally have been the last leaf of the manuscript and thus subject to wear, but is evident on f. 181 as well. Two explanations of the bifolium's appearance seem to be possible.

First, the nine prayers at the end of the manuscript occupy almost exactly four sides. Only the right-hand centre line appears on these folia, with no other vertical or horizontal lines. The Litany finishes its last two petitions at the top of f. 185r, and could probably have been squeezed into the final lines of the previous page. The scribe could thus have originally prepared a quire of two bifolia, four leaves, for the

---

[11] See Ker **367** and in facsimile p. 13.

remaining canticles and the Litany, which were often adjuncts to a psalter manuscript.[12] A further bifolium was added either because the scribe wanted to add more material after the Litany and realised that he would run short, or because he wanted to be certain of having enough space for the amount of text remaining to be written. If the latter, he completed the quire with a few prayers that were easily available, not wishing to leave any waste space at the end of the manuscript.

A second possible explanation is supported by the unusual nature of the prayers[13] on these leaves and the appearance of the bifolium in question. The sheet closely resembles the half-sheet now numbered as f. 7 which, Ker demonstrated in the introduction to the facsimile,[14] was a bifolium inserted later, consisting of the opening illustration of King David and his harp (f. 1, now lost) and a rewritten

---

[12] See M.C. Morrell, *A Manual of Old English Biblical Materials.* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1965) for analysis of the Anglo-Saxon psalters and their layout. For a similar problem in a slightly earlier manuscript see F.A. Gasquet and Edmund Bishop, *The Bosworth Psalter.* (London, 1908), and the more recent analysis of M. Korhammer, 'The Origin of the Bosworth Psalter' *ASE* 2 (1973), pp. 173-87. See also F. Wormald, *English Kalendars Before A.D. 1100.* Henry Bradshaw Society 72 (London, 1937) where, of nineteen calendars printed, eight come from psalter manuscripts. For lists of these manuscripts see Gneuss, 'Preliminary Handlist' and M. Lapidge, 'Surviving booklists from Anglo-Saxon England' in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England. Studies presented to Peter Clemoes.* Ed. M. Lapidge and H. Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 33-89.

[13] See pp. 58-61 of this chapter.

[14] p. 14.

version of the corresponding folio.[15] The pricking and ruling are cursory, the margins awkward, and the hand is much larger and looser than in the rest of the manuscript. In fact, Ker argued originally that a different hand wrote this folio, but revised his opinion for the introduction to the facsimile. F. 7, like ff. 181 and 186, is a much darker, almost brown-coloured, shade. Possibly, then, the last bifolium of the manuscript was recopied at the same time as the first, and for a similar reason. In this case, the cursory pricking and ruling of these bifolia would parallel the preparation of the folio used in the first quire, and would suggest late additions to the manuscript. These folia might then have been prepared at a slightly later date than the rest of the manuscript, probably by the same scribe, but without full reproduction of the method used in quire preparation. The first bifolium was redone to allow the illustrator to produce a suitably elegant frontispiece; the reason for the last is obscure unless it concerns the colophon. Also, the last three prayers, the texts appearing on the last bifolium, are unusual texts, the choice of which might have been that of the owner of the manuscript.[16]

The manuscript was twice foliated in post-medieval times. The first foliation, in pencil from 1 to 196, was completed after the removal of the illuminations but

---

[15] See B.N. MS 12173 which describes the missing first folio, and L. Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque (impériale) nationale*, Tome I, (Paris, 1868), pp. 56-68 Librairie de Jean, duc de Berry.

[16] See pp. 58-61 for analysis of the prayers and their place in the manuscript.

before Silvestre examined the manuscript in the 1830s. Ker refutes Krapp's suggestion that the folios were cut from the manuscript after the pencil foliation, noting that it was common in the nineteenth century to take account of missing folios in the enumeration.[17] Ker, though he does not refer to it, presumably is taking into consideration a pencilled '21' visible on the stub of the leaf between folios 20 and 21 in the third quire at the appropriate point for the pencil sequence. The foliation in pen is probably of the later nineteenth century, added when the manuscript was incorporated by Delisle into the supplementary collection.

The contents of the manuscript have been enumerated several times, but they are included here for ease of reference and for the addition of notes compiled from my study of the codex. Differences from the descriptions of Bromwich, Ker and Krapp affect principally the end-leaves.

Endleaves: i paste-down r invisible
v blank
ii - iii fly-leaves contemporary with date of binding (but reused from elsewhere as they had already been sewn once)
ii r blank
v top
left: at top, some words written but deleted (expunged, perhaps)
just below: Exp x - 16
below and slightly to the right, in pen crossed out in pencil, cursive script: Suppt f. No 2014[18]

---

[17] Colgrave, p. 12.

[18] The manuscript was first catalogued as Suppt. 333, but was included in the main numbering system when Leopold Delisle completed the general catalogue. The label on the next flyleaf suggesting MS fonds latin 2014 is a mistake. The manuscript is collected with the group of codices of 'très-grand format' in the catalogue. It is the

below this a pasted label as follows: LATIN 8824

iii r & v blank

iv contemporary with manuscript but not identical (possibly added by binder); probably the original paste-down as recto is severely discoloured

r blank

v in lower left corner an erasure; a heavily discoloured spot on parchment, illegible in daylight

v also contemporary with manuscript

r blank

v at top centre in pen, underlined: Suppl. Lat. 333

Text: ff 1r - 63v Pss. 1 to 50 with facing prose translation

f. 1 also has the following: in pen at top centre, subsequently crossed out: Suppt f. No. 2014; in pencil at foot of page: 1658 (number of restoration of 1979)

An introduction in Old English prose precedes each psalm of the prose translation except Psalms 1, 21, and 26. The latter two psalms follow missing folios which no doubt included the introductions.[19]

ff 64r - 175v Pss. 51.6 to 150.3 Latin with facing metrical translation

ff 176r - 183v Latin canticles[20]

1. f. 176r INCIPIUNT CANTICA CANTICUM ISAIE PROPHETE [Is. xii] Confitebor tibi domine quoniam iratus es michi;conversus est furor tuus & consolatus es me;

2. f. 176r-v CANTICUM EZECHIE REGIS [Is. xxxviii, 10-20] Ego dixi indimidio dierum meorum; uadam ad portas inferi;

3. f. 177r CANTICUM ANNE [I Reg. ii, 1-10 and II Sam. ii, 1-10] Exultavit cor meum in domino; & exaltatum est cor meum in deo meo;

4. f. 177r-178v CANTICUM MOYSI [Ex. xv, 1-19] Cantemus domino gloriose enim honorificatus est;

---

narrowest of the group, although not the tallest.

[19] Most psalter manuscripts with a frontispiece dispensed with a prose introduction before the first psalm.

[20] See J. Mearns, *The Canticles of the Christian Church* (Cambridge, 1914); Canticle numbers 1-7, 11, 8, 9, 16, and 10.

5. f. 178r-178v CANTICUM ABBACUC PROPHETAE [Hab. iii, 2-19] Domine audivi auditum tuam & timui;

6. f. 178v-180v CANTICUM MOYSI AD FILIOS[21] ISRAHEL [Deut. xxxii, 1-43] Adtende caelum et loquar; & audiat terra uerba ex ore meo;

7. f. 180v-181r YMNUS TRIUM PUERORUM [Dan. iii, 57-88, 56] Bedicite [sic] omnia opera domini dominum;

8. f. 181r-181v UMNUS AD MATUTINAS DOMINICA DIE [or Hymnum Optimum] Te deum laudamus te dominum confitemur

9. f. 181v-182r CANTICUM ZACHARIAE PROPHETE [Lk. i, 68-79] Benedictus dominus deus israhel; quia uisitauit & fecit; redemptionem plebis suae;

10. f. 182r CANTICUM SANCTE MARIAE [Lk. i, 46-55] Magnificat anima mea dominum

11. f. 182r-183v FIDES CATHOLICA ATHANASI EPISCOPI Quicumque uult saluus esse; ante omnia opus est enim; ut teneat catholicam fidem;

12. f. 183v CANTICUM SYMEONIS [Lk. ii, 29-32] Nunc dimittis seruum tuum domine; secundum uerbum tuum in pace;

ff. 183v - 185r Litany of the Saints[22]

ff. 185r - 186r Nine Prayers

1. f. 185r Aufer a nobis domine iniquitates nostres & ut sancta sanctorum puris mereamur mentibus introire.

2. f. 185r ORATIO Scelera mea quibus iram merui; dimitte

3. f. 185r .....(illegible, perhaps ORATIO) Per horum omnium sanctorum domine angelorum

4. f. 185r ITEM ALIA ORATIO Exaudi me domine sancte pater omnipotens aeterne deus;

5. f. 185v ALIA ORATIO Deus qui uiuorum es saluator omnium qui non uis mortem peccatoris nec lataris in perditione morientium;

6. f. 185v ORATIO Pietatem tuam domine peto ut orationem meam & uotum meum dignanter suscipias supplicationem serui tui;

7. f. 185v ALIA Adsit nobis domine quis oratio sanctorum atque

---

[21] MS reads **eilios israhel**, which would make **exilios** a possible reading, except that the standard canticle reading here is **filios.**

[22] See L. Delisle, ed. *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 4[e] serie, 2 (1856), 148.

archangelorum patriarcharum;

8. f. 186r ALIA ORATIO Sancte marie semper uirginis sanctorumque omnium archangelorum angelorum patriarcharum...te fili dei qui uiuis;

9. f. 186r Da quesumus domine deus indulgentiam mearum michi peccatorem;

f. 186r Colophon[23]: Hoc psalterii carmen
inclyti regis david
-i- cognomto cada-
Sacerdi wulfwinus
manu sua conscripsit;
Qui comq*ue* legerit scriptu
Anime sue expetiat
uotum.

Below colophon in early fifteenth-century book hand:
Ce liure est au duc de Berry
Jehan R

f. 186v Lower left-hand side at margin:
iii flor vi gr
(This hand seems contemporary with the autograph; possibly an evaluation or a price)[24]

---

[23] The colophon is likely to be original, both because it appears in the appropriate place, and because the careful insertion of the cognomen suggests a concern for accuracy which would be unlikely in a copy. Also, the insertion of the surname is awkward, and squashed in between two lines of the colophon, a layout which would be more likely if the colophon were original.

[24] Bruce suggests, because of this notation, that the Duc de Berry might have picked up the manuscript in the Amsterdam sales. While that is certainly possible, and relatively unprovable, the use of such a notation to indicate price is by no means restricted to the Low Countries and Holland in the fourteenth century. Use of the florin, introduced as a gold coin in Florence in 1252, became widespread in Western Europe, and the florin was the best-known gold coin from the fourteenth century, minted in almost every medieval European principality. The second part of the price would be more useful were it not abbreviated, but gr. could suggest the groat of England, the gros or *g*root of Flanders and the Low Countries, the grosso of Italy, the gros or gros tournois of France, and the groschen of the Germanic lands. See, for a list of coins in circulation between 1100 and 1500, Peter Spufford, *Money and its Use*

Endleaves: i leaf contemporary with date of manuscript, numbered in ink 187

r blank, except for obverse of price

v top centre, in late medieval hand:

Psatlerium [sic] in ydiomate pe.

slightly below above in a smaller hand and centred:

And p.....iu m di roman c + i ... ydioma barbaru

at bottom centre of leaf a heavily erased line, perhaps chemically treated; appears to be post-medieval hand underneath

ii - iii fly-leaves contemporary with date of binding; both blank both sides

iv paste-down

r small label on bottom left-hand corner.

Bibliothèque Nationale
Restauration 1979
sous No 1658

[In 1979 the manuscript was restored: the page edges and edges of fragments were filled out and most of the gold initials in the text were repainted. Other initials also appear to have been retouched, particularly the green versals (some pencil directions remain) and possibly some blue ones.]

v invisible

Ker describes the hand of the manuscript as 'neat-looking, but, in detail, irregular'.[25] The Latin passages are written in Caroline minuscule, the Anglo-Saxon translation in Anglo-Saxon minuscule, and the scribe preserves the usual eight distinctions in letter forms between the two.[26] Irregularities, however, are readily found. For example, the cross-stroke of *e* in both scripts tends to be very high,

---

in Medieval Europe (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 225-39 and Appendix I 'The Coins Most Commonly in Use in the Middle Ages' pp. 397-410.

[25] Ker, *Catalogue*, **367**, p. 440.

[26] The special letter-forms for *a*, *d*, *e*, *f*, *g*, *h*, *r* and *s* are discussed in Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. xxvi-xxxii.

causing confusion with both *c* and *t*, or pushing the letter well above the x-height. The appearance of the hand suggests an excessively careful approach to letter-formation, resulting in unevenness and awkwardness in the script. The hand is artificial and precious-looking, generally too small for easy reading in the original, and of course even more difficult in the reduced facsimile, but clearly organized and comprehensible.[27] The size of the script can also vary quite substantially from the small, tight fist of f. 64r to the large, loose hand of, for example, f. 7 and f. 163r. The hand, then, at first glance a very neat one, is on further examination careless, with uncertainty in details of letter production and inconsistency of size.

Punctuation is also a problem for the scribe, and the method used varies considerably. The manuscript, however, was clearly not intended for liturgical use, since it is not pointed for singing, and the punctuation is not nearly consistent enough for such a usage.[28] In fact, the punctuation almost gives the impression of being an afterthought, and the signs which do appear seem to have been extensively revised

---

[27] Although the editors of the facsimile do not mention it, the facsimile is a reduced one, almost a third smaller than the manuscript.

[28] Compare, for instance, the Caedmon Manuscript, Bodleian MS Junius 11, which, without sufficient evidence, has been considered to be intended for quasi-liturgical use, at least reading the poems in church. See P. Clemoes, *Liturgical Influence on Punctuation in Late Old English and Early Middle English Manuscripts.* (Cambridge, 1952), G.C. Thornley, 'The Accents and Points of MS Junius 11' *TPS* (1954), pp. 178-205, and V. Day 'The Influence of the Catechetical Narratio on Old English and Some Other Medieval Literature' *ASE* 3 (1974), pp. 51-62.

throughout.[29] Such an approach to the layout of the material suggests that perhaps the text was intended for private meditation and careful reading, an approach in which the attention to details of meaning and interpretation would be hindered rather than helped by exhaustive and prescriptive punctuation. Often appearing to have been added afterwards, the punctuation frequently occurs in the margins and usually is placed just above or just below the line (although it can be an inch or more away from the final word of the line). The mark at the end of many verses in Old English is ;̓ and the medial dot · is commonly transformed into a punctus versus ; at the end of other verses. Otherwise, the punctuation in the Old English is a confusing mixture of *distinctiones*, and the punctus versus. Some preference for a medial dot · for pauses in mid-line can be identified, although there is very little punctuation inside the psalm verse in the Old English. The final pause is also marked by the punctus versus ; or the sub-distinctio .. However, in the vernacular, the scribe's grasp of a system of punctuation is imperfect. The Latin text consistently uses the punctus elevatus ⁝ as a major medial pause, with the punctus versus ;, or sometimes just a medial distinctio at the end of a verse. However, the punctuation is sparse and uncertain, and any

---

[29] The colour of the ink is much darker, usually very black even when the ink of the text is a light brown shade. In part this could be explained by simple mechanics; the scribe would hold the pen differently for producing the *distinctiones* than he would for making letter forms. However, the punctuation in this manuscript, especially the end punctuation, often slants to the right when the text is carefully vertical or, if anything, slants to the left. Whether these minor indications suggest a cursory revision of the manuscript immediately after its production, or simply argue for a scribe uncertain of his punctuation cannot be determined. Old English punctuation remains a difficult problem.

analysis of its purpose remains tentative.

There are very few corrections in the manuscript. The punctuation may have been revised but the numerous substantive errors in both the Latin and Old English texts remain largely ignored. The scribe used several methods of marking the deleted letter or word: erasing occasionally, crossing out once, and expunging (placing a dot underneath) several times.

ii. Texts

The *Paris Psalter*, like many medieval manuscripts. is not a seamless whole, a careful compilation of texts which fit neatly together, but a collection of disparate works which are put together, probably for this manuscript only. These include: a version of the Roman Psalter, a set of *tituli*, a prose version of the first fifty psalms and introductions for each, a metrical version of the last hundred psalms, a set of canticles, a litany of the saints, and nine prayers. Examination of the context and purpose of these texts may provide clues not only to the provenance and intent of the manuscript, but also to the use of the texts (especially of the metrical psalter).

a) The Latin Psalter

The Latin text of the psalter in MS lat. 8824 is a version of the Roman psalter, with some admixture of Gallican forms. It is not the version of the Roman psalter from which the metrical psalms were originally translated, representing a more Gallicanized version of the text. It is not an especially corrupt version, and is collated

by Weber for his definitive edition of the Roman psalter.[30] Unfortunately, Thorpe in his edition collated the Latin psalter against the Vulgate. Tanger published a set of corrections, and Ramsay reconsidered the Latin psalter as well, but Wildhagen in his analysis (for both his articles about the relationships among the Anglo-Saxon psalter glosses, and for his edition of the Cambridge Psalter) mistakenly accepted Thorpe's text.[31]

In the Middle Ages three different psalter translations from the original Hebrew, via Greek and Syriac recensions, were available. Some disagreement among scholars as to the origin of these three texts remains, but generally St. Jerome is assumed to have been instrumental at least in the development of the three traditions.[32] Whether he was responsible for the actual translation and revision of the texts is uncertain, particularly with respect to the Roman Psalter, which is now usually dated A.D. 84. However, the account below of the texts represents received

---

[30] Weber, *Le psautier roman.* Weber uses several English psalters for his edition.

[31] See Tanger, 'Collation', and Robert L. Ramsay, 'The Latin Text of the Paris Psalter: a Collation and some Conclusions' *AJP* 41 (1920), pp. 147-76. Sisam points out the error in the facsimile, p. 15.

[32] See E.F. Sutcliffe, 'Jerome' *CHB* Vol. 2, pp. 80-101 at 95 and Raphael Loewe, 'The Medieval History of the Latin Vulgate' pp. 102-54 at 111. Also useful is H.H. Glunz, *History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon.* (Cambridge, 1933). For a clear explanation of the argument that Jerome was not responsible for the Roman psalter see Dorothy A. Sneddon, *Studies in the language of the Anglo-Norman translations of the Psalms with particular reference to the Oxford Psalter.* (B.Litt., Oxford, 1972).

opinion in the Middle Ages, and as such is more useful for present purposes than more recent developments.

Jerome (Eusebius Hieronymus, c340-420) is renowned for having revised the texts of the Latin Bible into a form very close to what later became the Vulgate version. The Roman psalter is generally identified with the first revision he made of the Psalter. Jerome used the various Old Latin texts as source material for this recension, which remains the psalter text of the Breviary in use in St. Peter's, Rome and in the church at Milan, and a variation of which is used today in the Mozarabic liturgy used by special dispensation in Toledo. Also, the verses from the psalter in the Missal and the Invitatory Psalm in the common Breviary were Roman Psalter readings, until the revision of liturgy undertaken during Vatican II.

Jerome's second version of the psalter, undertaken in the years 388 to 392, drew from a wider range of source material, including Origen's *Hexapla.* This version was widely used quite early in Gaul and is hence known as the Gallican version. In fact, the terms Roman and Gallican were first applied to the two versions of the psalter in the monastery of St. Gall during the ninth century.[33] Its use in Gaul meant that this version of the Psalter, in many ways the least satisfactory of the three, became, because of Alcuin's revision of the texts of the Bible in the ninth century, the psalter which appears in the Vulgate.

Finally, Jerome concluded that it was impossible to produce an accurate psalter

---

[33] See van Dijk, Stephen and J.H. Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy.* (London, 1960).

text without resorting to the original Hebrew; therefore, his third and final version of the text was an exhaustive retranslation from the Hebrew, known as the Hebraicum. Except for the psalter and Job, this exhaustive retranslation of the texts of the Old Testament became the basis for the Vulgate. Despite its accuracy and greater Latinity, however, the Hebrew Psalter never came into general liturgical use, appearing throughout the Middle Ages as a text for scholars to work from, most frequently in double or triple psalters. Jerome thus never intended for the Gallican version to be common usage, and, through his zeal for reconsidering the text of the psalter, he initiated the practice of producing triple psalters with parallel columns of text, in order to assist study. The importance of triple psalters as an influence on the layout of the manuscript of the *Paris Psalter* will be discussed later in the chapter.

Some attempt at dating psalters of the ninth to eleventh centuries in England can be made by determining the amount of Gallican influence on the Roman text. However, this procedure is a difficult one to follow with any degree of certainty, for the strength of Continental influence varied geographically and chronologically.[34] In fact, the Roman psalter demonstrably remained in use at Canterbury into the twelfth century (e.g. the Bosworth Psalter), a resistance to change being shown which seems unusual for the community which had more direct traffic with the Continent, especially with France, than any other Anglo-Saxon church.[35] However, the use of

---

[34] C. & K. Sisam, ed. *The Salisbury Psalter*, E.E.T.S. o.s. 242, (Oxford, 1959) pp. 47-52.

[35] See N. Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066.* (Leicester, 1984), where the deliberately 'old-fashioned' use of the

the Roman Psalter at Canterbury may simply be a hint that the ties of the English Church were to Rome rather than to Gaul—the Roman Psalter was used for all purposes in Rome and much of Italy until the pontificate of Pius V (1566-1572). Loyalty to St. Augustine was at the root of the usage. The change from the Roman to the Gallican Psalter in England was by no means a simple shift from one set of readings to another.

(b) *Tituli* and Prose Introductions

The set of *tituli* which introduce each psalm in the manuscript is a complete one, drawn in the first instance from the pseudo-Bede commentary *In Psalmorum Librum Exegesis.*[36] The commentary consists of a number and short title for each psalm, a set of *argumenta* or short descriptions of the material, and the commentary proper. In the layout of the manuscripts, the set of *argumenta* is clearly separated from the commentary, as also, for example, in B.N. MS lat. 12,273.[37] In that

---

Roman Psalter is discussed on pp. 261-66.

[36] Migne, *Patrologia Latina* XCIII,478-1098. The most complete study in print of these questions with regard to the *Paris Psalter* is J. Douglas Bruce, *The Anglo-Saxon Version of the Book of Psalms commonly known as the 'Paris Psalter'* (Baltimore, 1894). A shorter version of his findings is 'Immediate and Ultimate Sources of the Rubrics and Introductions to the Psalms in the Paris Psalter' *MLN* 8 (1893), pp. 72-82. The most recent analysis of these questions occurs in Patrick P. O'Neill, 'The OE Introductions to the Prose Psalms of the Paris Psalter: Sources, Structure, and Composition' in J. Wittig, ed., *Eight Anglo-Saxon Studies. Studies in Philology* 78 (1981) pp. 20-38.

[37] The manuscript is cited by J.W. Bright and R.L. Ramsay, ed. *Liber Psalmorum: The West-Saxon Psalms.* (Boston: Heath, 1907), p. i. They use it to

manuscript the scribe sets the *argumenta* apart with a blank line and introduces each section with a versal. These *argumenta* occupy between four and eight lines of text for each psalm. The set of *tituli* derived from these argumenta is a common one in psalter manuscripts, identified in Salmon as Série I.[38] The same series appears in at least two other Anglo-Saxon psalters, the Blickling Psalter and the Vitellius Psalter. The ancestry of the text is Irish, and the earliest versions of it occur in the Codex Amiatinus (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, amiatinus MS 1) from Wearmouth-Jarrow c. 700 and the Cathach of St. Columba (Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS s.n.), a sixth century Irish manuscript. By way of this Irish connection the collection of *argumenta* (and the *tituli* drawn from the material) is traceable to the fourth century school of exegesis in Antioch led by Theodore of Mopsuestia.

The *tituli* are clearly a set chosen and inserted into the manuscript for some sense of continuity. They do not correspond to the mystical and allegorical interpretation of the text found in the pseudo-Bede commentary itself. Their emphasis is literal and historical, which corresponds to some extent with the metrical translation, but does not agree with the direction of the prose version. They do

---

collate the **argumenta**. I checked it for the layout of the text. Ff. 1-6a consist of eight numbered **lectios**; ff 6b-20a, called the **prologus**, include a brief description of each psalm, giving the theme, personages and some preliminary interpretation; ff. 20a-21a are a table of contents of the exposition itself, which appears on ff 21a-75b. The material for the rubrics comes from the **prologus** section only.

[38] P. Salmon. *Les 'Tituli Psalmorum' des manuscrits latins.* (Paris: Centre de Pastorale Liturgique, 1958), pp. 47-74.

provide some continuity, since the set is a complete one, in that similar rubrics appear above each psalm in the manuscript. Also, while the *tituli* have very little in common with either translation, they do accord in letter and spirit with the prose introductions for the first fifty psalms. Possibly, the scribe of this manuscript recognized the rubrics and ideas in the first fifty psalms, found a complete set of the *tituli*, and added them himself for the last hundred psalms. He made some effort to avoid literal statements in favour of allegorical or mystical rubrics, but the choice in this series was limited almost entirely to the practical and historical facts available for each psalm.

The scholar originally responsible for the *tituli*, Theodore of Mopsuestia (ob. 428), espoused a somewhat extreme literal and historical interpretation of the psalms.[39] In contrast to the Alexandrian School, which saw the psalter as allegorical prophecy prefiguring the events of the New Testament, Theodore and the school of Antiochene exegesis described the psalms in terms of specific historical situations and

---

[39] For Theodore's commentary on the Psalms see R. Devreesse, ed. 'Le commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les psaumes' *Studi e Testi* 93 (1939), and for a general discussion of his influence see M.L.W. Laistner, 'Antiochene Exegesis in Western Europe during the Middle Ages,' *Harvard Theological Review* 40 (1947), 19-31. Henry Mayr-Harting analyses his influence in England in *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England*, (London: Batsford, 1972), pp. 204-14 and note p. 312. Theodore's influence on psalter texts, especially the *Paris Psalter* is enumerated by R.L. Ramsay, 'Theodore of Mopsuestia and St. Columban on the Psalms,' *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 8 (1912), pp. 421-51 and 476-97. For more recent views of the Irish treatment of Theodore and its influence on biblical texts, especially the psalter, see Martin McNamara, 'Psalter Text and Psalter Study in the Early Irish Church (A.D. 600-1200)' *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 73C (1973), pp. 201-98 and J.F.T. Kelly, 'Christianity and the Latin Tradition in Early Mediaeval Ireland' *BJRL* 68 (1986) pp. 410-33 at 428-31.

endeavoured to show their lesson for Christian life on a purely didactic and practical level. Normally these explanations were preceded by a short prologue which established the purpose and argument of the psalm. From this division derived the work of the pseudo-Bede (possibly Ambrose Autpert) and this set of *tituli*, which originates in the prologue to each psalm commentary. Theodore's interpretations were condemned as heretical by the Second Council of Constantinople. The **argumenta** from them survive only because they were mistakenly thought to be the work of Bede in later centuries.

This tradition of historical and literal exegesis of the psalms thus had Byzantine origins, and may have come to England with the arrival of Theodore and Hadrian in 669.[40] Bede describes Hadrian as a native of Africa, a man learned in the Scriptures, and a great scholar of Greek and Latin.[41] Theodore, who became the Archbishop, was a native of Tarsus in Cilicia (currently southern Turkey or northwestern Syria) and was likewise learned in Greek and Latin. (Bede notes that Hadrian was specifically enjoined to prevent Theodore from introducing any inappropriate Greek customs into the English church.[42]) Both men would have had

---

[40] See Michael Lapidge, 'The School of Theodore and Hadrian', *ASE* 15 (1986), pp. 45-72 for a preliminary study of texts which can be connected directly to Theodore and Hadrian.

[41] Bede, *HE*, Bk. IV, Ch. 1.

[42] That they did introduce some knowledge of Greek seems possible; see Mary Catherine Bodden, 'Evidence for knowledge of Greek in Anglo-Saxon England', *ASE* 17 (1988) pp. 217-246, where knowledge of Greek vocabulary, especially transmitted by glossaries, is argued for England in the eighth and early ninth centuries.

the knowledge to be able to read Theodore of Mopsuestia's commentary and, despite their best efforts to avoid matters Greek, the Antiochene method of exegesis may have influenced their teaching. Mayr-Harting argues that,

> The contribution of particular value which Theodore could have made at Canterbury was the kind of rich, literal exegesis which Theodore of Mopsuestia's commentary on the Psalms, for instance, had displayed. (p. 206)

Archbishop Theodore's own teachings have not survived except in fragmentary references by other writers, but these samples of his biblical exposition suggest this tradition of scientific, practical and literal evocation of real life in the Near East. This was the tradition out of which the *Paris Psalter* rubrics developed.

The Antiochene school of exegesis probably did arrive in England by way of Theodore of Tarsus at Canterbury, but an alternate point of entry could have been Northumbria with the Celtic monks who brought material from Ireland. The set of rubrics used in the manuscript belong to the series associated with St. Columba by Salmon. He notes that the series, the most widely circulated and most frequent in medieval manuscripts:

> Tous semblent dérivés, par l'Angleterre et les missions insulaires sur le Continent, d'un texte en usage en Irlande au VIe siecle, quelles que soient ses origines plus lointaines. (p. 47)

A Gallican Psalter of the sixth century, the Cathach of St. Columba (Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS s.n.) is the first manuscript in which the series appears. Because of its occurrence in the pseudo-Bede *De titulis psalmorum*, the set of *tituli* achieved

wide circulation. Bernhard Bischoff describes the Latin translations of Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Irish works influenced by Antiochene exegesis, and argues that the point at which they, and other such texts, began to influence Anglo-Saxon learning is a turning-point in the history of Latin exegesis.[43] That a Latin translation of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the psalms was available in sixth century Ireland has been shown by R. L. Ramsay.[44] Also, a fragment in MS Vatican Pal. lat. 68 (ff 1r-46r) includes glosses on words and sentences in Psalm 39. The text is based, according to Bischoff, on the commentaries of the Antiochene exegete, and the manuscript includes Irish and Anglo-Saxon glosses on the text. This manuscript is an eighth-century one, written by the Northumbria scribe Edilberict, who was probably educated by the Irish and signs himself in the Irish way.[45]

---

[43] See Bernhard Bischoff, 'Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter' *Sacris Erudiri* 6 (1954) pp. 189-279, rep. *Mittelälterliche Studien, Aufsatze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1966), pp. 205-273. For a translation see Bernhard Bischoff, 'Turning-Points in the History of Latin Exegesis in the Early Middle Ages' in *Biblical Studies: The Medieval Irish Contribution, Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association.* ed. Martin McNamara Vol. 1 (Dublin: Dominican Publications, 1976), 'Introduction' pp. 74-94 and 'Catalogue of the Latin Exegetical Literature, both Hiberno-Latin and that showing Irish Influence, up to the Beginning of the Ninth Century' pp. 95-160. For Theodore on the psalms see especially pp. 87-8, 105-6 and notes. Also in the same volume is Joseph F. Kelly, 'Bibliography on Hiberno-Latin Biblical Texts', pp. 161-4.

[44] R.L. Ramsay, 'Theodore' pp. 476-97.

[45] See also R.I. Best, *The Commentary on the Psalms with Glosses in Old Irish preserved in the Ambrosian Library.* (Dublin, 1936), and, for a preliminary look at Irish attitudes to the Bible, R.E. McNally, 'The "tres linguae sacrae" in Early Irish Bible Exegesis' *Theological Studies* 19 (1958), pp. 395-403. For a possible Irish influence on Anglo-Saxon decoration, see M.R. James, 'Syriac Apocrypha in Ireland'

The approach to the psalter and other biblical texts which the Antiochene School embodies could thus have arrived in England through either or both of these channels. While not in the principal stream, the techniques of historical and literal exegesis remained an important subsidiary current in Anglo-Saxon biblical studies. The rubrics known as the Serie de St. Columba belong to the mainstream allegorical tradition of exegesis, but each manuscript varied somewhat in its specific choice of rubric. In MS lat. 8824, for example, the christological focus of the series is retained, but occasionally a literal reading rather than an allegorical one is chosen. For example, the standard rubric for Psalm 31 is *Post baptismum vox paenitentium*[46] but the *Paris Psalter* manuscript reads *Oratio ezechie post languorem.*[47] This is the second of the penitential psalms, where the standard Serie I reading might be most appropriate. The rubric appearing here is an unusual one, referring to the historical event of David's own penitence, rather than the generalized application of the psalm. Other examples include Psalm 56, where the series reading is *Vox Pauli post resurrectionem*, but MS lat. 8824 has *Vox dauid quando fugiebat a facie saul*[48] and Psalm 73 where the series has *Vox Christi ad Patrem* but this manuscript has

---

JTS 20 (1910), pp. 290-1.

[46] Salmon, p. 59.

[47] f. 33r.

[48] Salmon, p. 64; f. 68r.

Machabeorum pericula narrantur et pretes.[49] The rubrics in this manuscript, then, generally follow the allegorical readings of the collection, but occasionally show a tendency toward the literal readings of the Antiochene School. The *Paris Psalter* readings at times return to the tradition which underlies much of Irish biblical study—the practical literal explanation and objective commentary—a study charactized by 'realistic illustration from concrete knowledge.'[50] To some extent this may be the result of the use of the vernacular, which perhaps cannot carry the higher levels of meaning that a sacred language could, but the texts of other vernacular psalter versions from Anglo-Saxon England show an attempt to encompass at least the allegorical level of exegesis.[51]

However, what is of most interest in the connection between literal exegesis and the *Paris Psalter* is the correspondence of the prose introductions with the pseudo-Bede text. For the first fifty psalms, the prose translation, the translator of the text also wrote a short introduction to explain the historical, allegorical and anagogical interpretation of the song. It is these introductions which show most clearly the shadowy figure of Theodore of Mopsuestia in their ancestry. For the example already given, Psalm 31, the prose introduction reads in part:

---

[49] Salmon, p. 65; f. 87v.

[50] Bischoff, pp. 76-7.

[51] Cf. *Kentish Psalm 50*, ll. 72-6.

> Dauid sang þisne an and þrittigoðan sealm, wundriende þære unaseccgendlican gesælignesse þæra manna þe him God forgifð ealle heora scylda and him ælc geswinc aferþ, swa swa he him oft dyde. And he witgode eac be Ezechie, hu he sceolde wundrian þære myclan mildheortnesse þe he him oft forgeaf, ægðer ge on his hælo ge on his alysnesse æt his feondum.[52]

The reference to Ezekiel in the rubric is carefully explained in the introduction. The historical background of David's penitence is rehearsed, and its moral importance emphasized for the reader. This method is precisely the approach of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Others have shown the close connection between the prose introductions and the translation itself, so that the author of the prose psalter is certainly the author of the introductions as well.[53] Whether the rubrics, especially for the first fifty psalms, were already connected to the text it is difficult to say. If they were, then the text of the first fifty psalms closely resembles the layout of the pseudo-Bede. However, the rubrics have no such apparently close connection with the psalms of the metrical translation, and were probably a later addition to that text, possibly even appearing for the first time with the metrical psalms in this manuscript.

The prose introductions provide one more piece of evidence for late Anglo-Saxon psalter study. The same text, possibly even copied from the same exemplar, is copied into the margins of British Museum MS Cotton Vitellius E xviii,

---

[52] J.W. Bright and R.L. Ramsay, ed. *The West-Saxon Psalms.* (Boston, 1907) p. 67.

[53] See Bruce, p. 120.

the Vitellius Psalter.[54] The mid-eleventh century hand that inserted the interlinear gloss also copied these *argumenta* or prose introductions.[55] Comparison with the *Paris Psalter* rubrics and introductions is difficult, especially since Rosier did not include the *argumenta* in his edition of the Vitellius Psalter.[56] The manuscript is a Winchester production, probably from the cathedral priory rather than the New Minster.[57] The introductions in the Vitellius Psalter do not appear to be copied directly from *PPs*, but may derive from the same exemplar.

(c) The Prose Translation

The translation from ff. 1 - 63v of the psalter is into Old English prose.[58] Prose introductions written across the two columns precede each psalm (except Pss.

---

[54] Ker, **224**. The interlinear gloss to the psalms and canticles is edited by James Rosier, *The Vitellius Psalter.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962).

[55] Unfortunately, heat shrinkage from the Cotton fire at Ashburnham House in 1731 makes the introductions, which were already written down the side of the folio and in any available blank space in the text, somewhat difficult to read.

[56] An edition by Philip Pulsiano of the Vitellius introductions is forthcoming.

[57] See Ker, **224**, p. 301. Compare the litany of B.L. MS Arundel 60, Ker **134**.

[58] See the edition of J.W. Bright and R.L. Ramsay, *Libri Psalmorum: The West-Saxon Psalms.* (Boston, 1907). The edition was reviewed at length by J.H.G. Grattan, 'On the Text of the prose portion of the "Paris Psalter"' *MLR* 4 (1909), pp. 185-9; and was responded to at more length: J.W. Bright, 'On the Text of the prose portion of the "Paris Psalter"' *MLN* 24 (1909), pp. 77-8; and J.W. Bright and R.L. Ramsay, 'Notes on the West-Saxon Psalms' *MLN* 33 (1913), pp. 471-4.

1, 21, and 26). William of Malmesbury's twelfth-century *Gesta Regum Anglorum*[59] attributes a translation to King Alfred of Wessex, who is said to have been working on a prose translation of the psalter ending, in the last year of his life, at Psalm 50. This ascription has received support from the work of various scholars on the evidence primarily of vocabulary comparison.[60] The first sustained exposition of the argument was that of J. Bromwich, who collated the prose psalter against Alfred's translation of the *Cura Pastoralis* and the *Consolation of Philosophy* to suggest a shared vocabulary and method of translation.[61] More recently, Janet Bately has argued that the similarities with Alfred's other translations are too marked to be

---

[59] See Asser's *Life of King Alfred*, ed. W.H. Stevenson (Oxford, 1904; rep. 1959); quoted in *English Historical Documents*. ed. D. Whitelock. 2nd ed. (London, 1979), pp. 289-303, and in M. Lapidge and S. Keynes, ed. & tr. *Alfred the Great: Asser's Life of King Alfred and other Contemporary Sources.* (Harmondsworth, 1983), pp. 67-110. See especially chapters 24, 76 and 88 for Alfred's devotion to the psalter. William of Malmesbury follows Asser; see *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs, Rolls Series (London, 1887-9) I, p. 132. For a summary of this material see A. Frantzen, *King Alfred.* (Boston, 1986), pp. 89-105.

[60] A suggestion by R. Wülker, in *Grundriss zur Geschichte der angelsachsischen Litteratur.* (Leipzig, 1885) #500, was pursued by J. Wichmann, 'König Aelfreds angelsachsische Ubertragung der Psalmen I-LI Excl.' *Anglia* 11 (1889), pp. 39-96. See also A.S. Cook, *Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers.* [First Series] (London, 1898), p. xl.

[61] J. I'a Bromwich, 'Who was the translator of the prose portion of the *Paris Psalter*?' in *The Early Cultures of Northwest Europe.* H.M. Chadwick Memorial Studies. ed. Sir Cyril Fox and Bruce Dickins (Cambridge, 1950), pp. 289-304. When the article was published, it was not well received, and the arguments advanced by Bromwich were largely dismissed for two decades.

overlooked, and point to Alfredian authorship.[62] The translation would certainly have fitted into Alfred's programme of educational translation, and the vocabulary similarities with the works produced under Alfred's aegis provide a firm basis for the assumption. Bately has identified lexical affinities between the prose psalms and such productions of King Alfred's circle as the translation of Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*, Augustine's *Soliloquies*, and Gregory's *Cura Pastoralis*. Furthermore, the straightforward plain translation of the prose version incorporates some exegetical interpretation and explanation in the text itself, in addition to that found in the prose introductions. Such inclusion of psalter commentary is, of course, consonant with the Alfredian theory of authorship, since the king acknowledged and, obviously therefore, even welcomed a great deal of clerical help with his translations. However, since a complete metrical version of the psalms did exist and was probably available to the scribe, some explanation must exist for its rejection in favour of the prose version in the first third of the text. That explanation could as easily be a preference for the more straightforward prose and the higher proportion of exegetical material as reverence for the work of a king.

The remaining two quinquagenes, one hundred psalms, are translated into verse, and appear on ff. 64a to 175b. The author is anonymous.

---

[62] See especially J.M. Bately, 'Lexical evidence for the authorship of the prose psalms in the Paris Psalter' *ASE* 10 (1982) pp. 69-95. More recently, for a discussion of this material in the more general context of Old English prose, see, by the same author, 'Old English prose before and during the reign of Alfred' *ASE* 17 (1988) pp. 93-138.

(d) The Canticles

Following the psalter is a standard set of canticles, twelve in number. These include the Athanasian Creed; the Lord's Prayer, Gloria and Creed, which accompany other psalters where additional material occurs, do not appear in the manuscript.[63] These are a standard group of psalter canticles, corresponding to those necessary for the Offices. Similar groups of canticles are found in several other Anglo-Saxon psalter manuscripts, where they are often glossed.[64]

(e) The Litany

After the canticles is a short Litany, with few distinguishing characteristics.[65] It was published by Leroquais in 1856, a diplomatic edition with little annotation, and is briefly discussed by Francis Wormald in the introduction to the facsimile. Seventy-four figures are listed in the petitions, including seventeen each of apostles, martyrs and confessors and twenty-three virgins. The additional female saints may suggest some particular concern with women, particularly Anglo-Saxon women.

---

[63] See Mearns, James. *The Canticles of the Christian Church.* (Cambridge, 1914) p. 52.

[64] See Gneuss, 'Liturgical manuscripts', pp. 118-19. For a detailed discussion of the monastic canticles, which does not consider those in this manuscript but points out much that is relevant, see Michael Korhammer, *Die monastischen Cantica im Mittelalter.* Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie 6 (Munich, 1976).

[65] See the facsimile, ff. 183v-185r or the edition by V. Leroquais, 'Notes', pp. 147-51.

Francis Wormald posited that the manuscript may have been intended for the use of 'some pious great lady'[66]—the additional virgins may be a small point which gives support to this argument. Otherwise, the figures named in the litany are a standard group for the most part, resembling in general what very much later, in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, became the Use of York, rather than the Use of Sarum.[67] Each group begins in the standard way with early figures of the Church, includes a representative chronological sampling of saints, and concludes with several insular figures.

St. Martial appears at the foot of the list of apostles, which means that the

---

[66] facsimile, p. 18.

[67] There are few Anglo-Saxon litanies (e.g. Bodleian MS Digby 63 of the ninth century; the *Salisbury Psalter*, Salisbury Cathedral MS 150 of the tenth century, and the Leofric Missal, Bodleian MS 579, written c. 970 at Glastonbury) surviving from before the Conquest, and the great changes made in the eleventh and twelfth centuries make post-Conquest litanies uncertain witnesses to pre-Conquest practice. Until recently, the two major collections of material were those of Francis Wormald: *English Kalendars before A.D. 1100.* Henry Bradshaw Society 72 (1954), and *English Benedictine Kalendars after A.D. 1100.* Henry Bradshaw Society 76 (1939). The best model for analysis of a litany is F. Wormald, 'The English Saints in the Litany in Arundel MS. 60', *Analecta Bollandiana* 64 (1946), pp. 72-86, which carefully considers what kinds of material can be used to draw tentative conclusions from litanies and calendars. The work of Edmund Bishop, whose major articles are collected in *Liturgica Historica.* (Oxford, 1918) remains useful, and a complete bibliography of his publications appears in N. Abercrombie, *The Life and Work of Edmund Bishop.* (London, 1959). Also useful for this analysis were the preliminary notes found in D.H. Farmer, *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints.* (Oxford, 1978), and, for the resting-places of saints, the edition of F. Liebermann, *Die Heiligen Englands* (Hanover, 1889), supplemented by D.W. Rollason, 'Lists of saints' resting-places in Anglo-Saxon England' *ASE* 7 (1978), pp. 61-93. Finally, some service-books of the later Anglo-Saxon church provide useful material for analysis of a litany, but the text of MS lat. 8824 does not lead directly to any of these manuscripts.

arguments of his followers at Limoges that he should be placed not with the confessors but with the apostles had been accepted in the monastery where this manuscript was produced. These attempts at promoting Martial's recognition were accelerated after their proclamation by a council on 2 August 1029;[68] it is likely that the martyr's higher status in this manuscript provides evidence for a date after that announcement. Martial ranks as an apostle in four other mid-eleventh century English manuscripts (three psalters and one Bible[69]) but they are geographically and chronologically disparate. Wormald argues that this early acceptance in England of Martial's dubious position as the last apostle may be connected with Cnut's association with William, duke of Aquitaine.[70] If the king encouraged the claims, then Martial would have been more likely elevated in a manuscript produced during or just after his reign.[71] If the date of the manuscript is closer to the middle of the eleventh century, as recent scholars have argued, then the position of Martial may

---

[68] See Karl Leyser, 'The Ascent of Latin Europe' Inaugural Lecture at Oxford on 7 Nov 1984. (Oxford, 1986), pp. 6-11 for an account of the activities of Adémar of Chabannes (988-1034) on behalf of St. Martial of Limoges.

[69] See Wormald, 'The English Saints in the Litany in Arundel MS. 60', *Analecta Bollandiana* 64 (1976) pp. 72-86 at p. 74 and Appendix pp. 84-6.

[70] in facsimile, p. 18.

[71] However, Anglo-Saxon association with Aquitaine did not begin or end with Cnut. For the earlier period see Wilhelm Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century.* (Oxford, 1946), and for the association with Cnut see F. Barlow, *The English Church 1000-1066.* 2nd ed. (London, 1979), pp. 18-21.

suggest a monastery or nunnery endowed by Cnut or Emma for the origin of the manuscript. This does not, however, narrow the provenance of the manuscript by very much, since both Cnut and Emma were very active in donation to religious foundations.

In the list of martyrs the petitions invoke the protomartyr Stephen, the first three bishops of Rome after Peter, four Roman martyrs of the third century, Vincent of Zaragoza, Gervase and Protase of Milan, Christopher, and Alban, the protomartyr of Britain, all standard figures in any medieval litany. The last four names are the more significant: four of the most influential English royal saints. Oswald is a standard figure in Anglo-Saxon litanies from the seventh century on, and his cult was a national, and , later, international one. Kenelm (here spelt Cynelm), the Mercian prince and martyr of the early ninth century, may appear because of the revival of cults of royal saints which began in the late tenth century.[72] This revival and the special concerns it argues for royal saints may also affect the inclusion of the last two martyrs in this litany.[73] Edmund's cult only became a national one after 1020 when Cnut ordered that a stone church be erected at Bury St. Edmunds and the clerics there

---

[72] See D.W. Rollason, 'The cults of murdered royal saints in Anglo-Saxon England' *ASE* 11 (1983), pp. 1-22 for the argument that these cults were extended and revitalised for political reasons.

[73] For the cults of Edward and Kenelm see E. Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century.* (Oxford, 1946) pp. 249-50. Edward's *Life* is edited by C.E. Fell, *Edward, King and Martyr.* (Leeds, 1971).

be reformed by Benedictine monks.[74] The last of these king-martyrs, Edward, who died in 979, had a cult which was widespread from the early eleventh century, aided by the translation of his relics to Shaftesbury by Dunstan in 980.[75] However, while the litany includes some of these royal saints, there are by no means enough to suggest definite royal involvement in the production of the manuscript.

The list of confessors is a strongly insular one. Benedict appears first, a common feature of Benedictine manuscripts. Among the rest are Cuthbert, Guthlac, Aidan, Patrick, Dunstan, Swithun and Birinus. What Wormald calls 'the most significant' combination in the text is that of Aldhelm and Paternus.[76] Their occurrence together is a feature of Malmesbury manuscripts, for Aldhelm was the abbot of Malmesbury and Paternus a monk and bishop of Wales whose name occurs primarily in manuscripts of southern, especially south-western centres, such as

---

[74] See M. Winterbottom, ed. *Three Lives of English Saints.* (Toronto, 1972), pp. 65-87. For Cnut's possible involvement see ed. F.E. Harmer, *Anglo-Saxon Writs.* (Manchester, 1952), p. 191. On the other hand, Ælfric's *Life of King Edmund* may suggest at least a local cult which had already grown. See *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Primer.* 9th ed. rev. by N. Davis. (Oxford, 1953), pp. 81-7, and W.W. Skeat, *Ælfric's Lives of Saints.* 4, E.E.T.S. o.s. 114 (Oxford, 1900) for editions.

[75] See the papers in David Hill, ed., *Ethelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference.* BAR British Series 59 (Oxford, 1978), and S. Keynes, *The Diplomas of King Æthelred 'the Unready' 978-1016.* (Cambridge, 1980). Æthelred declared Edward's sanctity in 1001, but the cult only focused opposition towards him, helping his successor and chief opponent Cnut.

[76] facsimile, p. 18.

Gloucester and Malmesbury.[77] Wormald implies, although he does not assert, that the manuscript is a Malmesbury production. There were, however, other influences at work in the litany. Swithun is a Winchester saint, the bishop of Winchester whose relics were translated to the Old Minster in 971 by Æthelwold. Also, the penultimate figure in the list of confessors, Eodoce, was a continental saint whose feast was not well known in England, but was of high rank at Winchester. The list of confessors so far, then, suggests a southern, and more especially, a southwestern origin for the litany, and probably for the manuscript. Winchester is almost certainly an influence on the litany,[78] as Malmesbury may also be. The last saint in the list of confessors is Petroc, the most famous of the Cornish hermit-saints. His inclusion must argue for a southwestern origin, at Malmesbury or even further west in Devon or Cornwall.[79]

The list of virgins has a lower proportion of insular names but some are

---

[77] See the discussions of these libraries in R.M. Thomson, 'The Scriptorium of William of Malmesbury' in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts, and Libraries: Essays presented to N.R. Ker.* ed. M.B. Parkes and A.G. Watson (London, 1978), pp. 117-42, and M.B. Parkes, 'The Handwriting of St. Boniface: A Reassessment of the Evidence' *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache* 98 (1976), pp. 161-79.

[78] See N.J. Morgan, 'Notes on the Post-Conquest Calendar, Litany and Martyrology of the Cathedral Priory of Winchester with a Consideration of Winchester Diocese Calendars of the Pre-Saxon Period.' in *The Vanishing Past.* Studies presented to Christopher Höhler. Ed. A. Borg and A. Martindale. BAR International Series III (1981), pp. 133-71. Morgan points out that saints who had relics at Winchester included Swithun, Birinus (translated by Ethelwold in 980), Ethelwold, Hedda, Justus, Alphege of Winchester, Frithestan and Brinstan (p. 147). Judoc's relics were translated in 901 or 902 from Saint Josse-sur-Mer (Picardy) to the New Minster (p. 151). See also Liebermann, pp. 15, 16 and Wormald, 'Litany', pp. 79 and 112.

[79] See Lynette Olson, *Early Monasteries in Cornwall.* (Woodbridge, 1989).

similarly significant. This list is the least clearly organized of the litany. The chronological order of the earlier lists is lost, and Margaret of Antioch appears twice—listed as both Margaret and Marina. Among the Continental virgins are Scholastica, the patron saint of Benedictine nunneries, Petronilla the patroness of Charlemagne, and Genevieve the patron saint of Paris. The noteworthy connections from the continent, then, suggest Frankish and Benedictine influence. Brigid, the abbess of Kildare, second only to Patrick in popularity among the Irish saints, also appears. The last six virgins are all insular saints, and include representatives from various cults and regions. Tecla was a nun of Wimborne in Dorset who went to Boniface's aid on the continent. Etheldreda (written Æðeldryþa here) and Sexburga represent Ely, while Alfgifu appears from Wessex, particularly Shaftesbury Abbey. Tova, one of the three hermits of Thorney killed by the Danes in 870, is the penultimate entry.[80] Her cult was venerated in Thorney by the millenium, and, as part of his programme of reform and renewal, Æthelwold translated their bodies. Last of the virgins is the rather obscure Cornish saint known as Columba the Virgin.[81] As with the list of confessors, the last figure is Cornish, a fact which may be as significant for diagnostic purposes as is the combination of Aldhelm and Paternus.

The litany thus includes in each group of petitions a representative selection of Continental and historical saints before shifting to insular and relatively

---

[80] The two male hermits, Tancred and Torhtred, do not appear as martyrs.

[81] although a misapplication of Latin grammar might just possibly have led to the incorrect listing of the better-known Columba of Ireland here. This does, however, seem unlikely.

contemporary figures. The major English saints do occur, including the Durham trio of Cuthbert, Aidan and Oswald, and the national saints Edward, Edmund and Etheldreda. However, Patrick and Brigid suggest Irish influence, while the appearance of Petronylla, Genevieve and the elevated position of Martial suggest a Frankish connection. The names occurring towards or at the end of each list seem to be the most useful for determining the possible origin of the manuscript. Among these are the Malmesbury combination of Aldhelm and Paternus, although both of these saints occur alone in other south-western manuscripts and their occurrence together here could conceivably be chance. However, the Dorset saint Tecla, and the Cornish ones Petroc and Columba, make a south-western provenance very likely. Canterbury is impossible because Alphege's martyrdom in 1016 meant his inclusion in every Canterbury litany thereafter. The manuscript is almost certainly Benedictine, given the importance accorded to Benedict himself, to Scholastica, to several royal saints, and the mention of several saints who achieved greater recognition after their relics were translated in the Benedictine Reform. The litany's provenance, then, was a Benedictine monastery or nunnery in the southwest, probably not Winchester but possibly Malmesbury, or locations farther west in Devon or Cornwall.[82]

(f) The Prayers

At the end of the manuscript are nine Latin prayers, for the most part short

---

[82] Possible monasteries, according to the Ordnance Survey map, *Britain before the Norman Conquest.* (Southampton, 1973), include Tavistock, Buckfast, Exeter, Athelney, Muchelney, and possibly Glastonbury or Abbotsbury.

confessional petitions. I have argued above that they may have carried some significance for the compiler, since the final quire was one of three bifolia, not two bifolia and an added folio. The prayers at the end of the manuscript may have been simply filler, last-minute additions to fill the pages after the important material—the canticles and the litany—were complete. What seems more likely, given the care with which the manuscript is laid out and the texts arranged, is that the prayers were chosen for a specific purpose, and were intended for recitation after study of the psalms.[83]

The prayers do not correspond to any of the prayers or collects found in other Anglo-Saxon psalters, nor do they correspond to the material in other Anglo-Saxon prayer manuscripts such as the Book of Cerne (C.U.L. MS Ll. i. 10), the Book of Nunnaminster (B.L. MS Harley 2965), or MS Royal 2 A. xx. Equally, there is no apparent connection to other texts in this manuscript. Five of the prayers (numbers two, three, six, seven and nine) have to date defied any kind of identification and it is just possible, however unlikely, that they were composed for inclusion in this manuscript. There are more corrections in this section of the codex than in most of the rest of the manuscript. Such a high number of corrections suggests either frequent use of this part of the manuscript, or scribal uncertainty about the text. Four of the

---

[83] For good introductions to this complex material see Henry Littlehales, ed. *The Prymer or Lay Folks' Prayer Book. Part II. Introduction.* E.E.T.S. o.s. 109 (London, 1897), and C.E. Hohler, 'Some Service Books of the Later Saxon Church' in *Tenth-Century Studies.* ed. D. Parsons (London, 1975), pp. 60-83 and 217-27. See also E. Brayer & A-M. Bouly de Lesdain, 'Les prières usuelles annexées aux anciennes traductions françaises du psautier' *Bulletin de l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes* 15 (1969), pp. 69-120.

prayers are written in the first person plural, five in the first person singular. Alternative readings are written into the seventh prayer should the petitioners all be female. These are all intriguing hints about possible usage of the manuscript, but offer no conclusions. Some of the prayers, however, do have parallels in other medieval manuscripts, and may be more instructive about the milieu of this material.

Only one of the prayers has a contemporary parallel; the fifth one occurs in the Missal of Robert of Jumièges.[84] The prayer is also used in the Sarum Missal and in the Bobbio Missal, in all cases as a Post-Communion prayer for a mass said by the priest for himself.[85] Lowe in his edition of the Bobbio Missal argues that the greater part of this mass comes from eighth-century Gelasian sacramentaries, and this prayer in particular was derived from Ambrosian origins. However, this does not affect its appearance in this manuscript if Höhler's argument that the Missal of Robert of Jumieges represents what was most likely to be common practice in Anglo-Saxon England is accepted.[86] The variations in the Paris Psalter manuscript from the Jumieges text do not help, for the later service-books invariably follow the Missal text at these points.

The first one appears in many later manuscripts and printed works as a collect for the priest during the Mass. A short collect, beginning **Aufer a nobis domine**

---

[84] *Missal of Robert of Jumièges*. ed. H.A. Wilson. Henry Bradshaw Society 11 (1896), pp. 252-3.

[85] *Sarum Missal*, ed. J. Wickham Legg (Oxford, 1916), p. 399. *Bobbio Missal*, ed. E.A. Lowe. Henry Bradshaw Society 58, 61 (Oxford, 1920) p. 121 and Notes pp. 407-11.

[86] Höhler, 'Some service books', p. 75.

iniquitates nostres, the prayer appears in a number of liturgical manuscripts, and is even shortened to an abbreviation in the Liber Evesham of c. 1300.[87] The officiating priest uses it after the opening exchange of responses as a preparation for the Mass in the Ordinary of the thirteenth-century Sarum Missal.[88] A lengthened version appears in the fourteenth-century Westminster Missal, also used there in the Ordinary as the collect of the Preparation for the Mass.[89]

Phrases and ideas from the other prayers show that they belong to the penitential tradition of medieval liturgical material. Occasionally there are echoes which sound more specific, but which only demonstrate the common vocabulary of the penitential material. For example, the fourth prayer, **Exaudi me domine**, begins with a phrase which occurs in a prayer in the Missal of Robert of Jumieges, and recurs much later in a collect after Mass appearing in the Sarum Missal.[90] The same prayer calls on St. Michael to guide the soul after death as it leaves the body, so that it will reach the throne of God and be more quickly judged and received into glory. These sentiments are commonplaces of the Anglo-Saxon homiletic tradition, derived from the **Visio Sancti Pauli** and associated texts. The references and ideas are the same as those in numerous other prayers, insular and continental, but the specific prayers do not otherwise survive. Similarly, the eighth prayer, the only one to the

---

[87] *Liber Evesham.* ed. H.A. Wilson. Henry Bradshaw Society 6 (1893), prayer 15.

[88] *Sarum*, p. 217.

[89] *Missale ad usum Ecclesiae Westmonasteriensis.* ed. J. Wickham Legg. Henry Bradshaw Society 12 (1897), Vol. II, Col. 490.

[90] *Sarum*, p. 12.

Virgin Mary, which pleads for the intercession of Mary and all the saints on behalf of the speakers, has some parallels of vocabulary to the Gelasian Sacramentary, notably the repetition of **semper uirginus**. However, Clayton is unable to trace the prayer any further.[91]

Appendix I includes a diplomatic edition of the nine Latin prayers in the manuscript. These texts may yet prove to be most useful for establishing the provenance of the manuscript, but as yet, to use Wormald's words, 'they have so far eluded identification in any other early English psalters.'[92] The greatest number of parallels in the prayers are with the eleventh-century Missal of Robert of Jumieges, hardly surprising since that is the liturgical book closest in date to the Paris Psalter manuscript. It is easier, in fact, to identify what the prayers are not: they are not Barking products; there are not many parallels to Winchester; and they are not Cluniac, but do seem Benedictine. The distinction between Roman and Celtic modes of prayer may prove useful in the end, but at the moment drawing such a distinction (given the mixed nature of most of these prayers) is difficult. Whether or not the prayers were an afterthought, their inclusion in the manuscript completes the material necessary for private devotional use of the text.

---

[91] *The Gelasian Sacramentary.* ed. H.A. Wilson. Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae. (Oxford, 1894). See also *The Monastic Breviary of Hyde Abbey, Winchester.* ed. J.B.L. Tolhurst. Vol. 5. Henry Bradshaw Society 71 (London, 1934) for frequent occurrences of the same phrase. For a discussion of this prayer see Mary Clayton, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England.* Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 2. (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 105-6.

[92] Wormald, facsimile introduction, p. 18.

iii. Decoration

The decoration of the text presents a number of interesting problems. There were originally four types of decoration in the manuscript: full-page illuminations, outline drawings, rubrics for each psalm, and versals. The illuminations were lost between the inventory of 1402 of the manuscript—which refers to the opening illustration of King David and his harp—and the eighteenth century when the work was bound in its present form.[93] Calculation of the verses left untranslated in relation to the twelve missing pages suggests that there were ten illustrations in the manuscript: one each at the beginning and end of the psalter, and eight others reflecting the eightfold liturgical division of the psalter.[94] There are faint imprints of illuminations on ff. 45v, 132v, and 175v and a stronger reflection on f. 97v. Edges of the missing folios with some borders of the illuminations remaining are found after ff. 26, 79, and 97. These imprints and edges suggest that the illuminations covered a proportion of the page larger all round the written space by an inch. The colours appear to be the same as those used for the versals: blue, green, and gold. On f. 176v appears the impression of a horizontal line dividing the page of illumination in half, as well as some detail of the upper picture. The same horizontal break mid-way down the page appears in reflection on f. 132v, as well as a heavy reddish discolouration of the leaf. The lost illuminations probably illustrated the text of the

---

[93] See J.D. Bruce, *Anglo-Saxon Version*, pp. 51-5.

[94] For other methods of division of the psalter see Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts*, p. 322.

psalter fairly simply, without lavish use of colour or complex patterns. More distinct reflections would be likely to appear on the facing pages if an elaborate system of illustration and illumination had been used. Wormald identifies a Winchester acanthus border from one of the edging fragments;[95] it is likely that these illustrations were outline drawings with some colour added. Such illustrations would belong to the small group of forerunners of the twelfth-century Winchester style.[96]

Secondly, thirteen delicately-drawn vignettes illustrating the text of the psalter appear in the early pages of the text. Identifying a direct source from such a small corpus of material is usually impossible. The drawings are direct illustrations of the psalter text and could certainly all be original compositions. However, the major analogue of these illustrations was identified by Wormald[97] as the Utrecht Psalter[98],

---

[95] See F. Wormald in facsimile, p. 14.

[96] For a review of the background to the period see R. Deshman, 'Anglo-Saxon Art after Alfred' *Art Bulletin* 56 (1974) pp. 177-200, which discusses the rise of Winchester and the development of royal patronage. See also Richard Gameson, 'English Manuscript Art in the Mid Eleventh Century,' forthcoming.

[97] F. Wormald, *English Drawings of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries*.(London: Faber, 1952). Four drawings are derived from Utrecht Psalter drawings of the same psalm verses, and at least one more shows Utrecht influence. See also his 'Decorated Initials in English Manuscripts from A.D. 900 to 1100' *Archaeologia* 91 (1945), pp. 107-35.

[98] A great deal of literature concerns itself with the Utrecht Psalter (now Utrecht, University Library MS 32), its sources, its origin, and its influence, especially on Anglo-Saxon manuscripts of the eleventh and early twelfth centuries. The Utrecht Psalter itself is a ninth century copy of the Gallican Psalter made at the abbey of Hautvillers near Rheims. A useful introduction to its study is J.H.A. Engelbregt, *Het Utrechts psalterium; een eeuw wetenschappelijke bestudering (1860-1960)*, (Utrecht, 1965), which is a critical survey both of the manuscript itself including the 'didacto-mnemotechnical function' of the drawings, and of scholarship concerning the psalter. Engelbregt includes an extensive bibliography and a summary of the text both

a ninth-century manuscript from the abbey of Hautvillers near Rheims, which was lent to Christ Church, Canterbury around the year 1000.[99] Another possible source is the first set of illustrations in Harley 603, a Psalter which was the earliest English imitation of the Utrecht work.[100] The Utrecht Psalter tradition exemplifies a literal

---

in Dutch and in English; useful reviews are J. Backhouse, *Burlington Magazine* 108 (1966) pp. 326-7 and R. Häsler, *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 29 (1966), pp. 173-5. For facsimiles of the manuscript itself, see that of the Paleographical Society in 1874 and the more recent but not necessarily preferable K. Van der Horst & J.H.A. Engelbregt, *The Utrecht Psalter*, Codices Selecti 75 (Graz, 1982). See also E.T. DeWald, *The Illustrations of the Utrecht Psalter* (Princeton, 1932). For the sources and tradition of the psalter drawings see F. Wormald 'The Utrecht Psalter' in *Collected Writings I.* Studies in Medieval Art from the Sixth to the Twelfth Centuries. Oxford, 1984), pp. 36-46 and G.R. Benson & D.T. Tselos 'New Light on the Origin of the Utrecht Psalter' *Art Bulletin* 13 (1931), pp. 13-79. This material is analysed more closely in D. Tselos, *The Sources of the Utrecht Psalter Miniatures.* 2nd ed. (Minneapolis, 1960), and defended against Engelbregt and Wormald in 'Defensive addenda to the problem of the Utrecht Psalter' *Art Bulletin* 44 (1967), pp. 334-49. The more serious implications of these ideas are discussed in Dora Panofsky's 'The Textual Basis of the Utrecht Psalter Illustrations' *Art Bulletin* 25 (1943), pp. 50-8, in which she argues that the method of illustration and the material chosen both suggest that the psalter derives from a double or triple psalter tradition dating back as early as the fifth century on the continent.

[99] The connection with Canterbury does not, however, have to be a direct one. See, for instance, E. Kantorowicz, 'The Quinity of Winchester' *Art Bulletin*, 19 (1947), pp. 73-85. Both scribes and manuscripts moved around Anglo-Saxon England. For a more detailed analysis of the Quinity see J. Kidd, 'The Quinity of Winchester Reconsidered' *Studies in Iconography* 7-8 (1981-2), pp. 21-33.

[100] The history of English copies of or developments from the Utrecht Psalter is also disputed. See Dimitri Tselos 'English Manuscript Illustration and the Utrecht Psalter' *Art Bulletin* 41 (1959), pp. 137-49, and S. Dufrenne 'Les copies anglaises du Psautier d'Utrecht' *Scriptorium* 18 (1964), pp. 185-97 for the first developments from Wormald's initial statement of the question. The manuscripts which clearly show Utrecht influence are B.L. MS Harley 603, the Eadwine or Canterbury Psalter which is Cambridge, Trinity College MS R. 17.1, and the manuscript known as either the Canterbury Psalter or the Great Canterbury Psalter which is Paris, B.N. MS lat. 8846. All of these manuscripts are Canterbury products, and they are usually dated sequentially; that is, MS Harley 603, depending upon the hand, from the second

approach to the text, providing a direct interpretation of the verse being illustrated.[101] The twelve drawings interspersed between verses in the Latin text reflect this tradition, with some interesting variations. The single verse appearing in

---

quarter of the eleventh century to the late eleventh century; the Eadwine Psalter to c. 1200, and the Great Canterbury Psalter to the first quarter of the thirteenth century. M.R. James argues, in 'Four Leaves of an English Psalter, Twelfth Century' *The Walpole Society* 25 (1936-7), pp. 1-23, that four isolated leaves of illuminations which survive are the remnants of another English psalter which represents an intermediate stage between the washed-colour drawings of the Canterbury Psalter and the highly-wrought illuminations of the Great Canterbury Psalter. For a discussion of the latter work see A. Heimann, 'The Last Copy of the Utrecht Psalter' in *The Year 1200: A Symposium.* Intro. J. Hoffeld. (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1975). The manuscript is not available in facsimile but see *Bibliothèque Nationale. Departement des Manuscrits. Reproduction des 107 miniatures du Manuscrit latin 8846.* (Paris, 1906). Tselos argues for other manuscripts being influenced by the Utrecht style, including on p. 149 what he calls the Berry manuscript (the *Paris Psalter*), and arguing for its similarity to Hand E of the Harley Psalter (which Wormald dates to the second quarter of the eleventh century). The Harley Psalter, unfortunately, is still not available in facsimile, but was the subject of a recent article: Janet Backhouse, 'The Making of the Harley Psalter,' *British Library Journal* 10 (1984), 97-113. Notably, MS Harley 603 substitutes a Roman version of the psalter for the Gallican text of the Utrecht Psalter, but it retains the use of three quite narrow columns for the text. The rustic capitals of the Utrecht Psalter become a clear Caroline Minuscule of the mid eleventh century. Backhouse distinguishes among the hands of the illustrators, establishing its Christ Church provenance, and concentrating on the work of Eadui Basan, a leading Canterbury scribe. See also Rolf Häsler, 'Zu zwei Darstellungen aus der altesten Kopie des Utrecht Psalters' *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 44 (1981), pp. 317-39, where a possible royal background to the manuscript is suggested. Perhaps the most useful text for analysis of the relations among these psalters is Suzy Dufrenne, *Tableaux synoptiques de 15 psautiers mediévaux à illustrations intégrales issue de texte.* (Paris, 1978). Here, all the manuscripts with 'literal' illustrations of the text are described systematically in 169 tables. See also O. Pächt, *The Rise of Pictorial Narrative in Twelfth-Century England.* (Oxford, 1962).

[101] The influence of the Utrecht Psalter on Anglo-Saxon manuscripts has been widely discussed. For its direct influence on psalter copying see S. Dufrenne, 'Les copies anglaises du Psautier d'Utrecht' *Scriptorium* 18 (1964), pp. 185-97, a good introduction to the question.

the Old English side of the text demonstrates that the illustrator—in this case probably the scribe himself—shared the same literal approach to the material, although the drawing derives not from the Latin, but from a suggestion in the Old English prose introduction.[102] In any case, in a few small drawings, the Paris Psalter illustrator conveyed a number of striking images, presenting motifs which were common concerns of the medieval Christian.

In a series of vividly-drawn sketches corresponding to the text of the verse near which they appear in the text, the Paris Psalter drawings suggest prayer and penitence. They serve as textual illustration of the most basic kind, since they make clear the concern of the compiler of the manuscript with literal understanding, rather than mystical interpretation, of the psalms. They reflect a desire to use the psalter as a simple means of communicating with God. Three of these thirteen drawings depict the psalmist in an attitude of prayer, and the artist optimistically suggests in each sketch that God is listening, and His hand stretches out to the penitent. In a fourth the psalmist stands looking up into the clouds as the hand of God appears with a pair of dividers[103]—an image combining both prayer and penitence which continues to

---

[102] See Robert M. Harris, 'An Illustration in an Anglo-Saxon Psalter in Paris' *JWCI* 26 (1963), pp. 255-63.

[103] The inspiration for this motif of God's compass is the opening of Genesis or possibly Proverbs 8:27. Wormald compares the iconography here to the Eadwi Gospels, now in the Kestner Museum in Hanover. Written c.1025 in Winchester, the text includes a diagram of God with a compass on f. 9v. See also J.B. Friedman, 'The Architect's Compass in Creation Miniatures of the Later Middle Ages,' *Traditio* 30 (1974), 419-29. Friedmann argues that the motif comes from Jewish commentaries in France. Wormald points out another parallel, the closest one, in 'An English Eleventh-Century Psalter with Pictures,' *The Walpole Society* 38 (1960-2), 1-13. He

have a telling effect.

Two more of the line drawings portray the physical act of penitence, as men bring offerings to God.[104] One of these drawings may derive from the iconographic tradition of the separate offerings made by Cain and Abel. Broderick points out that in the tenth century Athelstan Psalter, for instance, Cain proffers a pot, while Abel carries a bag slung over his shoulder, a presentation very like that of the drawing on f. 3r. In his thesis, Broderick traces the source of the image through aggadic lore by way of the Irish acquaintance with the works of the Syriac fathers, including Theodore of Mopsuestia.[105] In the drawing, the first man, who is standing still, is holding not a jar but a kind of casket from which some drapery falls, while the second man, carrying a large sack, is stepping forward and indicating with one hand the open mouth of the sack. A connection with this tradition, however, is tenuous at best, and

---

examines the Tiberius Psalter, B.L. MS Cotton Tiberius C. vi, from Winchester in the mid eleventh century, which has a well-known diagram of the motif on f. 7v. The motif also occurs in the Bury St. Edmunds Psalter, now Vatican MS Reg. lat. 12, and is discussed by A. Heimann, 'Three Illustrations from the Bury St. Edmunds Psalter and their Prototypes' *JWCI* 29 (1966), pp. 46-56. For further discussion of this mid (or possibly late) eleventh century manuscript see R. Thomson, 'The Library of Bury St. Edmunds Abbey in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries' *Speculum* 47 (1972), pp. 617-45, and a dissertation which I have not seen: R.M. Harris, *The Marginal Drawings of the Bury St. Edmunds Psalter.* (Ph.D., Princeton, 1960).

[104] Gale Owen argues, in 'Wynflæd's Wardrobe' *ASE* 8 (1979) p. 217 that the second man in the sketch on f. 3r is actually a woman because of the round hat worn. See also her book, as Gale Owen-Crocker, *Dress in Anglo-Saxon England* (Manchester, 1986).

[105] Broderick, Herbert Reginald. *The iconographic and compositional sources of the drawings in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11.* (Ph.D., Columbia, 1978). The tradition of the offerings of Cain and Abel to God is discussed on pp. 249-52.

one argument against it is Owen's contention that the second figure in this drawing is not Cain but a woman because of the headgear. (The figure seems to have a beard!) Lastly, two drawings show the awful consequences of insufficient prayer and penitence. In the ninth diagram the Anglo-Saxon motif of Hell Mouth appears,[106] and it is full of the heads of sinners looking up. Also, in the second diagram, Christ is seen in the clouds carrying a banner while below is a pit full of heads. While all these drawings are literal interpretations of the text, the role of the psalmist is also representative of every man, and man's direct and personal approach to God is the concern of the compiler and illustrator of the text. He illustrates verses which reflect these concerns, and arranges his material to reflect most directly the hopes and fears of the psalmist, and of every Christian. Because these line drawings end abruptly after the first quire, more precise analysis of their origins and purpose is impossible.

The *tituli* at the head of each psalm are the third decorative feature of the manuscript. The rustic capitals used for these argumenta serve as one of the few unifying features of the manuscript. The colour of the lettering is a faded red. The scribe finished each page (and possibly a whole quire) before going back to fill in the relevant rubrics. Not much concern was taken to leave sufficient space for the *tituli*, and quite often the Latin is drastically abbreviated, with all or part of the source

---

[106] A motif later to be a commonplace in the mystery plays, a tangible manifestation of the fate of evil souls. See M. Schapiro, 'Cain's Jaw Bone that did the First Murder', *Art Bulletin* 24 (1942), p. 211.

material left out.[107] This practice is most evident in the rubric to Psalm 13 on f. 11v, where the scribe is forced to run three lines down the margin because he mistakenly writes 'se interrogantem' twice.

Finally, the versals for both the Latin and Old English texts are the fourth kind of decoration in the manuscript. The main principle of illumination of the versals seems to have been alternating blue and gold for the Latin, and alternating green and gold for the Old English.[108] The scribe worked by quires, as evidenced by the relative strength of the pigments and by the relative occurrence of mistakes. Mistakes are most frequent at the beginning of a quire, when using a new pigment, and when both the Latin and Old English texts have the same versal.[109] Despite great efforts to keep to the system, the only quires which are consistent with this practice for every versal are the seventeenth and the twenty-second (ff. 119-126 and 158-165).[110]

---

[107] See, for instance, f. 23r where space is left for the **titulus** of Psalm 22, but the rubric is left out, whereas at the foot of the same folio no room for the rubric of Psalm 23 is left, so it is squeezed in at the top of f. 23v.

[108] Ker, *Catalogue*, p. xxxviii points out that although red is the most frequent colour for versals, other colours can be used in addition, often alternating in a more or less regular series. Of the colour schemes given as examples red, blue, and green is quite common, usually found in manuscripts from Exeter, while the *Paris Psalter* is unique for its variation of gold, blue and green.

[109] The illuminator certainly knew Old English; at the opening of Psalm 82.1 the versal 'h' is followed by an illuminated blue *wynn* to change what would otherwise have read *hylc* into *hwylc*.

[110] In quire 17, from ff. 119a-126b, all the Latin versals are either blue or gold, all the Old English are green or gold. Quire 22 is somewhat more complex, in that during Psalm 135 nearly every line has a versal, and the poet varies gold and green versals for the Old English, but uses gold, blue and green for the Latin passages where these very short verses occur (ff. 158a-165b).

iv. History of the Manuscript

The provenance of the manuscript and its history until 1402 are unknown.[111] The earliest reference to the codex occurs in an inventory of that date of the possessions of Jean, duc de Berry and brother of Charles V of France. A well-known collector of manuscripts, he signed his name and title on f. 186r, and stamped the outer edges of the book with the arms of Auvergne and Burgundy. How and why Berry acquired this particular manuscript is uncertain and opinions differ. The price, 'iii flor vi gr', on the obverse of the page signed by the duke, proves little. He was renowned as a collector and commissioner of richly illuminated manuscripts (most notably Books of Hours);[112] it is, therefore, perhaps worth considering why this manuscript with only ten illustrations should have entered his possession. Perhaps the most plausible explanation would be that he inherited it or received it as a present, but no record of such a transaction has been found. Alternatively, the relatively early date of the text, its interesting format, or perhaps the spurious notion that it was Hebrew may have been the incentives.

---

[111] The short history of the manuscript which follows was largely established by Delisle when he catalogued the entire manuscript collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale in the mid-nineteenth century. It was first rehearsed at length by J.D. Bruce. A quick review of the late medieval references to the manuscript is necessary to prepare the way for a fuller discussion of the rediscovery of the codex by Dom Edmund Martène.

[112] Many have commented on the Duke's importance as not just a collector but also a patron, even according to Marcel Thomas an 'active collaborator' in the production of illuminated manuscripts in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. See, for instance, M. Thomas. *The Golden Age. Manuscript Illumination in the Time of Jean, Duc de Berry.* (London, 1979).

The inventory of 1402 (begun in December 1401) describes item 1027 on f. 78r as:

> Item un tres ancien psaultier long ystorie d'ouvrage romain et au comencement de dauid jouant de la harpe et sur les fueillets peint des armes de france et de boulongue couvert de vieille foie a demi topaz donc en l'un na point de fremoner.[113]

In the margin a medieval hand notes its departure to the Sancta Capella. The duc de Berry founded the Sainte Chapelle at Bourges and donated numerous manuscripts to its library[114] In 1404 this manuscript was the seventh item[115]—described in the same terms as in the earlier inventory—of a group of thirty-two works given on the

---

[113] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS francais 11,496.

[114] See, first, L. Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1868) Tome I, pp 56-68 'Librairie de Jean, Duc de Berry,' and Tome III, Appendix XXXIII, 'Librairie du duc de Berry', pp. 170-3, and p. 339, correcting and adding to the entry in Tome I. Further analysis of the Duke's library according to the two inventories of 1413 and 1416 can be found in M. Douet d'Arcq, 'Notice sur la bibliothèque de Jean, duc de Berry en 1416', *Revue archéologique* 7 (1850) pp. 144-168 and 224-233; and in M. Hiver de Beauvoir, *La librairie de Jean, duc de Berry, au château de Mehun-sur-Yèvre (1416) publiée en entier pour la première fois d'après les inventaires et avec des notes.* (Paris, 1860) Hiver de Beauvoir describes the treasures donated to the Sainte Chapelle in *Description, d'après la teneur des chartes, du trésor donné par Jean, duc de Berry, à la Sainte-Chapelle de Bourges, avec une introduction, des notes, et deux notices*, (Bourges, 1855), pp. 96-105, with a supplement: 'Notice des joyaux d'église trouvé à la grosse tour de Bourges et à Paris après le décès de duc Jean'. See also the first sixty-two entries of an unfinished catalogue by M. Paulin Paris 'Livres de Jean, duc de Berry' in *Bulletin du bibliophile*, Deuxieme serie (1837), pp 601-14, and the very useful L. Delisle, 'Notes sur la bibliothèque de la Sainte Chapelle de Bourges' in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, 4e série 2 (1856) pp. 142-59.

[115] There were two copies of the list of books given by Robinet d'Estampes (the Duke's librarian) to Arnoul Belin, the treasurer of the Sainte Chapelle. The original is lost; a copy appears in B.N. MS Nouv. acq. lat. 2016, f. 228.

10th of May. The projected donation had been thirty-nine manuscripts, but at the last moment the Duke added nine and deleted sixteen from the total. He made a further gift the following year, sending the major portion of a large purchase of manuscripts from de Baude de Guy to Bourges. The chapel continued to acquire manuscripts, and apparently to care for them, until the mid-sixteenth century when the library comprised around a hundred volumes. The *Paris Psalter* manuscript remained there throughout; it probably appears as the thirty-seventh item in the 1552 catalogue of the library, described as **Psalterium Davidis.**[116] Thereafter the manuscript, and in fact the library, dropped from view until the early years of the eighteenth century.[117]

In August 1708 Dom Edmund Martène arrived at Bourges in the course of the journey around France subsequently published in two volumes as the *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux benedictins.*[118] He visited the cathedral first, arriving the next day at the Sainte Chapelle where, he commented, there had once been a rich library but the surviving manuscripts totalled around fifty or sixty. He was disgusted to find them in a piteous state—the manuscript room was (and had been for some years) in use as a large chicken coop or *poullalier* with the manuscripts, open on the desks,

---

[116] Catalogus Librorum Repertorum in Bibliotheca Sacri Capellae palatii Bituricensis (17 Nov. 1552), p. 145.

[117] Delisle suggests that the manuscripts of the Saint-Chapelle attracted the attention of Dom Anselme Le Michel in the mid-seventeenth century, but the manuscript Delisle refers to, (B.N. MS lat. 13,071, f. 176v) although it does consist of lists of manuscripts from various places in France, including the Royal Library, Corbie and St. Maur, does not seem to include the Sainte Chapelle texts.

[118] Martène, Edmund. *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux benedictins de la congrégation de Saint Maur.* Vol. I (Paris, 1717), pp. 27-9.

covered in droppings. He extracted promises from the abbot that the room would be put in order. Martene refers to the Paris Psalter in the following terms:

> L'un des plus curieux manuscrits de la Sainte Chapelle, est celui qu'on appelle les heures du duc Jean. C'est un pseautier latin avec une version angloise de six ou sept cens ans. Ceux qui me la montrerent, croyoient que c'etoit de l'allemand ou de l'hebreu. Mais si-tot que je l'eus vu, je connus le caractere Anglo-Saxon.

He goes on to mention the litanies and notes the English saints in them. He concludes with the comment that this particular volume was conserved in the *chartrier*, a cartulary or box for charters, which spared it the worst of the avicular depredations. The most intriguing point about this passage is that the *Paris Psalter* was clearly kept in a box, separately, and treasured as an unusual object.

Less than fifty years later the struggling canons of the Sainte Chapelle wrote to Louis XV enumerating their problems: their suffering during the Religious Wars and since a fire in 1750, their inability to take care of the precious relics and ornaments given them by their founder, their urgent necessity for repairs and a new organ; in short, begging for monetary help from the king and offering him (perhaps in return) their library.[119] The offer of the library was accepted after due consideration. It is uncertain whether the canons received any help other than the lifting of the burden of caring for the manuscripts and jewelled relics. The manuscripts arrived at the Bibliothèque Royale on 8 August 1752,[120] were duly

---

[119] B.N. MS fonds latin 17173, ff. 232-3.

[120] See the 'Etat des Manuscrits' B.N. MS lat. 17,173, f. 226. The rest of the manuscripts remaining at the Sainte Chapelle were of thirteenth or fourteenth century

described in Latin, and stamped with the imprint of the Bibliothèque Imperiale.[121] The *Paris Psalter* manuscript was entered provisionally in the supplementary Latin collection as number 333. At about this time it was rebound for the only time in its career and labelled on the spine *Psalteri Anglo-Saxonicum.* A century later the manuscript was re-catalogued by Léopold Delisle in the division of 'tres-grand format' as MS lat. 8824, the second manuscript in the 1863 Latin supplement. It has remained there to this day.[122]

v. Layout of the Manuscript

The most striking feature of the manuscript is its unusual proportions. It measures 526 X 185 mm, and the writing space on each page averages 420 X 95 mm. Furthermore, each page is divided into two columns (Latin on the left) by a space of 15 mm, resulting in an average column width of 42 mm. As far as I have been able to ascertain, this method of layout of the text is unique, at least in Anglo-Saxon England. Many large early manuscripts made use of a two-column format, especially psalter commentaries, but the narrowness of the column in relation to the height of the manuscript is singular. The proportion of column width to height of writing space

---

origin, except a twelfth-century copy of Papius' *Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum.* They included numerous liturgical and moral texts, and ten of the manuscripts had lost at least one leaf, usually the first one.

[121] It seems to have taken some decades for the manuscript to be rebound and catalogued, because by the time it was stamped the country had entered on the Napoleonic era.

[122] It was restored in 1979, including some repair to the faded versals, and remains one of the treasured manuscripts of the Bibliothèque nationale.

is 1:10 in the *Paris Psalter* manuscript. This proportion may be part of the explanation for the unusual shape and layout of the manuscript.[123] The apparent proportion for a manuscript measuring 526 X 186 mm is 1:3, and perhaps other manuscripts of similar proportions may cast some light on the layout of the *Paris Psalter.*

There are some manuscript parallels for such remarkable proportions in the late tenth and eleventh centuries. Linda Brownrigg notes that they include such diverse texts as: B.L. Harley 5431, a copy of the Rule of St. Benedict (230 X 85 mm; proportion 1:3) from the end of the tenth century; Leiden Scaligis 69, a Cosmographia (140 X 60; 1:2.3), end of tenth century; Pembroke College, Cambridge MS 302, Gospels (197 X 102; 1:2), second quarter of the eleventh century; B.L. MS Royal 8 B xi, Paschasius Radburtus (8 3/4" X 4 1/2"; 1:2), second half of the tenth century; Trinity College, Cambridge MS B. l. 42, Latin poetry (7 1/4" X 3 1/2"; 1:2), the end of the tenth century; and B.L. Harley 110, Latin poetry (1:2), end of the tenth century.[124] There is some tendency toward poetry here, but it is by no means a conclusive one, and otherwise the manuscripts have nothing in common besides their unusual format.[125] Also, none is even close to the remarkable proportions of the

---

[123] One possible, but unlikely and undemonstrable, influence on the layout may be numerological. The layout of some aspects of medieval manuscripts, particularly the decoration, has been argued to have been carefully organised with mathematical proportions.

[124] Linda L. Brownrigg, personal communication, August 1987.

[125] Strangely, the tendency towards poetry in these narrow manuscripts is borne out later in the Middle Ages, for the unique late twelfth century holograph, the *Ormulum*, measures 508 X 200 mm (which makes it the closest parallel to the

Paris Psalter manuscript.

No matter what the reason, the size and shape of the manuscript occasioned a number of changes in the scribe's attitude to his text. The stages of the development of page layout can be seen in the first quire (apart from folio 7). He began with the apparently required narrow two-column format but attempted to apply proper principles of word division at the end of the lines (in both Old English and Latin). By the end of the first quire he had discarded all such ideas and, as Wetzel points out, he becomes one of the two worst scribes in Old English with respect to word-division at the ends of lines.[126] Furthermore, a group of thirteen line drawings illustrating the psalms appear only in the early folios of the first quire and were discontinued at the beginning of the second quire. Finally, the first two quires are ruled down the centre of the page with only two lines, indicating the limits of the

---

proportions of the *Paris Psalter* manuscript, and parallel also for its being a metrical version of the Bible, in this case a paraphrase of the gospels). For reasons no longer accepted, the Middle English manuscripts known as holster books conform to these proportions, and include four romance manuscripts, two commonplace books, three books of hours (originally French), and several poetry manuscripts including English and Latin works, Chaucer, and versions of *Piers Plowman.* See Gisela Guddat-Figge, *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Middle English Romances.* (1976), pp. 30-6. Note also the comment of M.R. James concerning an early thirteenth century copy of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* measuring 9 7/8 X 4 1/2" (1:2.2) that 'The tall narrow format of the book is common in copies of Latin poets, intended, as I think, for the use of students, since they could be conveniently carried.' *Catalogue of Medieval Manuscripts in the University Library, Aberdeen.*(Cambridge, 1932), p. 56, concerning item 165. The only other medieval texts of comparable size are account books, but they also date to a later period, and are not so narrow.

[126] See Claus-Dieter Wetzel, *Die Worttrennung am Zeilenende in altenglischen Handschriften.* (Frankfurt, 1981), especially Appendix One, which points out the problems in word-division in the manuscript. The other text which receives equally poor treatment is the *Metres of Boethius* in MS Bodley 180.

writing space, while the scribe in most of the remainder of the manuscript rules a third line down the centre to guide the versals of the Old English. The layout of the manuscript must, then, have been completed with care and checked several times in the early stages, so that minor corrections such as ruling an extra line, establishing more stringent line boundaries, and cutting out the line drawings (for whatever reason) could be made.

vi. Purpose, Provenance and Date of the Manuscript

The *Paris Psalter* manuscript, then, is an unusual one in several ways. First, the size and shape of the codex is peculiar and there are few early medieval parallels of manuscripts of such proportions. Second, given the constraints the proportions of the codex impose on the writing space, it is remarkable that the layout consists of two narrow columns, with a great deal of blank space on each side, at the top, and at the bottom of the folio. Third, the columns keep very carefully in step with each other, and blank space is left in either column where one version of the text finishes more quickly than the other. Also, the columns are uniformly 4.2 mm wide and 420 mm long. Words are written without regard to word division in both texts. The 1:10 proportion of the writing space and the clean lines of the two columns must both have been intentional choices, probably of the person or persons who commissioned the manuscript. Fourth, the manuscript is the first attempt at this arrangement of material. The first and last quires both show signs of rearrangement. Line drawings which appear in the early folios are stopped. The same set of rubrics is used throughout the

manuscript, but is appropriate only for the vernacular version of the first fifty psalms. The two versions of the psalms in the vernacular do not fit together well, and neither one corresponds directly to the Latin version appearing in the opposite column. The first fifty psalms have prose introductions, but the last hundred do not. Such anomalies might have been less obvious if the manuscript had been a second or third copy of the same texts. Fifth, the purpose for which this haphazard collection of texts was put together in this unusual format is also obscure. The manuscript is not pointed for liturgical purposes, and could not have been intended for use during a public service. Neither are the translations literal enough that the text could readily be used for teaching purposes. Similarly, there are no glosses, even syntactic or lexical ones, that would suggest such a use of the manuscript. Finally, the manuscript is so long and narrow that, unless the original binding was exceptionally loose, the folios would not hold open sufficiently to allow extended use of a given passage. There is also no sign on any folio of clips or weights which would hold the vellum down. The manuscript can only have been produced for a particular purpose, and was almost certainly a special commission.

In a particular sense, the *Paris Psalter* manuscript is also a double psalter, part of the medieval tradition of double and triple psalters, in which various versions of the psalms appear in multiple columns in the manuscript. Here, rather than two Latin versions of the text, the scribe wrote one Latin and one vernacular version, preserving the two-column format. Aside from the layout of the manuscript, the appearance of drawings adapted from the Utrecht tradition in the early folia of the codex suggests

a connection with the double psalter tradition. The drawings in the Utrecht Psalter itself, and in those manuscripts derived from it, are literal interpretations of the text. Like the commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia, they try to clarify and delineate the historical and literal facts of the psalms. In fact, Dora Panofsky argues convincingly that the Utrecht Psalter cycle of line drawings was itself developed from a double or even a triple psalter.[127] She points out that several of the Utrecht Psalter illustrations do not coincide with the Gallican Psalter version (which appears as the text of the manuscript) but with the more scholarly Hebraic version.[128] She traces the history of comparative or parallel editions of the psalter and postulates that they may have been more common than hitherto suspected. Certainly the Paris Psalter fits into such a tradition, and the associations of several of the texts in the manuscript with other psalters and other texts in Anglo-Saxon England suggest a wide currency, both geographically and temporally, for this kind of text.

The manuscript is thus a kind of double psalter with additional material, all most likely intended for private use. The canticles, the litany, and the prayers all suggest individual devotion. In fact, the manuscript was even described, admittedly much later, as a private text, appearing in Martène's description as the 'heures du duc Jean.' The person for whom the manuscript was intended (probably the person who commissioned it) wanted a de luxe edition of the psalter augmented by enough

---

[127] Panofsky, 'The Textual Basis of the Utrecht Psalter Illustrations' *Art Bulletin* 25 (1943), pp. 50-9, especially 57.

[128] This point may also be relevant for the text of the metrical psalter, which has readings from all three Latin psalters.

liturgical material for private prayer and meditation. The choice of a bilingual edition may well have been because Latin was familiar but not completely comfortable for the patron, and a parallel Anglo-Saxon translation made comprehension easier.[129] Also, if the intended practice of the manuscript's user was to contemplate a verse or group of verses and then to meditate upon their sense, the vernacular would be more useful to a lay person, for whom such concentration might be possible only in the vernacular. A poetic translation would provide the familiarity and the elegance of verse, and perhaps be of mnemonic use as well. The reason for a combination of a prose version and a poetic version is unknown. Why a vernacular prose translation for the first fifty psalms was preferable when a poetic one must have been available remains uncertain. The obvious, but impossible to prove, answer is that the first fifty had royal authority, which would be appropriate for a great psalter; the poetic version was the next most authoritative and noble choice. Otherwise, reasons are difficult to find. One possible clue is the careful prose introductions which accompany the prose translation. For someone seeking to understand the psalms, especially for someone unwilling or unable to spend time reading the Latin commentaries, the prose

---

[129] For discussions of lay literacy in the early Middle Ages, see C.P. Wormald, 'The uses of literacy in Anglo-Saxon England and its neighbours' *TRHS* 5th ser. 27 (1977), pp. 95-114; M.B. Parkes, 'The Literacy of the Laity' in *Literature and Western Civilization: The Medieval World.* ed. D. Daiches & A.C. Thorlby. (London, 1973), pp. 555-77; and F. Baüml, 'Varieties and Consequences of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy' *Speculum* 55 (1980), pp. 237-65. For the attitude of Athelstan see S. Keynes, 'King Athelstan's Books' in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England.* ed. M. Lapidge & H. Gneuss. (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 143-201; and for the attitude of Alfred see *Asser's Life of King Alfred*, ed. W.H. Stevenson (Oxford, 1904), chapters 23, 81 and 88 (pp. 20, 67, and 73).

introductions may have looked a useful tool. The prose translation is closely linked to the introductions, and it was included as well. As to other possible reasons, it would be foolhardy to argue that the compiler of the manuscript preferred the prose to the poetry on grounds of literary merit. Also, that the commissioner of the manuscript was a member of Alfred's immediate family, and preferred the text for reasons of ancestral nostalgia, is an argument impossible to prove, and it narrows down the list of possible patrons in an uncomfortably handy way. The texts remain an unusual compilation, almost certainly a once-only collection organized into this elegant manuscript for a specific person and for a specific purpose.

This kind of private collection of devotional texts became common later in the Middle Ages in the form of Books of Hours.[130] Although these manuscripts varied in size and decoration, they were almost always commissioned by one person for his, or usually her, own use. They included shortened versions of the Offices for private use, personal prayers and meditations, and selected didactic texts for enlightenment. The texts were often a mixture of Latin and the vernacular. The prayers, meditations and sermons were generally couched in fairly simple terms, and were lavishly illustrated as a further aid to comprehension and for glory. These manuscripts were treasured objects, specially chosen and arranged for the individual's delectation, and by the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, they became the chosen manuscripts for copious and skilled illumination by the great Continental masters of the art. The greatest medieval patron of these texts was the duc de Berry. In some ways the *Paris*

---

[130] See J. Harthan, *Books of Hours and their Owners*. (London, 1977).

Psalter, with the other private prayer books of Anglo-Saxon England, is the forerunner of this later tradition.[131]

Furthermore, if the *Paris Psalter* were a prized manuscript commissioned by a nobleman or noblewoman exclusively for his or her own devotional use, one possible explanation of the manuscript's unusual size is that it was intended to fit into something else—a receptacle of some kind. Some manuscripts, particularly of the early Anglo-Saxon period (the Lindisfarne Gospels and Stonyhurst Gospel, for example), were boxed for special purposes.[132] In the early eleventh century someone might have already had or commissioned a box for which a manuscript would be an appropriate complement. The fourteenth-century inventories from Bourges suggest that the manuscript was a prized one, bound beautifully, wrapped in a silk cover, and equipped with clasps and an elegant frontispiece of David with his harp. Dom Martène notes quite specifically that this manuscript is separately conserved in a *chartrier*. Someone collecting the case in which the manuscript was stored might well transfer the codex to another, less ornamented, box for safekeeping. In any case, the possibility that the manuscript's size and shape were dictated by

---

[131] Of course, the size is again quite different.

[132] The Lindisfarne Gospels are said to have been kept in a silver box, possibly deriving from the Irish notion of the *Cumdach*, while the Stonyhurst Gospels were kept in a leather bag. See Battiscombe, C.F., ed. *The Relics of Saint Cuthbert.* Published for the Dean and Chapter of Durham Cathedral. (Oxford, 1956). The most recent analysis is *The Stonyhurst Gospel of Saint John*, ed. T.J. Brown. Roxburghe Club 250 (Oxford, 1969).

external rather than internal considerations seems worth exploring.[133] If those external considerations included a desire to encase the codex, then the parallels to the elegant, jewel-encrusted and richly-illuminated private devotional works of the later Middle Ages become more obvious.

These texts for private use were most commonly commissioned and used by noblewomen all over Europe. If, as K. and C. Sisam suggest,[134] the *Paris Psalter* was for the use of a woman—for some 'pious great lady'—then she also was beforehand in the commissioning of fine manuscripts. After the Benedictine Reform more nuns learned Latin, but they may still have preferred vernacular texts. The prayers are a mixture of singular and plural petitions, and one of them is corrected for feminine plural endings. There are more women in the litany than might be expected. However, all of these are minor points, and on the evidence available it is difficult even to suggest that a woman commissioned the work, especially as no details of its origin are available except what can be guessed from inspection.

Even the date of the manuscript is difficult to determine. The script is late Anglo-Saxon. Ker states with certainty that the handwriting cannot be dated before 1030. The artificial, rather precious, hand is a late development of Anglo-Saxon minuscule. Its mannered appearance is more likely to have been a development of

---

[133] See C.R. Dodwell, 'Losses of Anglo-Saxon Art in the Middle Ages' *BJRL* 56 (1973), pp. 74-92. Dodwell points out the loss of book-covers on several occasions (pp. 84, 91) including the group of '14 book-covers both large and small, adorned with gold and silver' (p. 91) at Winchester.

[134] The earliest suggestion that the manuscript was 'fur den Privatgebrauch einer vornehmen Dame' seems to be in M. Forster, 'Texte', p. 130.

the middle decades of the eleventh century. Wormald, however, argues for a date early in the second quarter of the century on the basis of the illustrations, and the development of Utrecht Psalter influence on Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. He is inclined to favour a date between 1025 and 1035. It is difficult to date such a consideration as artistic influence in any case, and the extent of the Utrecht Psalter effect on the *Paris Psalter* manuscript must remain uncertain. Certainly it is unlikely that the psalter illustrator had the Utrecht Psalter or a direct copy at hand, since he invented at least one illustration. Wormald's insistence on the decade after 1025 does not allow sufficient latitude, especially when the script is clearly suggestive of a later date. Illustration, sometimes even more than script, can be an uncertain indicator of date, especially if the manuscript is the work of a smaller, geographically isolated house. The manuscript belongs, then, to the second quarter of the eleventh century, and while it seems marginally more likely that it belongs to the latter part of the period, this is not certain. No outside evidence can be found and the internal evidence for date is inconclusive.

The provenance of the manuscript remains unknown.[135] The *Paris Psalter* is an early devotional text, almost certainly made primarily for the use of one person. It was probably copied in a monastery or nunnery, and the hand suggests southern England. Evidence of the Litany points strongly toward the southwest, but central locations such as Winchester are not out of the question. The elegance of the

---

[135] although Temple suggests Canterbury, presumably from the association with the *Menologium* and the Utrecht Psalter.

manuscript and the complexity of its layout do not really suggest a provincial product, but there are correspondingly few ties to the major centres of manuscript production. Throughout the manuscript are suggestions of Irish learning, but these also are not in any way conclusive. The nine Latin prayers at the end of the text may yet prove the most useful indicators of date and provenance.

Chapter Two — Texts Parallel to the *Paris Psalter*

Passages parallel to the metrical psalms appear in three other Old English texts. Verses are used to fill a gap in the text, to explicate a feast day, and to give poetic rather than prosaic translations of the psalms to what may have been a lay audience. The manuscripts in which these texts are found range in date from the early eleventh to the mid twelfth centuries, and in place from Worcester to Canterbury to Winchester. They suggest wide currency of the metrical translation in Anglo-Saxon England, particularly since none of the texts derives directly from any other. Peter Baker argues that two of them may be copies of the same exemplar, or of a copy of the same exemplar, but this is the closest demonstrable relationship among the codices.[1] In any case, the wide divergence of use, of date, and of place for these appearances of the metrical psalms suggests that the text must have been relatively well known in Anglo-Saxon England.

a) The Canterbury Psalter

The first parallel passage studied here was the last to be written. Five psalms corresponding to the metrical psalter occur in the Canterbury Psalter. A de luxe manuscript from the middle years of the twelfth century, Cambridge, Trinity College R. 17. 1 is a triple psalter variously known as the Canterbury Psalter for the place of

---

[1] Peter S. Baker, 'A Little-Known Variant Text of the Old English Metrical Psalms,' *Speculum* 59 (1984), pp. 263-81 at 270. See also P.P. O'Neill, 'Another Fragment of the Metrical Psalms in the Eadwine Psalter' *N&Q* 35 (1988),pp. 434-6.

origin or the Eadwine Psalter for the scribe.[2] A display manuscript from Christ Church, Canterbury, the codex consists of the three Latin psalters, each with an interlinear gloss. For the Hebrew Psalter, on the left side of each folio, the gloss is in Anglo-Norman; for the Roman version, in the centre, in Old English; and for the Gallican version on the right-hand side (the major text, in a hand over twice as large as that of the other two), glosses taken from the *Glossa Ordinaria* occur. The illustrations in the manuscript are copies of the Utrecht Psalter, and the Canterbury Psalter was the second major English psalter manuscript to depend heavily on the line drawings of the Rheims manuscript, which was available at Canterbury from the turn of the eleventh century.[3] Because the line drawings of the Paris Psalter also derive from the Utrecht tradition, and its layout is somewhat reminiscent of that of a triple psalter, there are links beyond the textual between the Canterbury Psalter and the Paris Psalter manuscripts.

The major parallel fragment appears from Psalms 90.15.2 to 95.2.1 as a replacement for the Old English interlinear gloss for these psalms.[4] A small parallel occurs elsewhere in the manuscript, at 142.8. The parallel text was edited in some detail by Peter Baker, the only previous edition being the diplomatic one of the whole

---

[2] For a description of the manuscript see Ker, no. **91**; *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Trinity College, Cambridge. Exhibition Catalogue.* Notes by Simon Keynes. (Cambridge; August, 1985), pp. 37-9; reduced facsimile edited M.R. James, *The Canterbury Psalter*, (Friends of Canterbury Cathedral, London, 1935) and proposed facsimile gen. ed. R. Pfaff.

[3] See the references in Chapter 1, pp. 64-5.

[4] except Ps. 92.1-2 which is glossed according to the D-tradition, and is virtually identical to the Regius Psalter at this point.

text by F. Harsley.[5] None of the editors of the *Paris Psalter* seems to have been aware of this variant text, although Wildhagen pointed out its existence several times at the turn of the century.[6] Kenneth and Celia Sisam consider the text, noting that the Canterbury Psalter gloss 'has practically all the faults of P [the *Paris Psalter*] and some of its own.'[7] Baker argues, as a result of more detailed examination, that there was a common ancestor, further suggesting that it 'must have been a copy of great authority.'[8] It seems to have very few errors, and respect is paid to its spellings.

The gloss corresponding to the *Paris Psalter* is written by the main hand of the text, which is a different hand from that of the gloss immediately before and after the passage. This suggests, of course, that the gloss was supplied later from another manuscript. However, as Baker argues, it was copied in before the decoration was completed.[9] The versals do not interfere at all with the text of the gloss, which is in a way surprising since the scribe did experience difficulty in making the metrical psalter conform to the layout of the Canterbury Psalter. Again, the metrical psalter

---

[5] F. Harsley, ed. *Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter*, E.E.T.S. o.s. 92 (London, 1889). Two doctoral theses consider the text, but without reference to or collation of the metrical psalter parallel: Bruce L. Liles, *The Canterbury Psalter: An Edition with Notes and Glossary.* (Ph.D., Stanford, 1967); Charles D. Ludlum, *A Critical Commentary on the Vocabulary of the Canterbury Psalter.* (Ph.D., Stanford, 1954).

[6] For example, see K. Wildhagen, *Uber die in "Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter" enthaltene altenglische Psalter-Interlinearversion.* (Halle, 1908), p. 11.

[7] *The Salisbury Psalter*, 'Appendix I' p. 49n.

[8] p. 271.

[9] pp. 264-5.

is forced to fit into an already established manuscript layout. Like the *Paris Psalter* too, the Canterbury Psalter was preserved as a special manuscript, one of the **Libri de armariolo Claustro**, the books kept in the press by the cloister.[10]

The remarkable number of shared readings between *CPs* and *PPs*, despite the late and chaotic state of the text in the glossed psalter,[11] suggests a close relationship between the two versions. Baker is probably correct in his argument that both manuscripts were copies from the same exemplar, or, at the furthest, copies of a copy of a version of great textual authority. Such a conclusion is particularly interesting in light of other connections between the *Paris Psalter* and the Canterbury manuscript. As pointed out earlier, the illustrations in each manuscript derive from the Utrecht Psalter tradition. The place of the *Paris Psalter* in the line of English copies of the Utrecht Psalter is unclear. The Canterbury Psalter represents a much later development of the Utrecht tradition in England, with full-colour illustrations only one stage less elaborate and formalized than those found in B.N. lat 8846, the last direct copy of the Utrecht Psalter made in England. Like that manuscript, and unlike B.L. MS Harley 603 or the *Paris Psalter*, it includes only one large illustration for each psalm, attempting to picture all the contents of the psalm in a continuous panel.

The Trinity College manuscript and the Paris manuscript share, then,

---

[10] See M.R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover.* (Cambridge, 1903), the Eastry Catalogue (named for the Prior of Christ Church from 1284-1331, Henry de Estria) #323.

[11] See Sisam, *Salisbury Psalter*, p. 58: 'The confusion of vocabulary, phonology, and inflexions in the uncorrected E defies historical analysis...' This statement may need some revision now that the microfiche concordance is available.

closely-related versions of 167 lines of Anglo-Saxon metrical verse, one of the longest parallel texts available in Old English poetry, and their illustrations derive from the same original. Furthermore, the layout and appearance of the Paris manuscript, particularly the narrowness of its columns, appears very like that of the Canterbury Psalter in many ways, which may lend some substance to the possibility that a double or triple psalter was the exemplar from which the *Paris Psalter* manuscript was copied. Certainly the use of the metrical psalter as a substitute, however unsatisfactory, for an interlinear glossed version, argues that the text from which the Canterbury Psalter scribe, Eadwine, copied these lines either presented the metrical psalter itself as an interlinear version (which seems unlikely for purely practical reasons) or, like MS lat. 8824, presented the text as a parallel Latin/Anglo-Saxon version. Without a Latin text in close proximity, the metrical psalms might not appear to be a translation close enough to the original that it could substitute for a gloss.

The Anglo-Saxon gloss in the Canterbury Psalter occurs in the middle column over the Roman Psalter. The metrical psalter is a translation of the same version, and a copy of it (not the one from which the translation was made) appears in the Paris manuscript. The Utrecht Psalter likewise has the Roman version. In Chapter One, I argued for a preponderance of double and triple psalters in the environment of the *Paris Psalter*; here the continued importance of the Roman Psalter, over a hundred years after the Conquest, must be mentioned. Granted, the Gallican version has pride of place on the outside of the folio and has a column twice as wide as either the

Hebrew or Roman versions, but some kind of affinity of the vernacular to the Roman Psalter continued. Also, the glossators took special care to ensure that the Old English version was complete. The manifest errors in the Old English gloss of E do not detract from the elegance of the manuscript, nor can they affect what is clearly a desire for complete versions of the Old English text. If, as it would appear, a copy of the metrical psalter was the only version to hand, or within easy reach, then the scribe used that rather than have an incomplete gloss. For this scribe, the metrical version could stand in for a glossed version. However, a scribe who could produce the errors that this one did cannot be depended upon as reflecting a wider opinion that the metrical psalter was no more than a glorified gloss.

These connections among copies of the Utrecht Psalter are extensive, and need more elaboration, especially with respect to the relative dates of the triple psalters. In particular, the last copy of the Utrecht Psalter, now called the Great Canterbury Psalter (B.N. MS lat. 8846), needs more consideration. The manuscript, like E, has the Gallican Psalter with Latin glosses, the Hebrew Psalter with an Anglo-Norman interlinear gloss, and the Roman Psalter, in this manuscript in the centre of the page, which does not have a continuous Old English gloss. However, Hargreaves and Clark published in 1965 four short passages of Old English glosses to the Roman Psalter in this manuscript. They collated with most of the glossed psalters, and demonstrated the closest parallels were to E. These glosses demonstrate no relationship to P, but

do show a continuing interest at Canterbury in vernacular versions of the psalter.[12]

b) The *Menologium*

The second fragment is the shortest of the parallel texts, consisting only of three lines from Psalm 117.22 used to punctuate the description of a feast day in another poem. The *Menologium*,[13] a calendar poem, appears with the gnomic poem *Maxims II*[14] in the prefatory material to the C copy of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the Abingdon Chronicle.[15] B.L. MS Cotton Tiberius B i was written in the mid-eleventh century at Abingdon, but the version of the Chronicle displays very close ties, especially in the earlier entries, to chronicle material originating at Christ

---

[12] H. Hargreaves and C. Clark, 'An Unpublished Old English Psalter-Gloss Fragment' *N&Q* 210 (1965), pp. 443-6.

[13] The standard edition is Elliot Van Kirk Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems.* Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records VI. (New York: Columbia, 1942), pp. 49-55. See p. clxiv for references to further editions, which include: R. Imelmann, ed. *Das altenglische Menologium* Berlin, 1902; Charles Plummer and John Earle, *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel.* Oxford, Vol I 1892 Text, Appendices, Glossary; Vol. II 1899 Introduction, Notes & Index. rep. 1952. (Appendix A edits *Menologium* and *Maxims II.*); and H.A. Rositzke, *The C-Text of the Old English Chronicles.* Beitrage zur Englischen Philologie 34. (Bochum-Langendreer, 1940), pp. 3-11. An early, still useful, edition is Karl W. Bouterwek, *Calendcwide i.e. Menologium ecclesiae Anglo-Saxonicae poeticum.* (Gutersloh, 1857). For a translation of the text see Kemp Malone, 'The Old English Calendar Poem,' *Studies in Language, Literature and Culture of the Middle Ages and Later.* Festschrift for K. Willard. Ed. E. Bagby Atwood and A.A. Hill. University of Texas at Austin, 1969, pp. 193-9. Also, compare the Old English prose *Menologium* in B.L. MS Harley 3271 and CCCC 42, for which see *Studien zum altenglischen Computus.* ed. Henel, pp. 71-77.

[14] See the editions of the *Menologium* listed above, and T. Shippey, *Poems of Wisdom and Learning in Old English.* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 76-9 for the most recent edition of *Maxims II.*

[15] See Ker, **191.**

Church, Canterbury, and is particularly close to the B chronicle, MS Cotton Tiberius A vi.[16] These two manuscripts thus represent one version of the southern recension of the Chronicle: the B Chronicle ends at 977; the C Chronicle continues with local and national entries to 1066.[17] The *Menologium*, on ff. 112r-114v of the C Chronicle manuscript, follows a copy of the Old English translation of the *Orosius*;[18] the calendar poem, *Maxims II*, and the opening entries of the Chronicle (to the year 491) are written by a single scribe in a different, and later, hand from those used in the *Orosius*. The two short poems, then, were seen as prefatory material to the Chronicle, parallel to the genealogies, computus material, and calendars which are found in other chronicle manuscripts.[19]

A versified account of the seasons, months and festal days of the Christian year, the *Menologium* was probably compiled from the author's own knowledge and available liturgical texts including missals, calendars and sacramentaries.[20] It is a

---

[16] See Ker, **188.**

[17] For the B chronicle, see now Taylor, Simon, ed. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Vol. 4 MS B.* (Cambridge, 1983).

[18] See J. Bately, ed. *The Old English Orosius.* E.E.T.S. s.s. 6 (Oxford, 1980). Bately suggests a possible Winchester connection, for this text at least.

[19] For the most recent expositions of this material see J. Bately, ed. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Vol 3 MS A.* (Cambridge, 1986), and 'Manuscript Layout and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle' *BJRL* 70 (1988), pp. 21-43.

[20] There are several other menologia surviving from insular sources, including two Latin versions (one of which was formerly ascribed to Bede), and the Calendar of Oengus, written in Irish verse about the end of the tenth century.

calendar poem, possibly belonging to the genre of catalogue poetry,[21] composed in a catenulate structure in which facts are linked according to the list principle of organization. In this poem, the list is a chronological one, and for the most part, the poet enumerates the events of the year quickly and precisely. The *Menologium* is a utilitarian piece written for what seem to be didactic purposes.[22] It is concerned with the explication in the vernacular of material necessary for the proper observance and understanding of the high festivals of the Christian year.

The poem, 231 lines in length, begins and ends, logically enough, at the twenty-fifth day of December, the Nativity of Christ. The poet has some difficulty getting from one festal day to the next important day while keeping to the alliterative and metrical strictures of the verse. This often means a somewhat convoluted explanation such as in ll. 15-17 *emb feower wucan...butam twam nihtum* (after four weeks except two nights, i.e. twenty-six days) or ll. 95-6 *þæs emb eahta and nigon dogera rimes* (after the count of eight and nine days, or seventeen days), but the poet is generally quite accurate and the number of days can be puzzled out without too much difficulty. His only possible slip occurs in the first few lines, when he notes that on *þy eahteoðan dæg* after Christ's birth the calendar (*kalend*) begins.[23] Since

---

[21] For an initial statement of this argument see F.C. Robinson, 'Old English Literature in Its Most Immediate Context' in *Old English Literature in Context.* ed. J.D. Niles. (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 11-29. For a detailed analysis see Nicholas Howe, *The Old English Catalogue Poems.* Anglistica Volume 23. (Copenhagen, 1985).

[22] The other catalogue poems in Old English include *Seasons for Fasting*, and Cynewulf's *Fates of the Apostles.*

[23] See Dobbie's discussion in his introduction, p. lxiii.

he clearly means the first of January, and the 'eighth day' is confirmed by alliteration so 'seventh' cannot be inserted, he may be suggesting Christ was born on the 24th day of December (possibly at night so the count of days is correct) or may have miscalculated either the day or the metre—which is very unlikely. Also, it is possible that the poet included Christmas Day in his count, so that New Year's Day would indeed be the eighth day from the start of the catalogue. However, this method of counting does not occur again in the text, or it would cause confusion at several points. In any case, this is the poet's only slip.

The *Menologium* poet understandably prduces a flat and unimaginative explanation of the calendar year, never digressing from the business of getting from day to day for more than a few verses. No direct sources can be identified for the material and there are no parallels to other Old English poems, or even to prose martyrologies and explanations of festivals in other texts. Why, then, does the poet suddenly insert three lines from Psalm 117.22 of the *Paris Psalter* in this steady and careful translation? In line 54, after identifying March 25, the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary, the poet begins the transition to the next major feast, noting quite specifically:[24]

> Swylce emb feower 7 þreo;
> niht gerimes þætte nergend sent
> Aprelis monað; on þam oftust cymð
> seo mære tiid mannum to frofre

[24] The correspondence was first noted by Bouterwek (1857), who concluded that the *Menologium* was written after the Anglo-Saxon verse translation was in circulation.

drihtnes ærist; þænne dream gerist[25]
wel wide gehwær, swa se witega sang:
Þis is se dæg þæne drihten us
wisfæst worhte wera cneorissum
eallum eorðwarum eadigum to blisse.
(ll. 54-62)

Despite Dobbie's suggestion in his edition,[26] this psalm verse does not derive directly from the version in MS lat. 8824 since Psalm 117.22 there reads in part:

Þis ys se dæg þe hine drihten us
wisfæst geworhte wera cneorissum,
eallum eorð tudrum eadgum to blisse.

Haec dies quam fecit dominus; exultemus et laetemur in ea.

Aside from the minor spelling differences, the *ge-* prefix on *geworhte* (which results in a metrically less good reading), and the replacement of the pronominal accusative *þæne* with the particle and pronoun *þe hine* in this text, all of which could be minor corrections by a scribe, there is a clear separative variant here, as *eorðwarum* 'the dwellers of earth' from the *Menologium* cannot derive from *PPs*, *eorðtudrum*, a *hapax legomenon* meaning 'the human race', nor is it likely that the two texts derive from the same exemplar.

The day referred to in these lines is, of course, Easter and the simple explanation for this outpouring of praise is the poet's desire to mark the most

---

[25] Note the rhyme, perhaps to emphasize the Resurrection, perhaps inadvertent. See E.G. Stanley, 'Rhymes in English Medieval Verse' *Medieval English Studies presented to George Kane.* ed. E.D. Kennedy, R. Waldron & J.S. Wittig (Woodbridge, 1988), pp. 19-54.

[26] Dobbie, p. 171. 'The corresponding passage, Psalm 117,22, in the Paris Psalter is similar,...and the quotation here is perhaps derived from it.'

important festival of the year.[27] The verse chosen from the metrical psalms is the one immediately following the well-known 'cornerstone' or **caput angelorum** passage of the psalms, in which 'the stone which the builders refused is become the head-stone of the corner.'[28] Clearly, this was an appropriate and easily recognisable verse to include in the poem, from a psalm often sung at Easter. However, the poet of the *Menologium* was a competent enough versifier and could have produced his own version of the psalm verse, a version which would have been less conspicuous than the idiosyncratic psalm-translation of the *Paris Psalter* poet. Nowhere else in Old English texts by a single author is there a similar dependence, particularly for a short and easy passage, on another text. Ælfric certainly did all of his own translations of the psalms, as did most other homilists.[29] Cynewulf's references to the psalms are likewise original translations. The poet clearly had no need to use the *PPs* version here; that he did so makes it obvious that the metrical psalter was available to him.

---

[27] The poet carefully indicates the movable nature of Easter, using *oftust* to suggest that the feast can fall on any of the thirty-five days between 22 March and 25 April, so it is more likely to fall in April. See C.R. Cheney, ed. *Handbook of Dates for Students of English History.* (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1945), pp. 156-62 for a concise explanation of what was, after all, a major point of contention in the early Church.

[28] The psalm verse is quoted by Christ after the parable of the labourers in the vineyard, and occurs in all the synoptic gospels: Matt. 21:42, Mark 12:10 and Luke 20:17.

[29] See A.S. Cook, *Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers.* (London, 1898), and J.C. Pope, ed. *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection.* Vol. I E.E.T.S. o.s. 259 (Oxford, 1967), p. 152.

One other factor may have affected the inclusion of the *PPs* verse at this point in the manuscript. The difficulties faced by the poet in calculating dates and distances between feasts, and in explaining these clearly in a version intended for a lay audience have been discussed. All of the feasts mentioned in the *Menologium*, with one exception, are fixed, and the time intervals from one to the next remain constant. The major movable feast of the Christian calendar is, of course, Easter. The explanation of this fact, and the transition to the next feast, cause the poet great difficulty. In order to split up the exposition, and to give some sense of celebration rather than complication to the calendar at this point, the *Menologium* poet may have inserted the psalm verse. This is the only point in the poem at which the poet departs radically from his methodological and rapid presentation of material, so it is perhaps not wholly surprising that he also chose to use another poet's words here to supplement his text and to express the joy of the season in slightly different terms. Alternatively, it could be a respectful quotation from a well-known text.

Could the date and place of origin of the *Menologium* be ascertained they would help to determine similar information for the *Paris Psalter*, since the metrical translation must have been in existence to be used in the catalogue poem. However, there are few clues. The first portion of the *Chronicle*, the annals to the end of 977, appears to have been written at one time, along with the prefatory material, including the *Menologium*. The B Chronicle, Cotton Tiberius A vi, ends at the annal for 977. In the Abingdon Chronicle, the same hand continues to 1048, and local references begin. Some changes in details of appearance suggest the rest of the entries were

written in several batches, although by the same scribe. It is likely that the *Menologium* and *Maxims II* were added to this recension of the Chronicle in or after the year 977. However, both poems could well have had separate, independent existences and probably did.[30] Both the B and C Chronicle manuscripts are closely associated with Christ Church, Canterbury; Liebermann postulates that the *Menologium* was also written in Canterbury.[31] Liebermann bases his argument on the 'local knowledge' of Canterbury shown in lines 104-6 of the text. Certainly the *Menologium* poet highly praises St. Augustine as a *bisceop bremran*, 'a more glorious bishop,' and describes Canterbury as a *mynstre mærum*, a likewise glorious monastery. These arguments, however, are not sufficient. A Canterbury-trained monk could be located elsewhere, commenting on his home. Also, Canterbury, as the administrative and political centre of Anglo-Saxon Christianity, might be described in such laudatory terms anywhere in England.[32] However, the balance of the evidence for provenance favours Canterbury, with Christ Church being perhaps the more likely house.

The evidence for the date of the poem is even more tenuous. In his description of the Feast of St. Benedict, which the poet explains with some care

---

[30] Dobbie, p. lx.

[31] F. Liebermann, 'Zum angelsächsischen Menologium' Archiv 110 (1903) 98-9.

[32] See Nicholas Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066.* (Leicester, 1984). Even if the manuscript itself was an Abingdon product, the scribe or compiler could be from Canterbury, or could have been educated at Canterbury. See also Cyril Hart, 'The B text of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle' *Journal of Medieval History* 8 (1982), pp. 241-99.

corresponds to the vernal equinox on March 21, the poet does refer to the saint as *heard and higestrang* (l. 42). The choice of vocabulary is interesting, as other saints in the *Menologium* are referred to as *mære* (ll. 27 Matthias, 145 Laurence, 208 Martin), *breme* (l. 40 Gregory), *hæleða* (l. 121 Peter and Paul), and *þegn unforcuð* (l. 170 Matthew). Benedict is described as *heard and higestrang*, adjectives which might reflect the strength of mind and discipline required of those who are reforming the monasteries. Also, the poet goes on to describe those who worship Benedict as extolling him in writing,[33] and as being *rincas regolfæste* (l. 44a), or warriors of the rule. The use of such a specific term as *regolfæste* and the unusual description of Benedict suggest that the poem can probably be dated to the Benedictine Reform period in Wessex.[34]

The *Menologium*, then, is a poem with probable connections to Canterbury and possible connections to the tenth century Benedictine Reform. It is concerned, as are all of the texts identifiable as productions of the tenth-century revival, with the

---

[33] Swylce Benedictus
embe nigon niht þæs nergend sohte
heard 7 higestrang; þæne heriað wel
in gewritum wise; wealdendes þeow
rincas regolfæste.
(ll. 40b-44a)

[34] Imelmann also notes this reference to following the Benedictine Rule, and accordingly dates the poem after 963, when Æthelwold was consecrated bishop of Winchester. He suggests, on the evidence of a 1008 decree of Æthelred's concerning feast days, that the poem was specifically occasioned to explain the provisions for observance of these feast days. See pp. 39-40, 52-4. Such a specific occasion for writing the calendar poem is unnecessary, since the liturgical information it contains would be useful in the vernacular at any time in Anglo-Saxon England.

understanding of liturgical events and Christian doctrine in the vernacular. The inclusion of three lines from the metrical psalter in the calendar poem is unusual enough to suggest that the poetic version of the psalms may have had a similar purpose, or at least a similar use, and that the text of the metrical psalms was available in Canterbury in the late tenth century when the poem was composed. Because of the substantive differences between the two passages, the *Menologium* original must descend from a different exemplar than the *Paris Psalter* manuscript, which was clearly not a Canterbury production for other reasons as well. In the latter years of the tenth century the metrical psalms were available, and perceived as being useful, in the most important centre for the compilation and distribution of manuscripts in Anglo-Saxon England.[35]

c) *The Benedictine Office*

Finally, fragments from the *Paris Psalter* text appear in a manuscript which arises directly out of the second generation of the Benedictine Reform.[36] In

---

[35] See Brooks, pp. 261-78; N.R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1960), pp. 29-40.

[36] For the standard histories of the Benedictine Reform see Dom David Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England.* (Cambridge, 1949), pp. 31-56, and Frank Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1971), pp.433-69. See also the collection of essays ed. David Parsons, *Tenth-Century Studies.* (London, 1975). The argument that the Reform was a movement more political than devotional is first made by Eric John, 'The King and the Monks in the Tenth-Century Reformation' *BJRL* 42 (1959), pp. 61-87, which is reprinted in *Orbis Britanniae and Other Studies* (Leicester, 1966), pp. 154-80. In the same volume, see the other papers, especially 'The Beginning of the Benedictine Reform in England', pp. 249-64. For a different view of the Reform and its texts see M. McC. Gatch, 'The Office in late Anglo-Saxon monasticism' in

Bodleian MS Junius 121, a manuscript which may be a copy of Wulfstan's commonplace book,[37] forty-six verses from the metrical psalter appear in the compilation called *The Benedictine Office* on ff. 42r-54v.[38] The *Office* follows a homily beginning *Ne beo nan man oðres mannes ælmessan to geornful*, and precedes an Old English translation of Amalarius' **De Regula canonicorum.** The hortatory tone of the material is appropriate. Wulfstan is now generally thought to have compiled the text, whose title is a misnomer, for the work is neither specifically Benedictine, nor is it an Office.[39] It consists of ten sections of vernacular

---

Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England. ed. M. Lapidge & H. Gneuss. (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 341-62.

[37] See D. Bethurum, 'Archbishop Wulfstan's Commonplace Book' *PMLA* 57 (1942), pp. 916-29, and R.G. Fowler, 'Archbishop Wulfstan's Commonplace Book and the Canons of Edgar' 32 (1963), pp. 1-10.

[38] N.R. Ker, *Catalogue*, no. **338**; For the earliest descriptions of the manuscript see the Worcester Catalogues: J.K. Floyer and S.G. Hamilton. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Preserved in the Chapter Library of Worcester Cathedral.* Worcestershire Historical Society, 1906. p. 168; Patrick Young, *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Wigorniensis.* ed. with introduction by Ivor Atkins and N.R. Ker. (Cambridge, 1944). no. 321, **Constitutiones lingua Saxonica.** The manuscript is certainly a Worcester product. On f. 101, the scribe signs himself **Wulfgeatus scriptor Wigornensis**, and many of the texts are glossed by the Worcester 'tremulous hand' of the early thirteenth century.

[39] Cf. D. Bethurum's comment that the text is 'neither an Office proper nor specifically Benedictine' p. 567, review of Ure, *Speculum* 33 (1958), pp. 567-9. The standard edition is James M. Ure, ed. *The Benedictine Office* (Edinburgh, 1957). Earlier editions include Emil Feiler, *Das Benediktiner-Offizium, ein altenglisches Brevier aus dem ll. Jahrhundert.* Ein Beitrag zur Wulfstanfrage. Anglistische Forschungen, Vol. IV (Heidelberg, 1901); Part I appeared as a dissertation in 1900; and E. Thomson, *Godcunde Lar 7 Þeowdom: Select Monuments of the Doctrine and Worship of the Catholic Church in England before the Norman Conquest* (London, 1849).

explanation of the daily hours of the monastery. There are two copies of it extant, one of which, in Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS 201,[40] contains only the prose passages, while the other, the Junius manuscript, consists of interspersed prosaic and poetic sections.[41] The poetic sections, including single verses from various psalms and metrical versions of *The Creed*,[42] *Lord's Prayer III*,[43] and *Gloria I*,[44] make the text in MS Junius 121 almost twice as long as the Corpus version. The Corpus version, in the cramped first hand of the manuscript, completes all the prose vernacular material in two pages (one folio).

However, the Corpus text also occurs in a manuscript which is a composite one, including a large number of sermons and homilies by Wulfstan and Ælfric, as well as other miscellaneous prose texts, and a collection of five poetic pieces. These five pieces, although they are separated from *The Benedictine Office* text by a gap of over fifty folios,[45] include one text parallel with the Junius manuscript. The five

---

[40] Ker, *Catalogue*, no. **49**. CCCC MS 201 shares other material with Junius 121, including the 'Wulfstan' homilies XII, XXVI, XXVIII, the Canons of Edgar, and the short texts known as the **De ecclesiasticus gradibus** and **De confessione**. However, the similarity of material may reflect conjunction of interest, not necessarily a single origin for both MSS.

[41] J.D. Bruce and H. Bartlett cite K.W. Bouterwek, *Caedmon's biblische Dichtungen* Bd. I (1854), p. clxxiii, cxciv ff, as the first published notice of this correspondence. J. Ure points out in his edition that Thomson (1849) had already commented on the relationship.

[42] Dobbie, *Minor Poems*, pp. 78-80.

[43] Dobbie, *Lord's Prayer III*, pp. 77-8.

[44] Dobbie, *Gloria I*, pp. 74-7.

[45] prose fragments on ff. 112-115; poetry ff. 161-170.

poems are: *Judgment Day II*, *An Exhortation to Christian Living*, the macaronic poem *A Summons to Prayer*, a lengthy verse translation of the Pater Noster known as *Lord's Prayer II*, and the same version of the *Gloria* as in the Junius manuscript.[46] A tradition of liturgical verse paraphrase developed in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, giving rise to a number of translations of the Gloria, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. These translations, like the metrical psalter, appear not to have been occasional works, composed for inclusion in a specific manuscript, but were available for use in a number of contexts.

Whitbread argues convincingly that the poetic paraphrases in *The Benedictine Office* and the poems in CCCC MS 201 were independent compositions, and that vernacular renditions of important liturgical and doctrinal texts were common in the late Old English period.[47] Such a concern with the vernacular began, for liturgical and exegetical purposes,[48] with Æthelwold's writings for the Benedictine Reform in the early 970s. His works include a vernacular account of the founding of the monasteries (the *Regularis Concordia*), and an Anglo-Saxon version of the

---

[46] Dobbie, pp. 58-77. For a discussion of the last two poems listed here see L. Whitbread, 'Notes on Two Minor Old English Poems' *ELN* 4 (1967), pp. 241-3.

[47] L. Whitbread, 'The Old English Poems of the Benedictine Office and some Related Questions' *Anglia* 80 (1962) 37-49.

[48] Copies in Latin were certainly available, and in fact the oldest surviving manuscript of the Benedictine Rule is Bodleian MS Hatton 42, copied in England in the late seventh or early eighth century. That manuscript, however, is not close to the late texts connected with the Benedictine Reform.

Benedictine Rule.[49] From these translations it was but a short step to an explication of the offices. In the much-amplified version of the text appearing in Junius 121, the prose explanations of each of the daily hours are interspersed with psalm verses and with the metrical paraphrases. The text is thus a composite one, collected from materials at hand and put together in haphazard fashion. The exposition of the Office is reasonably complete only for Prime, includes some information on the Capitular Office, and dwindles through Terce, Sext, None, Vespers and Compline, ending with nothing but prose material for Nocturns. Table 1, listing the fragments in order of their appearance in the text, amply illustrates this change in quantity of material. This tapering off may be partly due to the fact that more explanation is needed at the beginning, and the reader or listener would have grasped the pattern of the ritual by the third office or so. Nevertheless, the exposition dwindles more quickly than would seem appropriate.

---

[49] See M. Gretsch, *Die Regula Sancti Benedicti und ihre altenglische Übersetzung* (Munich, 1973) which includes some discussion of Æthelwold's authorship, and the comparison with the Latin rule in her article 'Æthelwold's translation of the *Regula Sancti Benedicti* and its Latin Exemplar,' *ASE* 3 (1974) 125-151. For a survey of knowledge about the Rule in England see H. Gneuss's introduction to the reprint of Schroer's edition: *Die angelsächsischen Prosabearbeitungen der Benediktinerregel* ed. A. Schröer, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 2, 2nd ed. with supplement by H. Gneuss (Darmstadt, 1964). For the Latin *Regularis Concordia* see Thomas Symons, ed. (London, 1953). For Æthelwold's 'Historical Postscript' see T.O. Cockayne, ed. *Leechdoms, Wortcunning and Starcraft of Early England*, Rolls Series (1864-6) III, 432-45, printed under the title 'Eadgar's Establishment of Monasteries.' by D. Whitelock in *Philological Essays: Studies in Old and Middle English Language and Literature in Honour of Herbert Dean Meritt*, ed. J.L. Rosier (The Hague, 1970), pp. 125-36, which establishes Æthelwold's authorship of the text, and an account of the Benedictine Reform and its progress in England. Now, for Æthelwold, see Barbara Yorke, ed. *Bishop Æthelwold: His Career and Influence* (Woodbridge, 1988).

Table 1: Order in which the psalm verses appear in the Benedictine Office[50]

Prime:	69.1
	Gloria I
	53.1
	43.27
	Lord's Prayer III
	118.175
	118.176
	Creed
	87.13
	5.1
	5.2
	5.3
	5.4
	24.3
	24.4
	24.5
	24.6
	34.1
	34.2
	34.3
	70.7
	50.10
	50.11
	50.12
	50.13
	139.1.1-2
	58.1
	58.2
	60.6.2-4
	64.6
	102.1
	102.2
	102.3

[50] The numbering here follows Dobbie, and therefore Krapp; Ure is often one verse different because he follows the Vulgate numbering, not applicable to the Roman psalter.

		102.4
		102.5
		84.4.1-2
		122.4.1-2 (no Latin)
		32.18
		19.9
		27.10
		121.7
		101.1
		50.1
		79.18
Capitular Office:		
		69.1
		89.18
		89.19
Terce:	40.4	
		89.15
Sext:	nil	
None:	nil	
Vespers:		140.2 (at end of prose introduction)
Compline:		nil
Nocturns:		nil

The prose expositions found in both manuscripts are explanatory translations of Hrabanus Maurus' *De Clericorum Institutione*, particularly of its second book, *De Officiis et Orationibus Institutione*.[51] Extracts from this text appear in two Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, CCCC MS 190 and MS 265.[52] The more relevant to the *Office* text is the longer passage in MS 190, which might even be the direct source

---

[51] first identified by Emil Feiler in his edition, and more closely determined by Bernhard Fehr, 'Das Benediktiner-Offizium und die Beziehungen zwischen Aelfric und Wulfstan,' *Englische Studien* 46 (1913), 338 and 344-5.

[52] Ker, *Catalogue*, nos. **45** and **53** respectively. See also Ure, pp. 15-16.

of the *Office* text.[53] Because MS 190 has some Ælfric material, and because Ælfric prepared a number of texts for Wulfstan, Bernhard Fehr, followed by the most recent editor of the *Office*, James Ure, argued that the Office reflected a dual process of composition.[54] Ælfric, the argument goes, completed the original translation from the Latin and wrote two-thirds or so of each prose passage, while Wulfstan, in the process of compilation of the text, revised the Ælfric explanations and added more material at the foot of each. This theory does place the text squarely in the tradition being argued here, with a zeal for clarity and understanding which can lead to awkwardness in style. However, there are some major difficulties. None of the prose explanations is a long enough piece to allow for detailed analysis of metrical patterns and vocabulary. There is no clear outside evidence of Ælfric's involvement in the project. Also, Ure's suggestion of the 'intrinsic probabilities' that Ælfric wrote a vernacular text which Wulfstan used in his compilation cannot be supported by the linguistic and stylistic evidence, which is the only kind of evidence available for the text.[55] What does emerge from this controversy is the fact that the prose

---

[53] Unfortunately, as C. Sisam, H. Gneuss and especially K. Jost point out in their reviews, Ure does not print the Latin text, which would have made the correspondences clear. See C. Sisam, rvw *MAE* 28 (1959), pp. 197-9; H. Gneuss, rvw *Anglia* 77 (1959), pp. 226-31; and K. Jost, rvw *RES* 10 (1959), pp. 75-7. In her review Sisam also points out the major errors Ure makes in his analysis of the Latin psalm verses.

[54] Ure, pp. 25-46.

[55] The argument is first stated by Jost, pp. 76-7. See also Peter Clemoes, 'The Old English Benedictine Office, Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS 190 and the Relations between Ælfric and Wulfstan: A Reconsideration,' *Anglia*, 78 (1960) 265-83. Jost considers the rhythm and vocabulary parallels to Wulfstan, while Clemoes discusses Fehr's claims that Ælfric made the CCCC 190 extract, and then

introductions are as much a melange of conflicting material as the rest of the compilation.[56]

Another point which should be made for Wulfstan in the early eleventh century is that, as for Alfred in the ninth century, he could have commissioned a member of his entourage or a sympathetic monk to make the translation. In her edition of Wulfstan's homilies, Bethurum notes that 'he had a habit of commissioning translations.'[57] Any translator working at the archbishop's behest would be likely to follow the Wulfstan style, which may account for the inability of Ure and Fehr to prove that Wulfstan must have done the translation himself. He was a very busy man at the time.[58] If he did this translation of the *Office* for secular use, he did it while

---

translated it. For the original statement of the argument see B. Fehr, 'Das Benediktiner-Offizium und die Beziehungen zwischen Ælfric und Wulfstan', *Englische Studien* 46 (1913), pp. 337-46. Fehr modified his conclusions somewhat in his edition of Ælfric's letters, *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa IX (Hamburg, 1914). Clemoes uses evidence from the dating of the texts, depending in part on his 'The Chronology of Ælfric's Works' *The Anglo-Saxons.* Studies in some aspects of their history and culture presented to Bruce Dickins. Ed. P. Clemoes (London, 1959), pp. 241-5. He argues that the style Ælfric must have been using was the alliterative rhythmical prose of his later years, not the plain style in which the text behind the *Office* was written. Similarly, there are few instances of Ælfric's word choice, as discussed in M.R. Godden, 'Ælfric's Changing Vocabulary' *ES* 61 (1980), pp. 207-23.

[56] On the other side of the argument is D. Bethurum, who in her review of Ure's edition, *Speculum* 33 (1958), pp. 567-9 comments that Ure is 'probably correct' in his surmise that the *Office* was written by Ælfric (following his translation from Hrabanus Maurus) and the text was revised and rewritten by Wulfstan. However, she notes, 'though I do not think the evidence he adduces from vocabulary and rhythm quite prove it.' (p. 568)

[57] D. Bethurum, ed. *Homilies of Wulfstan.* (Oxford, 1957), p. 49.

[58] See D. Whitelock, 'Archbishop Wulfstan, Homilist and Statesman' *TRHS* 24 (1942), pp. 25-45.

in Worcester, not York, which narrows down the time in which he could have accomplished the work.[59] It is, of course, possible that Wulfstan did a quick version of the text, planning to rewrite it, but returned to it with even less time than on the first occasion, added a few more touches here and there, and made the translation available. This is, however, unknown, and it is possible to fall into the nineteenth century error of assuming that all surviving Anglo-Saxon texts were written by important men whose names we know. At the same time, there is no evidence for a Wulfstan imitator.

The question of how the psalm fragments and metrical paraphrases became a part of the *Office* was also not quickly settled. Thomson suggested in 1849 that the author of the psalms was the compiler of the *Office*, and was supported to some extent by Feiler in 1901, who stated that Wulfstan translated the liturgical poems, and the fragments could be individual translations. Jost pointed out that the fragments were not individual translations and dismissed the notion that Wulfstan produced the metrical psalms.[60] In his edition, Ure returns to the earlier mistaken argument. The correspondence with the *Paris Psalter* is so close that the two texts must be related, and Whitbread argues successfully that 'all the poems incorporated in the Benedictine Office seem also to have associations outside it.'[61] Clearly the compiler of the

---

[59] Gneuss shows in his review of Ure that all the liturgical affinities of the text are to Worcester manuscripts, including CCCC MS 391, CCCC MS 265, and B.L. MS Julius A vi.

[60] In K. Jost, *Wulfstanstudien.* Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten (Bern, 1950), p. xxiii.

[61] Whitbread (1962) p. 49.

Office made use of a Latin text or its translation for the prose expositions, and a number of Anglo-Saxon metrical translations which were also already available.

The metrical paraphrases, for example, are clearly independent texts collected in this manuscript only. Kenneth Sisam demonstrated remarkable parallels between the *Creed* and the calendar poem *Seasons for Fasting* and argued that the two pieces were by the same author.[62] They are certainly of the same school. The *Gloria* appears here and in CCCC MS 201, and Ure, supported by Whitbread, argues the same author wrote the *Lord's Prayer II* in that manuscript.[63] Whitbread suggests that some of these poems were a collection of liturgical paraphrases and commentaries which circulated as a group. *Lord's Prayer II* and *Gloria I* are representative pieces, both in the same reasonably competent but quite uninspired style.[64] The *Lord's Prayer III* (*Lord's Prayer I*, an even shorter paraphrase, is in the Exeter Book) is a neat, devotional paraphrase of the Pater Noster, reflecting a tradition which dates back to Bede of translating the primary texts into the vernacular.[65] The translation of these texts into Old English formed a favourite monastic exercise which was given

---

[62] Kenneth Sisam, *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 47-8.

[63] J.M. Ure, 'The *Benedictine Office* and the Metrical Paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer in MS. CCCC 201,' *RES* n.s. 4 (1953) 354-6. See also Whitbread, *Anglia*, pp. 44-6, and the corrections to Ure's edition suggested in L. Whitbread, 'Notes on Two Minor Old English Poems' *ELN* 4 (1967), pp. 241-3, concerning *LPII* and *GII*.

[64] Whitbread, p. 39. A similar comment could be made about the metrical psalter.

[65] See Bede's letter to Ecgbert, edited by C. Plummer, 'Epistola Baedae ad Ecgbertum Episcopum,' *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historia*, (Oxford, 1896) I, 409.

new life by the revived concern for vernacular translation and explication.[66]

The treatment of the fragments of the metrical psalms is best described as erratic. The majority of the psalm verses appear in the exposition of Prime, with a much smaller number occurring in the later offices. However, one of the metrical psalm verses appears in the prose exposition for Vespers. Elsewhere in the prose expositions the psalm verses which are mentioned are left in Latin or are translated into prose. The appearance of a metrical translation in the prose introduction itself certainly supports the idea of a single compiler who collected some material to explain the *Benedictine Office*, perhaps to a group who, like the monks at Eynsham, requested some further help with the material.[67] Unfortunately, the psalm verses do not properly convey the central role of the psalter in the daily offices, for the extracts provided occasionally run consecutively but more frequently do not. The fragments used appear to have been chosen more or less at random, for they do not reflect any particular doctrine or didactic purpose; they are simply representative psalm verses to fill in the text. Nor do they reflect the psalms which would have been used in each office. The verses simply give a general idea of how the psalms fit into the offices. For example, Terce should consist of an opening versicle, a hymn, three psalms (with

---

[66] This concern almost certainly affects many other Old English poems. See, for instance, the arguments of T.H. Bestul, 'The Old English *Resignation* and the Benedictine Reform' *NM* 78 (1977), pp. 18-23. See also Sandra McEntire, 'The Monastic Context of Old English "Precepts"' *NM* 91 (1990), pp. 243-8.

[67] 'Excerpta ex institutionibus monasticis AEthelwoldi episcopi Wintoniensis compilata in usum fratrum Egneshamnensium per AElfricum abbatem' ed. G.W. Kitchin, *Compotus Rolls of the Obedientiaries of St. Swithun's Priory, Winchester.* Appendix VII. Hampshire Record Society (London, 1892), pp. 173-98.

antiphons), a reading from the Bible, the acclamation, a short responsory, another versicle and its response, a collect and the conclusion. More psalms, prayers and other accretions are common, but Terce should consist of at least these materials. The appropriate psalm is Psalm 118.[68] In the *Office*, this order is followed, but the psalm is not defined, and the psalm verses which appear are perhaps part of the prayers and versicles at the end of the service, and come from Psalms 40 and 89. As versicles they are appropriately placed, but they do not represent the psalms which are normally recited or sung at Terce.[69]

The mixture of Latin and vernacular passages and the relative importance assigned by the scribe to each is evident in the layout of the text in the manuscript. Since the Corpus manuscript includes only the vernacular prose expositions the layout there is of no use in this enquiry. However, MS Junius 121 shows a very clear distinction in its attitude to the Latin as opposed to the vernacular material, with the vernacular passages being given priority. The expositions of the hours which, like Vespers, have little or no Old English are very cramped, with what have already been described as the sketchy indications of the shape of the liturgy being squashed in three and four entries to a line. Even the hand itself becomes cramped toward the end of

---

[68] See Rev. S.J.P. van Dijk, 'The Bible in Liturgical Use' in *Cambridge History of the Bible* ed. G.W.H. Lampe (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 220-52, especially 232, 246. This gives an overview of the liturgical use of the psalter, printing the list of psalms for each daily Office as it became established in the thirteenth century church. See also A. Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office: A guide to their organization and terminology.* (Toronto, 1972).

[69] See Ure, p. 96.

the text, and the writing becomes progressively smaller.

The treatment of the psalm fragments in the text also suggests a special attitude to the vernacular. Both the Latin and Old English versions of each psalm verse start at the left-hand margin with a rubricated initial. However, the Latin version of each verse is invariably given in a single line, no matter how many abbreviations are required. The Old English is written in the same hand, with distinctions to produce Anglo-Saxon minuscule, and each psalm verse in the vernacular is given as much space as is necessary. This means, on the average, two lines, and sometimes as many as three. Very few abbreviations are used in the vernacular text. In fact, the last line of the Old English is frequently run over (in Prime) by the Latin of the next psalm verse being inserted as necessary on the line above in order to fit. Such insertion on the line above never appears in the Old English passages. The result is a clear and legible manuscript in which the material of greater concern to the compiler, the Old English, is well served by the scribe, who reflects this concern with the vernacular in his layout of the text. This concern is also evident, of course, in B.N. MS lat. 8824, where the layout clearly indicates parity of the vernacular with the Latin.

The date and place of origin of the *Benedictine Office* are relatively easy to establish. It was probably compiled at Worcester in Wulfstan's episcopate, in the very late tenth century or, more likely, in the opening decade and a half of the eleventh century. MS Junius 121 is a Worcester product, perhaps copied from

Wulfstan's own material, dated by Ker to the third quarter of the eleventh century.[70] Not only is the manuscript subject to the ministrations of the tremulous hand, but also the codex is a continuation of the homiletic material found in Hatton 113 and 114, and Ker notes similarities of layout, script and a hand which is 'probably identical' with the main hand of the Hatton texts. The metrical psalms, then, were available at Worcester in the late tenth century (and probably through the eleventh century). The text used in the *Office* does not derive directly from the *Paris Psalter* manuscript, nor vice versa. The *Office* derives from a complete text of the metrical translation, since it includes verses from the lost first fifty psalms as well as from the last hundred extant in MS lat 8824.

The textual variants between the Junius 121 fragments and the *Paris Psalter* are inconclusive as far as determining the degree of proximity of the manuscripts is concerned. There are no clear separative errors, but the linguistic details of the manuscripts do vary somewhat. However, it is just possible that the two texts were copied from the same exemplar, since the variants are primarily linguistic and stylistic. Of the possible separative variants, two—89.18 J *Geseoh*/P *Beseoh* and 102.4 J *Se*/P *He*—are rubric differences which could be errors by one or the other decorator. Two more are in the very confused, for P, verse of 89.15, where the manuscript reading *hwæ hwi ga* is commonly emended to *hwæthwiga* (still not very close to J's *hwæthwygu*) and *eaðbede* also shows signs of tampering, while J has

---

[70] Ker, **338.**

eaðbene.[71] Because of the many erasures and corrections in P, this verse cannot separate the texts. The final possibility for a separative variant is 58.1 J *luge/* P *lungre*, and all the editors of J emend to agree with P. This is a clear separative error, but one error is not sufficient to conclude that the two texts came from different exemplars. What is clear here, as it was in the comparison of P and C, is that the eventual exemplar of the two recensions was an extremely good copy of the text.

Dobbie suggests that the psalter poet worked at Worcester in the late tenth century, paraphrasing the psalms as a direct effect of the Benedictine Reform.[72] This is not a tenable conclusion in the light of occurrences of metrical psalm material in manuscripts from other centres, nor is it reasonable to assume that because one Worcester manuscript of the mid-eleventh century used fragments of the metrical psalms the entire text must have been not merely known but, in fact, composed at that centre. There is no reason to suppose such limited movement for the text, but there is sufficient evidence of wider currency.[73] The fragments used in *The Benedictine Office* could not have been copied from the *Paris Psalter* manuscript, nor could the reverse have occurred, simply because neither manuscript has all the material

---

[71] Scansion makes no difference here:

89.15 Gehweorf us hwæthwiga, d2c halig drihten 2Ala
wes þinum scealcum 1A1b wel eaðbede. 1D2

Whether the reading is *eaðbede* or *eaðmede* or *eaðbene*, the last half-line remains metrically the same.

[72] p. lxxviii, although he does qualify the suggestion with 'although there is no direct evidence for any specific place of origin.'

[73] Similarly, the suggestion that Canterbury is the place of composition, because of the *Menologium*, is untenable. Whitbread (1962), p. 44.

appearing in the other. Both manuscripts do, however, descend from a late Old English exemplar.

Linguistically, there is really very little difference between the two texts. MS lat. 8824 is the more conservative of the two , preserving lWS *y*-spellings for unstable *ie* where Junius 121 has *i*: 64.6 *hyht/hiht*; *ðysse/ðisse*; 102.2 *wylt/wilt* but 121.7 *Sy/Si*, where *Si* may be an archaism, a shortened form of eWS *Sie*.[74] The psalter scribe prefers þ-spellings, with nineteen occurrences of *þ* where Junius 121 has ð, and only four occurrences of ð where J has þ as a spelling. In comparison to J and C, P shows a marked preference for þ-spellings, and for lWS *y*-spellings. Also, P tends to preserve or replace by analogy etymological unstressed vowels in weak syllables, where they are omitted in the later J: in *mægene/mægne* 70.7, 79.18, 87.13, and 121.7 and in *halgan/haligan* 53.1 (although mægen has a short stressed vowel, halig a long one). However, P is inconsistent in its treatment of unstressed vowels, for the syllable is syncopated in 118.175 J *sawul*/P *sawl*, and the vowel falls from *o* to *a* in 102.5 *gelicost/gelicast*, in the preterite of weak verbs of Class II in 87.13 *clypode/clypade*, and from *o* to *u* in 70.7 *wuldor/wuldur*. But in 102.5 the change is from *u* to *o* in J *geoguðe*/P *geogoðe*. Sometimes doubled final consonants after a short vowel are retained in P: 139.1 *men/menn*, sometimes in J: 140.2 *full/ful*, and the medial consonant after a short diphthong is lengthened in P, but not in J in 102.2 *ofergeotul/ofergeottul*. Both readings show the extended development of back umlaut

---

[74] See A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), **315-7**, p. 132. *Sy* is not likely to be disyllabic here, although it can be in late verse, because it is unnecessary for the metre: *Sy ðe on ðinum mægne sib* (3B1e).

of *e*, which is an Anglian characteristic.[75] All of these very minor variations are typical of late Old English spellings; none localize either text, although they may reflect differences in dialect and date.[76] P provides an example of lWS smoothing in 118.176 *sceap/scep*,[77] and the peculiar lWS development of *o>a>æ* in the pronominal adjective in 102.1 *þone/þæne*. In the same verse P has an example of *e* added before unaccented *a* to indicate the palatal quality of *c*: *ecan/ecean*.

Finally, and most interestingly, P preserves or restores three *eo*-spellings in 58.1 *gife/geofe*, 102.5 *edniwe/edneowe*, and 118.176 *forwurðan/forweorðan*. The last of these shows, for J, the lWS tendency for *w*+short vowel+*r* to fall together in *wur*,[78] while P shows here, as elsewhere in the text, a tendency to restore the etymological spelling. This is the only occurrence of *edneow* in P, although the verb form at 103.28 *geedniwad* has the *i*-spelling. For the root, *niw*-spellings occur three times in P (80.9, 143.10 twice), while *neowe*-spellings appear twice (95.1, 149.1). J's *edniwe* is the monophthongized version of WS *ie*, while the two versions in P show both the WS and the later Anglian forms with *eo* replacing *io* by back umlaut.[79]

---

[75] Campbell **210.2**, p. 88.

[76] Cf. Kemp Malone, 'When Did Middle English Begin?' *Curme Volume, Language Monographs* 7 (1930), pp. 110-17, and Jane Roberts, 'Traces of Unhistorical Gender Congruence in a Late Old English Manuscript' *ES* 51 (1970), pp. 30-7.

[77] Campbell **312**, p. 131.

[78] Campbell, **320**, p. 133.

[79] See Campbell **300**, p. 127, and **294-5**, p. 125.

Finally, P has, for *gyfu, gyfan*, most commonly the lWS *y*-spelling (five times), and its variant *i*-spelling (twice). Hoever, the *eo*-spelling, which appears four times in P (58.1, 118.72, 145.7, and 145.8 and compare *ceolan* 'throat' 113.16) may be a pure WS form in which *ie* after an initial palatal underwent back umlaut to *io*.[80]

Comparison of J with P thus reveals few, if any, important linguistic differences. Both are lWS texts, with a few Anglian readings. Possibly P may reflect some attempt to restore etymological readings or purer WS readings. However, in neither manuscript is there any real consistency.[81] For further information, see the collation of all the differences between J and P in Appendix Two.

The fragments appearing in *The Benedictine Office* which are verses of the first fifty psalms of a metrical translation are the only proof that the original translation was a complete one. As such, they represent a part of the text now lost. What is intriguing about these fragments is the ease with which they are recognizable as part of the metrical psalter. The translation as a whole demonstrates remarkable coherence of style and vocabulary. For example, the poetic parallels to Psalm 5.1 come predominantly from *PPs*:

5.1 Word þu min onfoh wuldres ealdor;
and mid earum gehyr ece drihten.
Verba mea auribus percipe domine; intellige clamorem meum.

---

[80] Campbell, **220**, p. 93.

[81] For an analysis of an Old English manuscript in terms of its scribal coherence see D.H. Horgan, 'Old English Orthography: A Short Contribution' *ES* 61 (1980), pp. 385-9.

The collocations in Old English poetry of *word* with an imperative giving orders to another person are:

PPs 53.2 and earum onfoh min agen word
118.25 do me æfter þinum wordum wel gecwician.
118.49 Gemun nu, dryhten, þines wordes

The collocations of *word* and *gehyran* in Old English poetry are:

PPs 105.20 noldan his wordum wel gehyran
137.1 forðon þu ealle mine word earum gehyrdest.

While no lines are precisely identical to Psalm 5.1, the parallels adduced here are clearly a result of the same techniques of versification. The main elements of the verse—*word-onfoh-earum-gehyr-drihten*—recur in slightly different order over and over in *PPs*. Obviously, the subject matter and purpose is the same, but there are clear parallels between the fragments and the metrical psalter.

Psalm 5.1 can be compared on one other point with the metrical psalter: its use of *onfon* as an imperative. While *onfon* is not a prosaic word and does occur with some frequency in Old English poetry, it does so as an imperative on only seven occasions besides this verse. Five of these occurrences are also from the metrical psalter:

71.3 Onfon beorgas eac beorhtre sibbe
85.5 þu mid earum onfoh ece drihten
118.116 Onfoh me freondlice fæle drihten
118.122 Onfoh þu þinum esne fægere mid gode
142.1 and mid earum onfoh ungemetum georne

The other two occurrences are:

A Summons to Prayer 28 onfo freolice factor aeternus
Beowulf 1169 Onfoh þissum fulle freodrihten min

The *Summons to Prayer* is a macaronic verse, written half in Latin, half in the vernacular. In this context, however, the *Summons* is important for its manuscript origin—it is one of the five poems mentioned earlier in this section as appearing in CCCC MS 201. The close parallel to 118.116 *Onfoh me freondlice* suggests that the two texts, while probably not by the same author, arose from a similar environment. The parallel to *Beowulf* is less easily explicable, except as another manifestation of biblical language. In any case, an overwhelming number of the parallels of Psalm 5.1 are to the metrical psalter.

This similarity is so convincing that it amounts to proof that the first fifty psalms represented by these verses form part of the same complete translation of the psalms. It is clear that the psalm fragments, like the other metrical texts and the prose introductions of the compilation, are part of a complete metrical version, the last hundred psalms of which are copied in the *Paris Psalter*. The fragments from the first fifty psalms are clearly from the same metrical version, an all-purpose text, available for use in a compilation.

A. Edition of Fragments of Psalms corresponding to the *Paris Psalter*

The edition which follows includes the psalm fragments from *The Benedictine Office* in Bodleian Library MS Junius 121. Variants with the text found in B.N. MS lat. 8824 are listed below each psalm verse. Notes and textual commentary follow at the end. Both the vernacular and Latin verses are included here, since the layout of the text suggests that the relationship between source and translation was

particularly close for psalter versions. The fragments are edited in psalter order for ease of reference. The text has been collated with the editions of Ure, Feiler, and Dobbie for the fragments, and Thorpe, Grein, Grein-Wulker, and Krapp for the *Paris Psalter*. Punctuation has been kept to a minimum. The only problem in this regard with psalm translation is the indication of the first and second *membra* of the psalm verse. Where it has been possible to determine the location of the caesura in the vernacular, a semi-colon marks the division. Minor lingustic variants, especially those already noted in the discussion above, have been omitted. Only Gallican and Hebrew variants which may be relevant are given here. Similarly, errors or misprints in the editions have been omitted from the notes.

5.1 Uerba mea auribus percipe domine; intellige clamorem meum.

Word þu min onfoh wuldres ealdor;
and mid earum gehyr ece drihten.

5.2 Intende uoci orationis mee; rex meus et deus meus.

Ongyt mine clypunga cuðum gereorde,
beheald min gebed holdum mode;
þu eart min cyning and eac ece god.

5.3 Quoniam ad te orabo domine; mane exaudies uocem meam.

Forðon ic to ðe ece drihten
soðum gebidde; and ðu symble gehyr
morgena gehwylce mine stefne.

5.4 Mane astabo tibi et uidebo; quoniam non uolens deus iniquitatem tu es.

Ic þe æt stande ær on morgen
and ðe sylfne geseo; forðon ic to soðe wat
þæt ðu unriht ne wilt ænig drihten.

19.9 Domine saluum fac regem et exaudi nos in die in qua inuocauerimus te. (Gallican: ...in die qua...)

Do drihten cyngdædum halne;
and us eac gehyr holdum mode
swylce we ðe dagadrihten cigen.

l. 1 cyng] god *with* cyng *written above in another but similar hand.*

24.3 Uias tuas domine notas fac michi; & semitas tuas edoce me. (Gallican: demonstra me)

Do me wegas þine wise drihten;
and me ðinra stiga stapa eac gelær.

l. 2 stapa MS] stapas Feiler, Ure, Dobbie.

24.4 Diriga me in ueritate tua & doce me; quia tu es deus salutaris meus et te sustinui tota die.

Gerece me on ræde and me ricene gelær;
þæt ic on þinre soðfæstnysse simble lyfige.

24.5 Reminiscere miserationum tuarum domine; & misericordie tue que a saeculo sunt.

Wes ðu gemyndig miltsa þinra;
þe ðu drihten dydest syððan dagas wæron
and ðu wislice þas woruld gesettest.

24.6 Delicta iuuentutis & ignorantiae meae ne memineris; secundum magnam misericordiam tuam memor esto mei deus.

Ne gemynega þu me minra fyrena
gramra to georne þe ic geong dyde
and me uncuðe æghwær wæron;
for ðinre þære myclan mildheortnysse
weorð gemyndig min mihtig drihten.

27.10 Saluum fac populum tuum domine & benedic hereditatem tuam; rege eos & extolle eos usque in seculum. (Gallican: in eternum)

Hal do þin folc halig drihten
and ðin yrfe eac eal gebletsa;

rece þu heo swylce and on riht ahefe
þæt hi on worulde wynnum lifigen.

l. 2 yrfe Feiler, Ure, Dobbie] yrre MS
l. 4 wynnum Feiler, Ure, Dobbie] synnum MS

32.18 Fiat domine misericordia tua super nos; sicut sperauimus in te.

Wese þin mildheortnys mihtig drihten
wel ofer us; swa we wenað on ðe.

34.1 Iudica domine nocentes me; expugna impugnantes me.

Dem drihten nu þa me deredon ær;
afeoht swylce þa me fuhtan to.

34.2 Apprehende arma & scutum; & exurge in adiutorium michi.

Gegrip gar and scyld and me georne gestand
on fultume wið feonda gryre.

34.3 Effunde frameam et conclude aduersus eos qui me persequuntur; dic anime meae salus tua ego sum.

Heald me herewæpnum wið unholdum
and wige beluc wraðum feondum
þe min ehtend ealle syndon;
sæge þonne syððan sawle minre
þæt ðu hire on hæle hold gestode.

40.4 Ego dixi domine miserere mei; sana animam meam quia peccaui tibi (Ga quoniam)

Ic nu mægene cweðe: 'miltsa me drihten;
hæl mine sawle forðon me hreoweð nu
þæt ic firene on ðe fremede geneahhige.'

43.27 Exurge domine adiuua nos; & libera nos propter nomen tuum. (Ga redime)

Aris drihten nu and us ricene do,
fælne fultum; and us æt feondu*m* ahrede
forðon we naman þinne nyde lufiað.

50.1 Miserere mei deus; secundum magnam misericordiam tuam.

Mildsa me mihtig drihten; swa ðu manegu*m* dydest
æfter ðinre þære mycelan mildheortnysse.

50.10 Auerte faciem tuam a peccatis meis; et omnes iniquitates meas dele.

Awend þine ansyne a fram minum
fræcnu*m* fyrenum; and nu forð heonon
eall min unriht adwæsc æghwær symle.

50.11 Cor mundum crea in me deus; et spiritum rectum innoua in uisceribus meis.

Syle me halig god heortan clæne;
and rihtne gast, god, geniwa
on minre gehigde huru min drihte*n*.

l. 3 min Feiler, Ure, Dobbie] mi MS

50.12 Ne proiicias me a facie tua; & spiritum sanctum tuum ne auferas a me.

Ne awyrp þu me wuldres ealdor
fram ðinre ansyne æfre to feore;
ne huru on weg aber þone halgan gast
þæ*t* he me færinga fremde wyrðe.

50.13 Redde michi laetitiam salutaris tui; & spiritu principali confirma me.

Syle me þinre hælu holde blisse;
and me ealdorlice æþele gaste
on ðinne willan getryme weroda drihten.

l. 3 ðinne Feiler, Ure, Dobbie] ðinre MS

53.1 Deus in nomine tuo saluum me fac; & in uirtute tua libera me.

On þinum þam halgan naman gedo me halne god;
alys me fram laðum þurh þin leofe mægen.

l. 1 haligan P

58.1 Eripe me de inimicis meis deus meus; et ab insurgentibus in me libera me.

Ahrede me halig god hefiges niðes
feonda minra þe me feohtað to;
alys me fram laðum þe me lungre on
risan willað nymþe þu me ræd gife.

l. 3 lungre all editors; P] luge MS
l. 4 geofe P

58.2 Eripe me de operantibus iniquitatem; & de uiris sanguinum salua me.

Genere me fram niðe nahtfremmendra
þe her unrihtes ealle wyrceað
and me wið blodhreowes weres bealuwe gehæle.

60.6.2-4 Sic psallam nomini tuo deus in seculum saeculi; ut reddam uota mea de die in diem.

Swa ic naman þinum neode singe;
þæt ic min gehat her agylde
of dæge on dæg swa hit gedefe wese.

l. 1 ðinum P
l. 2 ic *not in MS; inserted from P in all editions*

64.6 Exaudi nos deus salutaris noster; spes omnium finium terrae & in mari longe.

Gehyr us hælend god þu eart hiht ealra;
þe on ðisse eorðan utan syndon
oððe feor on sæ foldum wuniað.

l. 1 hyht P; l. 2 ðysse P

69.1 Deus in adiutorium meum intende; domine ad adiuuandum me festina.

f. 43b

Wes drihten god deore fultum;
beheald drihten me and me hraðe syððan

gefultuma æt feorhþearfe.

f. 51a l.2 beheald me drihten MS] *Feiler leaves; Ure emends this second appearance to agree with first; Dobbie omits.*

70.7 Repleatur os meum laude tua ut possi cantare gloriam tuam; tota die magnificentiam tuam. (Gallican: magnitudinem)

Sy min muð and min mod mægne gefylled
þæt ic þin lof mæge lustum singan
and wuldor ðin wide mærsian;
and ðe ealne dæg æghwær herian.

l. 1 mægene P; l. 3 wuldur P

79.18 Domine deus uirtutum conuerte nos; & ostende faciem tuam et salui erimus.

Gehweorf us mægna god; and us milde æteow
þinne andwlitan ealle we beoð hale.

Gehweorf us mægena...*folio lost after f. 97v* P

84.4.1-2 Conuerte nos deus salutaris noster & auerte iram tuam a nobis.

Gehweorf us hraðe hælend drihten
and ðin yrre fram us eac oncyrre.

87.13 Et ego ad te domine clamaui; & mane oratio mea preueniet te.

Ic me to ðe ece drihten
mid modgehygde mægne clypode;
and min gebed morgena gehwylce
fore sylfne ðe soðfæst becume.

l. 1 þo *emended by all editors except Thorpe to* to P
l. 2 mægene, clypade P.

89.15 Conuertere domine aliquantulum; & deprecare super seruos tuos. (cf. Gallican) Conuertere domine usquequo; & deprecabilis esto super seruos tuos.

Gehweorf us hwæthwygu halig drihten;

wes ðinum scealcum wel eaðbene.

l. 1 hwæ hwi ga MS *emended to* hwæthwiga P; eaðbede MS, *but see note.*

89.18 Respice in seruos tuos et in opera tua domine; et dirige filios eorum.

Geseoh þine scealcas swæsum eagum
and on þin agen weorc ece drihten;
and heora bearn gerece bliðum mode.

l. 1 Beseoh on þine P; l. 3 bliðe P

89.19 Et sit splendor domini dei nostri super nos; et opera manuum nostrarum dirige super nos.

Wese us beorhtnys ofer bliðan drihtnes ures
þæs godan godes georne ofer ealle;
gerece ure handgeweorc heah ofer usic.

l. 1 beorhtnes P

101.1 Domine exaudi orationem meam; & clamor meus ad te perueniat. (Ga & He ueniat)

þu min gebed mære drihten
gehyr heofones weard and gehlyde min
to ðe becume þeoda reccend.

l. 1 mere P
l. 2 heofones Dobbie, Feiler] heofonas MS, Ure; heofenes P

102.1 Benedic anima mea dominum; & omnia interiora mea nomen sanctum eius.

Bletsa mine sawle bliðe drihten;
and eall min inneran his þone ecan naman.

l. 2 þæne, ecean P

102.2 Benedic anima mea dominum; & noli obliuisci omnes retributiones eius.

Bletsige mine sawle bealde drihten;
ne wilt ðu ofergeotul æfre weorðan
ealra goda þe he ðe ær dyde.

l. 1 dryhten P; l. 2 wylt, ofergeottul P

102.3 Qui propicius fit omnibus iniquitatibus tuis; qui sanat omnes languores tuos. (Ga infirmitates)

He þinum mandædum miltsade eallum;
and ðine adle ealle gehælde.

102.4 Qui redemit de interitu uitam tuam; qui satiat in bonis desyderium tuum.
(Gallican replaces second line: qui coronat te in misericordiam & miserationibus)

Se alysde þin lif leof of forwyrde;
fylde þinne willan fægere mid gode.

l.1 He P

102.5 Qui coronat te in miseratione & misericordia; renouabitur sicut aquile iuuentus tua.

He ðe gesigefæste soðre mildse
and ðe mildheorte mode getrymede;
eart ðu edniwe earne gelicost
on geoguðe nu gleaw geworden.

l. 1 miltse P; l. 3 edneowe, gelicast P; l. 4 geogoðe, gleawe P.

118.175 Uiuet anima mea & laudabit te; & iudicia tua adiuuabunt me.

Leofað sawul min and ðe lustum hereð;
and me þine domas dædum fultumiað.

l. 1 sawl P

118.176 Erraui sicut ouis que perierat require seruum tuum domine; quia mandata tua non sum oblitus.

Ic gedwelede swa þ*æt* dysige sceap
þæt ðe forwurðan wolde huru,

la, sec þinne esne elne drihten;
forðon ic ðinra beboda ne forgeat beorhtra æfre.

l. 1 scep P; l. 2 þætte, forweorðan P; l. 3 sece P.

121.7 Fiat pax in uirtute tua; & abundantia in turribus tuis.

Sy ðe on ðinum mægne sib mæst and fyrmest;
and on þinum torrum wese tidum genihtsum.

l. 1 Si, mægene P

122.4 Miserere nobis domine miserere nobis.

Mildsa us nu þa mihtig drihten
mildsa us....

Verse appears in Feiler, Ure but not marked as psalm fragment; not included in Dobbie
l. 1 Miltsa P; l. 2 miltsa P

139.1.1-2 Eripe me domine ab homine malo.

Genere me wið niþe on naman þinum
fram yfelum men ece drihten.

l. 2 menn P

140.2 Dirigatur oratio mea sicut incensum; in conspectu tuo.

Sy on ðinre gesihðe mines sylfes gebed
full ricene gereht swa recels bið;
þonne hit gifre gleda bærnað.

l. 2 ful, recene, ricels, byð P.

Notes

5.1 The psalm fragments in MS Junius 121 are carefully punctuated. Nearly every half-line ends with a mid-point. Also, stress accents are quite common, including the following: 5.1.1 min; 5.1.2 gehyr, ece; 5.2.3 eac, ece; 5.3.1 ece; 5.3.2 symble, gehyr. For a complete list of these accents, see Ure, pp. 113-4.

5.1.1 *wuldres ealdor*. See Appendix Three.

5.1.2 *ece drihten*: common epithet in b-verse in P, and common in both verses in rest of OE poetry. Cf. *Cædmon's Hymn*, ll. 4a, 8a.

19.9 last verse of the psalm, which does occur in Prime in most monastic usages

19.9.1 On *god* the lower loop of the *g* is closed and the descender touches the cross stroke; on *cyng* the lower loop is open, the descender does not touch the cross stroke. **regem** makes *cyng* more likely, but P always has uncontracted *cyning*, so *cyng* cannot be authorial here. However, the poet probably wrote *cyning*, which was lost in transmission, and added here as a correction.

24.3 first of four verses from the first of the Alphabetic Psalms, **Ad te domine levavi animam meam.**

24.3.2 common gloss of **semitas** is *pað*, which never occurs in *PPs*. *stapa* is unique, and *stige* occurs five times elsewhere in metrical psalms. The editors of P all emend *stapa* to the masc. acc. pl. *stapas*, but the gen. pl. is possible, especially as a variation of *stiga*: 'Teach me of your paths, your steps.'

24.3.2 *gelær* follows Roman **edoce.**

24.4 second membrum of Latin ignored in translation, but reflected partly in translation of next verse. This kind of overlap is very rare later in the translation.

24.5.3 line added because the translation is conflated with two previous lines. Rather than repeating *miltsa*, or using *milde mod* or *mildheortnesse*, the poet gives here a concrete example of God's mercy and its eternal nature, his wise creation of the world. Cf. A. Squires, *The Old English Physiologus* Durham Medieval Texts 6 (Durham, 1988), p. 98.

24.6 Note the abundance of *m*-alliteration: *gemynega - minra* l. 1; *gramra - georne - geong* l. 2, vowel l. 3, *myclan - mildheortnessa* l. 4, *gemyndig - mihtig* l. 5. The ideas of God's might and mercy being well remembered are thoroughly interwoven, perhaps more by necessity than by choice.

27.10 The last verse of the psalm, this was often used as a versicle in the liturgy.

27.10.2 The scribal slip from *f* to *r* in *yrfe-yrre* is a paleographically explicable one, and *yrfe*, glossing **hereditatem**, is necessary for sense. The reading is supported by the glossed psalters.

27.10.4 A scribal error of *s* for *w* is less likely but still possible, especially given the

earlier slip in the verse. *wynnum* is anchored by alliteration, and by sense.

27.10.4 Note the translation follows the Roman **in seculum** with *on worlde wynnum lifigen*, not the Gallican **in eternum.**

32.18 This is also the last verse of the psalm, here **gaudete iusti in domino** [**Exultate iusti** in Gallican]. From the beginning the psalm was applied to martyrs, but rarely appeared in Prime. The translation here is accurate and concise, one of the few where the word-by-word principle holds true.

34.1 The first of three verses from the opening of the second Passion Psalm.

34.2 *gar and scyld*: He has **Apprehende scutum & hastam**, so **hasta**, 'spear, lance, pike' may influence the choice of *gar* here. Ga reading is same as Ro **Apprehende arma & scutum.**

34.3 cf. *Beowulf* ll. 1770-2. In [illegible] speech concerning Hroðgar's long reign occurs this parallel, which Klaeber calls 'remarkable.'

34.3.1 **Effunde frameam**: *Heald...herewæpnum* is an unusual translation, since **effundo** means 'to pour out, to shed'. This is the reading of both Ga and Ro, but He has **Euagina gladius et preoccupa ex aduerso persequentes me.** There is insufficient distinction between **framea** 'a short spear, sword' and **gladius** 'a sword, a knife', since either could be the 'battle-weapons' of the translation. **Euagor**, however, meaning 'to run abroad, to overflow, to spread' is somewhat closer to the martial sense of the Old English.

40.4 Note that the MS has exactly this layout—in verse lines, with mid-point to mark half-lines. The verse is commonly used as an opening versicle, primarily in Lauds and Vespers, but is another example of a verse which does not occur at the beginning or end of a psalm, but which is often used separately in the liturgy.

43.27 The last verse of a psalm of captivity used for public confession of martyrdom.

50.1.1a hypermetric verse.

50.10 First of four verses from middle of Ps. 50—the third clause of the psalm when separated liturgically.

50.10.1 He has **Absconde**, a possible source for *Awend.*

50.11.3 MS reads *midriht* at end of line, squeezed to fit. *min* renders **meis** and the loss of *n* (two minims) is readily understandable here. The end of the line is nearly in the binding here.

50.13 *ðinne* for agreement with *willan.*

53.1.1 *halgan* J, *haligan* P; P tends to preserve vowels in unaccented syllables.

53.1.2 He **fortitudine,** Ga **uirtute,** but *mægen* often renders **uirtutus** in metrical psalter.

58.1 First of two verses from the psalm describing the extent of the psalmist's enemies. Note that, according to Augustine, the **operantibus iniquitatem** or 'evil-doers' made the confessors, while the **uiris sanguinum** or 'blood-thirsty men' made the martyrs.

58.1.3 MS *luge* emended to *lungre* by Thomson, followed by all subsequent editors. This is an example of where a parallel text is most useful. Both *n* and *r* are lost from the original.

58.1.4 P has *geofe,* an older form. *gife* is standard lWS.

58.2.1 *nahtfremmend* for **operantibus iniquitatem.** A loan-translation *hapax legomenon,* further explained by the next line.

60.6 P is pointed in half-lines for this verse.

60.6.2-4 last verse of the psalm, which pledges the fulfilment of duties to God, possibly in a religious or monastic life. Note **deus** is never translated, but left as understood.

60.6.2 *ic* not in MS, added from P by Feiler, followed by Ure; possibly lost from eyeskip to *ic* in previous line. However, it is neither metrically nor syntactically necessary.

60.6.4b *swa hit gedefe wese.* The clause, or close parallels to it, occurs 4 times in P, including this one: 60.6, 68.16 *forþon gedefe is,* 105.22 *swa hit gedefe ne wæs,* and 117.13 *swa hit gedefe wæs.* All are in the b-verse. Other parallels in Old English poetry are *MB* 26.92 *swa hit gedefe ne wæs; Bwf* 561b *swa hit gedefe wæs,* 1670b *swa hit gedefe wæs,* and 3174b *swa hit gedefe bið.*

64.6 The verse opens the second section of the psalm.

64.6.1 *hiht*: J prefers *i*-spellings, where P often has lWS *y* as here in *hyht* and in l. 2 *ðysse* for J's *ðisse.*

69.1 The most common versicle of the liturgy, first of the **preces,** and prefixed to the offices of all the Canonical Hours, this verse appears twice in the text, on f. 43v in

Prime and on f. 51r in the Capitular Office. On f. 51 the punctuation is less careful and order of words shifted in l. 2a: *beheald me drihten.* Feiler prints as is, but Ure emends in accordance with earlier appearance and P. Latin only of the verse occurs five more times in the *Office.*

69.1.3 **festina:** *gefultuma.* See Introduction, p. 16.

70.7 In the middle of the psalm, this is a pivotal verse, often discussed by commentators.

79.18 P has only *Gehweorf us mægena* before loss of folio following f. 97. This is the last verse of the psalm, and according to the eightfold division of the psalter, a break would occur after Ps. 79. In this manuscript a one-page illumination marked such a spot, and these were torn out at Bourges. Grein-Wulker emends P to conform with J.

87.13.1 In P *Ic me þo ðe* is MS reading. Thorpe emends to *Ic me þonne to ðe.* In Bosworth's annotated copy of Thorpe the emendation is marked with an 'X' below *þonne* and an incomprehensible note in the margin. He follows the same procedure with 89.15 *hwæthwiga,* indicating possibly that he collated Thorpe's text against the manuscript (or perhaps against J). The J reading is preferable, followed in P from Grein.

87.13.1 Ga, Ro have **Et ego,** and P does not translate **Et.** He has **Ego autem,** but **autem** also is not translated. The poet either cut **Et** or did not have it in his exemplar. Thorpe's emendation is the only one to translate **autem.**

89.15 The first of three verses from the psalm, the first of the fourth division of the Psalter. The vernacular follows the Roman rather than the Gallican Psalter here, rendering **aliquantulum:** *hwæthwygu* (Gal. **usquequo**) and **deprecare:** *wes eaðbene* (Gal. **deprecabilis esto**). The Hebrew Psalter does not help: **Reuertere domine usquequo; et exorabilis esto super seruos tuos.**

89.15.1 *hwæthwygu* P here reads *hwæ hwi* with *ga* over the line. There is a small space between the first two syllables, possibly enough for a *t.* Also, the hand is wobbly here, and the scribe has problems with ink from *hwi* to *drihten.* (The uncertainty of the hand and the unevenness of the ink suggest either work resumed after an interruption, or a new quill, either of which might affect the difficulties with *eaðbede* later in the verse.) J's *hwæthwygu* confirms emendation to restore *hwæthwiga,* which all editions accept. See also *hwæthwygu* at 93.8.3, twice in *MB* at 11.52 and 20.111, and in *InC* l. 64.

89.15.2 *eaðbene* The manuscript of P shows signs of alteration, although *eaðbede* is accepted as the reading. The *b* is clearly added over an erasure, and a dot under

the *d* suggests that it was to be deleted. Krapp argues that the scribe wrote *eaðmede* and imperfectly corrected it, trying to reach J's *eaðbene*. The result is a *hapax legomenon*, which is, however, accepted by both Tinkler and Meritt after recourse to commentary.

89.18-19 These two verses are often separated from the text for use as a benediction for almost any newly undertaken task (according to rabbinical tradition).

89.18.1 P's *Beseoh on þine scealcas* follows the Latin **Respice in servos tuos** more closely, and may be the older reading.

89.18.3 P's *bliðe* is similarly more typical of the poet, as *bliðe mode* occurs 6 times in the text, and *bliðum mode* never except here in J. In none of these cases does it translate anything from the original.

89.19.1-2 The MS punctuation clearly has a mid-point after *ures* in J, so that syntactically it should be part of the first stave. All the editors, however, place *ures* at the beginning of the second line. Placing it at the end of the first line does create a hypermetric verse. However, placing *ures* at the beginning of the second line would create one of very few cases in the text where the possessive pronoun *ures* occurs in a different line from the governing noun *drihtnes*. The verse is a difficult one.

89.19.3 He has **fac stabile super nos**, which may influence *gerece...heah*. However, the verse is large Roman, since both Ga and He repeat the last clause.

101.1 The first verse of the fifth of the Penitential Psalms, most often used for private devotion.

101.1.1 P has *mere* in the MS, emended to *mære* in all the editions.

101.1.2 The MS and Ure have *heofonas*, while Dobbie and Feiler emend to the genitive *heofones*, which seems the intended reading. This seems to be an example of late Old English suffix confusion. There are three epithets for God in the verse, and *heofones weard* fits well with *mære drihten* and *þeoda reccend*. In this case the reading from P should influence J to make the slight emendation for sense and function.

102.1 The first of five verses, the longest sequence from one psalm in the text. Ps. 102 is a song of prayer and thanksgiving, appropriate for the latter part of Prime.

102.1 Again the poet follows the Roman reading, even replicating the use of the verb twice, as the subject of both clauses. The Gallican text is quite different.

102.4.1 *Se* is acceptable, but P's *He* is preferable. Both 102.3 and 102.5 render the

opening **Qui** with *He*, and it would make sense here, where the versals were added to the text later, and subject to error.

102.4.2 Again the Roman reading **satiat in banis desyderium tuum** is preferred to Gallican **coronat**, which leads to the next verse.

118.176.2 P has contracted version of *þæt ðe*: *þætte*. This is a lWS form.

118.176.3 *drihten*: *h* added in brown ink of a correcting hand.

121.7 verse near end of one of the Gradual Psalms. The words are similar to Luke 14: 32.

122.4 This verse is not noted as a psalm fragment in any previous edition, but it was pointed out to me by Celia Sisam. It falls between Ps. 84.4.1-2 and 34.18 in Prime, but no Latin appears in the text. It is the fourth of five verses of this Gradual Psalm. Possibly, not even the compiler of the *Office* saw this as a verse from the metrical psalter since, like 69.1, this is a popular versicle.

122.4 Both Ga and He have **nostri** for Ro **nobis**.

139.1.1-2 The fragment is the first half of the first verse of this prayer for deliverance from spiritual perils.

140.2 The fragment renders the Roman version of this difficult and obscure psalm. Both Ga and He have no internal punctuation, adding another clause to finish the verse. The verse appears not in the text of an office, but in the prose introduction to Vespers. It is included directly as part of the explanation, which means that the *Office* text certainly post-dates the metrical psalms, and the compiler of the *Office*, the man who put together this miscellany of translations and paraphrases, also wrote the introductions.

140.2.2 Note the odd correspondence of J *ricene...recels* and P *recene...ricels*.

---

d) The Prose Psalter and Fragments of the first fifty metrical psalms

These two texts, despite their juxtaposition in the same manuscript, are unrelated.[82]

---

[82] See Chapter 1, pp. 47-9.

However, they provide an opportunity for analysis not otherwise possible in Old English psalter study.[83] Of the twenty-one verses from the first fifty psalms represented in *The Benedictine Office*, sixteen correspond to passages of the prose translation occurring in the *Paris Psalter* manuscript. These are the only comparable examples of sustained and coherent translation of the psalms in Old English. The odd verses translated by Ælfric and the other homilists were *ad hoc* versions for a specific purpose. The psalter glosses have some coherence, especially the ones which take care to inflect the glosses and insert connectives (notably the Lambeth Psalter), but remain texts which cannot stand without the Latin. Only Alfred's prose psalter and the metrical translation provide any opportunity for comparing how different writers translated the same material.[84] Although one text is prose and the other verse, the translators use similar methods of rearranging and rendering the Latin.[85]

The first correspondence occurs in Psalm 5 verses 1 to 4 in the metrical version, and 1 to 3 in the prose.

---

[83] although R.S. Breitzer, *A Stylistic Study of the Old English Metrical Psalms.* (Ph.D., Iowa, 1970), devotes a chapter of his dissertation to comparison of the parallel passages in Psalms 59 and 107 of the metrical psalter.

[84] The Kentish Psalm, a paraphrase of Psalm 50, is more a commentary on the text than a literal translation of it.

[85] For some discussion of the two versions see Patricia Hollahan, *The Anglo-Saxon Use of the Psalms: Liturgical Background and Poetic Use.* (Ph.D., Illinois, 1977); Chapters Two, 'The Psalm Translations of the Paris Psalter' and Three 'The Kentish Psalm' consider to some extent the methods of translation, although Hollahan's concern is more with the background of the material and the possible use of commentary.

5.1 Verba mea auribus percipe domine; intellige clamorem meum.

Word þu min onfoh wuldres ealdor;
and mid earum gehyr ece drihten.

5.2 Intende voci orationis mee; rex meus et deus meus.

Ongyt mine clypunga cuðum gereorde
beheald min gebed holdum mode;
þu eart min cyning and eac ece god.

Drihten, onfoh min word mid (MS min) þinum earum; and ongyt mine stemne and min gehrop; and ðenc þara worda minra gebeda.

In the first verse of the psalm the only difference between the two versions lies in the greater elaboration and more emphatic petition of the prose version. The metrical version translates the Latin in two a-verses, and fills in the b-verses with epithets: *wuldres ealdor* and *ece drihten.* Together the two epithets render **domine.** The caesura in the Latin is replaced by *and,* most usually, of course, the tironian note, in the vernacular. The prose version rearranges the word order, placing *Drihten* as an opening vocative, the subject of three, rather than two, parallel verbs: *onfoh, ongyt,* and *ðenc.* The prose version is more demanding and more personal. Where the metrical version drops **clamorem** from the translation, the prose version renders it twice, with *mine stemne and min gehrop.* Also, the **clamor** is more specifically described in the prose in a third rendition: *þara worda minra gebeda.* The psalter poet produces the main idea of the Latin; the prose translator attempts to render not only nuances of meaning (giving **intellige** as *ongyt*) but also uses pleonasm for greater emphasis. In the prose three verbs appear where two would be sufficient, and three nouns render one word.

The rendition of the first verse in the prose includes the second verse as well, so that **Intende voci orationis mee** is loosely given as *ðenc þara worda minra gebeda.* The two verses overlap in the translation, and probably do so in the Latin source of the prose recension. The rest of the second verse is omitted, so that **rex meus et deus meus** disappears in the prose. However, the poet extends the translation in the second verse of the psalm, thereby compensating for the shorter version of the first verse. In fact, *Ongyt mine clypunga* translates both **intellige clamorem meum** in the previous verse and **Intende voci orationis mee** of verse two. Normally in the metrical psalter the two clauses would be separately translated; it is possible that the Latin source of the metrical psalter was missing a clause. Certainly, the line better translates the clause **intellige clamorem meam,** which may suggest some kind of shift of verse division in the vernacular version in textual transmission. Two standard filler phrases complete the first two lines of the translation and finish the first membrum of the psalm verse. The second part of the verse is closely translated, and with parallel repetition, so that **rex meus et deus meus** becomes *þu eart min cyning and eac ece god.* Vowel alliteration is necessary in the line, and the filler adverb *eac* is inserted. As in the first verse, an epithet is used for **deus**: *ece god.* Despite being close translations, both texts skip over parts of the source, translating selectively for emphasis in the vernacular.

5.3 Quoniam ad te orabo domine; mane exaudies vocem meam.

Forðon ic to ðe ece drihten
soðum gebidde; and ðu symble gehyr
morgena gehwylce mine stefne.

> Forðam ic gebidde on dægred to ðe; ac gedo þæt þu gehyre min gebed, Drihten.

In the third verse of the psalm the similarities between the two translations become more evident. Both render **quoniam**: *forðon* (*forðam*), **ad te**: *to ðe*, **orabo**: *gebidde*, **domine**: *drihten* (metrical *ece drihten*), and **exaudies**: *gehyr*. The emphasis in the prose is, however, substantially shifted. **mane** from the second membrum appears in the first half of the verse and *dægred*, a compound noun found in prose, is the translation. The second half of the verse is given over entirely to ordering that the Lord 'do' so that he hears the prayer of the psalmist. Where the metrical psalter marks the caesura with the conjunction *and*, the prose uses the adversative *ac*. Alfred takes more liberty with the text, and uses a much more personal and direct tone here. The metrical psalter renders **mane** with the standard *morgena*, adds two adverbs for alliteration (*soðum* and *symble*) and varies the translation of **vocem meam** with *mine stefne*.

> 5.4 Mane astabo tibi et videbo; quoniam non volens deus iniquitatem tu es.

> Ic þe æt stande ær on morgen
> and ðe sylfne geseo; forðon ic to soðe wat
> þæt ðu unriht ne wilt ænig drihten.

> Ic stande on ærmergen beforan ðe æt gebede, and seo þe; þæt is þæt ic ongite þinne willan butan tweon, and eac þone wyrce; forðam þu eart sy ylca God þe nan unriht nelt.

The last verse from this psalm to appear in the *Office*, this is the last repetition in this psalm of the psalmist's effort at prayer. Allegorically the psalmist here represents the whole church in his efforts to approach God, but neither writer strays from the

first-person individual point of view. The metrical version uses one and a half lines for each half of the Latin verse, and translates the text closely, rearranging the first line to find vowel alliteration with *æt* and *ær*,[86] and inserting the reflexive *sylfne* in the second line to alliterate with the added noun phrase *to soðe*. The second part of the verse is neatly concentrated and given personal force. The poet adds *ic wat* to express his own faith—as does Alfred with *ic ongite*. He then uses the adjective *unriht* as a noun, parallelling the standard gloss *unrihtwisnysse*, and alliterates with the additional adjective *ænig*. The prose translator produces a similar version for the first membrum, using the prosaic *stande...beforan þe* rather than *þe æt stande*. Alfred again emphasizes the notion of prayer with the addition of the phrase *æt gebede*. In the second membrum the prose translation is greatly amplified by the psalmist's expression of his knowledge of God's will *butan tweon* and His works. Alfred wants to elaborate both the question of God's knowledge and mercy, and the importance of prayer, which God must answer.

> 19.9 Domine saluum fac regem et exaudi nos in die in qua invocaverimus te. (Gallican: ...in die qua...)
>
> [god]
> Do drihten cyng dædum halne;
> and us eac gehyr holdum mode
> swylce we ðe daga drihten cigen
>
> Drihten, gehæl urne kyning; and gehyr us on ðæm dæge þe we ðe to clypiað.

The two versions are very close in the basic structure of the translation for this verse; both take each membrum as a complete entity, separate the verse with the conjunction

---

[86] Alliteration of a preposition with an adverb, however, is not ideal.

and, and remain close to the Latin. The metrical version prefers the auxiliary construction *Do...halne* to render **saluum**, where the prose accurately uses *gehæl*, the simple and direct imperative. The poet translates the second membrum to correspond more closely with the Gallican **in die qua** than with the Roman **in die in qua**, with *swylce we ðe dagas drihten cigen*. The prose version here accords precisely with the Roman text: *and gehyr us on ðæm dæge þe we ðe to clypiað*. For this verse at least, the prose version was translated from a psalter with more Roman readings than the one from which the metrical version was rendered. It also follows more closely the Latin syntax.

> 24.3 Vias tuas domine notas fac michi; & semitas tuas edoce me.
> (Gallican: demonstra me)
>
> Do me wegas þine wise drihten
> and me ðinra stiga stapa eac gelær.
>
> 24.3b Drihten, gedo me þine wegas cuðe, and lær me þine paðas.

The second of four consecutive sets of verses, this group reflects the *Office* compiler's concern with learning how to lead a good life. The verses are those petitioning God to teach the psalmist and to extend His mercy and forgiveness to the ignorant penitent. Both translators preserve this focus, but Alfred, again, expands the material for his own purposes. The poet simply renders the Latin.

The first fragment from Psalm 24 is the last half of verse three in the source. Both translations move the imperative verb to the beginning of the verse, translating **fac** with *Do* (metrical) and *gedo* (prose), although the prose again opens with the vocative *drihten*. The metrical version makes **domine** into an alliterative adjective

+ noun formula with *wise drihten*, and both texts render **vias tuas** with *þine wegas*, although the poetic version reverses the order, placing the noun before the possessive. This is a standard poetic technique, and avoids a breach of Kuhn's Law in the half-line. In the second part of the verse the translators choose different vocabulary. Alfred uses *paðas* to translate **semitas**, but the metrical version uses the doublet *stiga...stapa*. *Stapa* occurs as a simplex only in the metrical psalms, but *stige* is a more common gloss for **semitas**, occurring five times in *PPs*. *Pað* never occurs in the metrical text.

> 24.4 Dirige me in veritate tua & doce me; quia tu es deus salutaris meus et te sustinui tota die. (Ga. deus saluator meus)
>
> > Gerece me on ræde and me ricene gelær;
> > þæt ic on þinre soðfæstnysse simble lyfige.
>
> Geræd me, and gerece on þinre soðfæstnesse, and lær me, for þam þu eart Drihten min Hælend; ælce dæge ic anbidige þines fultumes.

Psalm 24.4, the second of the verses from **Ad te levavi**, repeats and varies the idea of the previous verse. The poet drops the second membrum of the verse, translating it only very sketchily and combining it with a synonym to the first translation for **veritate**. He translates the first membrum word by word, inserting only the filler adverb *ricene* and rendering **veritate** with the less accurate *ræde* for alliteration. The second line is more awkward, for **tu es deus salutaris meus et te** disappears, while the poet uses *soðfæstnysse*, a prosaic word, to refer back to the first half of the verse. *simble lyfige* loosely renders **sustinui tota die**. The poet thus emphasizes the first person pronoun and the psalmist's actions and desires. The prose version is more coherent, with the doublet *geræd...and gerece* to render **Dirige**, the appropriate prose

-nesse word *soðfæstnesse* for **veritate** and *lær* to render **doce**. For the first membrum, then, the prose translates word by word. The second membrum, unlike the metrical version, is also rendered word by word, the only shift being the expansion of **sustinui** as *anbidige þines fultumes*. In this verse the prose is closer to the Gallican text, since *Drihten min Hælend* renders **deus saluator meus**. The prose version is for this verse very close to the source.

> 24.5 Reminiscere miserationum tuarum domine; & misericordie tue que a sæculo sunt.
>
> > Wes ðu gemyndig miltsa þinra
> > þe ðu drihten dydest syððan dagas wæron
> > and ðu wislice þas woruld gesettest.
>
> Gemun, Drihten, þinra miltsunga and þinre mildheortnesse þe fram fruman worlde wæs.

The next verse presents the same problems. The poet expands **Reminiscere** as *Wes ðu gemyndig*, uses the second half-line for *miltsa þinra* for **miserationum tuarum**, and makes *drihten* (for **domine**) into a clause, so that the first membrum is translated in a line and a half. The second membrum is not really translated, although **a saeculo** is suggested both by *syððan dagas wæron* and *þas woruld gesettest.* The poet thus translates the first part of the Latin, and skims over the rest. The prose version is more accurate, for Alfred combines the two halves of the Latin verse in a quick but coherent translation. Again, an alliterating doublet, a common feature of Old English, occurs with *þinra miltsunga and þinre mildheortnesse* to render **miserationum tuarum...misericordie tue**. The final adjective clause is rendered word by word. Both versions convey the sense of the original, but the prose is both more succinct

and more accurate.

> 24.6 Delicta iuuentutis & ignorantiae meae ne memineris; secundum magnam misericordiam tuam memor esto mei deus.
>
> > Ne gemynega þu me minra fyrena
> > gramra to georne þe ic geong dyde
> > and me uncuðe æghwær wæron;
> > for ðinre þære myclan mildheortnysse
> > weorð gemyndig min mihtig drihten.
>
> þa scylda mines iugoðhades ne gemun þu, Drihten, ne huru þa þe ic ungewisses geworhte, þæt synt þa þe ic wende þæt nan scyld nære; ac for þinre myclan mildheortnesse beo þu min gemyndig Drihten.

The last of the series from Psalm 24 is verse six, where the difference between poetic and prosaic translations becomes very clear. The prose version here uses *scylda* for **delicta**, *iugoðhad* for **iuuentutis**, and *ungewisses* for **ignorantiae**, where the poet has **delicta**: *fyrena*, **iuuentutis**: *ic geong dyde* and **ignorantiae**: *uncuðe*. In both texts the verb **memineris** is given by a form of *gemunan* (prose *gemun*, poetry *gemynega*) but the poetry places the imperative in the first stress of the line, emphasizing its importance, and the prose (like the Latin) places the sins first—*ða scylda*. At the end of the first membrum, the prose translator includes an explanatory aside, an interpretative repetition of what has been said in the clause to make clear its implications. These additions are frequent in the prose version, usually, as here, introduced by *þæt is* or *þæt synt*, but never appear in the poetic version. Similarly, the prose adds the adversative *ac* to the beginning of the second half of the verse, again emphasising the opposition between the two parts of the psalm verse; the poet renders exactly the words of the text, only adding a weak epithet *mihtig drihten* to

complete the verse.[87]

27.10 Saluum fac populum tuum domine & benedic hereditatem tuam; rege eos & extolle eos usque in seculum. (Gallican: in eternum)

Hal do þin folc halig drihten
and ðin yrfe eac eal gebletsa;
rece þu heo swylce and on riht ahefe
þæt hi on worulde wynnum lifigen.

Gehæl Drihten þin folc and gebletsa þin yrfeland, and gerece þa þe þær on eardiað, and hi upp ahefe on ecnesse.

Psalm 27.10, the last verse of the psalm, occurs towards the end of Prime in the *Office*, followed by Psalm 19.9. The poetic version renders the Latin word by word, except where the insertion of filler adverbs, epithets, or phrases is resorted to. The prose translation is less literal, but conveys the sense by recreating the parallelism of the Latin in the vernacular. The prose might prefer the Gallican **in eternum**, with *on ecnesse*, but that is not certain.

32.18 Fiat domine misericordia tua super nos; sicut speravimus in te.

Wese þin mildheortnys mihtig drihten
wel ofer us; swa we wenað on ðe.

Sy Drihten þin mildheortnes ofer us, swa swa we gehyhtað on þe.

Psalm 32.18 is likewise the last verse of the psalm. The compiler of the *Office* chose selected verses appropriate to his intent. Here, again, the grace of God is lauded in another imperative petitioning His mercy. The poet rearranges the first

---

[87] Both versions are clearly translating the Roman psalter here, the only psalter to include **magnam** and **esto**. The Gallican is **secundum misericordiam tuam memento mei tu**, while the Hebrew text has **secundum misericordiam tuam recordare mei tu**.

membrum for alliteration, rendering **domine** with *mihtig drihten*, and using the weaker verb *wese* for **fiat**. The second part of the verse is given word for word. In the prose the subjunctive *Sy* is preferred, but the structure of the verse is the same. Both texts render the verse clearly. The only difference between them is a lexical one, with the translations for **speravimus**. The metrical version has *wenað* here, probably for alliteration, while the prose version has *gehyhtað*.[88] The difference is not here a matter of idiolect, since both texts also use the other verb in similar contexts.

34.1 Iudica domine nocentes me; expugna impugnantes me.

Dem drihten nu þa me deredon ær;
afeoht swylce þa me fuhtan to.

Dem me Drihten and þæm þe ne swencað; feoht wið þa þe wið me feohtað.

34.2 Apprehende arma & scutum; & exurge in adiutorium michi.

Gegrip gar and scyld and me georne gestand
on fultume wið feonda gryre.

And gefoh wæpn and scyld; and aris me to fultume.

The third collection of consecutive fragments from the first fifty psalms is from the second of the Passion Psalms, Psalm 34 verses 1 to 3. In the first verse neither text has any difficulty. Both have **iudica**: *dem*, **domine**: *drihten*, and use a noun-verb combination from *feohtan* to render the Latin combination with **pugnare** (**expugna impugnantes me**). Where the poet uses the verb *deredon* in a clause rendering

[88] The Hebrew text here has **expectauimus**, which would be well translated by *wenað*, since both mean 'to look for, to expect, to hope', while **sperauimus**: *gehyhtað* is a standard psalter gloss rendition, 'to hope, to trust'.

nocentes, the prose makes up a similar clause with *swencað*. As in previous verses, the prose makes clear the syntax in two places: the conjunctive phrase *þæm þe* where the poet simply has *þa*, and the extended opening *wið þa þe wið* for the poet's *þa*. The second verse is also easy for each translator, but the poetic version is more striking with its use of *gegrip* for **apprehende** and for the more poetic phrase *gar and scyld* rather than the prose *wæpn and scyld*. Both render **adiutorium** with *fultume*. The poet also has to add an additional half-line to finish the verse: *wið feonda gryre*. This is one of the more successful verses of the metrical text, with both the poetic word *gryre* and the poetic idiom *Gegrip gar and scyld*. The prose uses the translation *onfoh* for **apprehende**, and renders **exurge**: *aris* rather than the poetic version's *gestand*. The prose is very accurate for this verse, but the poetry provides a translation somewhat more in the spirit of the original. This is one of the few verses where the poetic translation may stand at some advantage in relation to the prose version.

> 34.3 Effunde frameam et conclude adversus eos qui me persequuntur; dic anime meae salus tua ego sum.
>
> > Heald me herewæpnum wið unholdum
> > and wige beluc wraðum feondum
> > þe min ehtend ealle syndon;
> > sæge þonne syððan sawle minre
> > þæt ðu hire on hæle hold gestode.
>
> Geteoh þin sweord and cum ongean hy, and beluc heora wegas mid þinum sweorde, þara þe min ehtað; cweð to minre sawle, Ne ondræd þu þe; ic eom þin hælo, and ic þe gehealde.

Both translators expand somewhat the last verse of this set of fragments. The prose version not only adds an extra command to the first membrum, but also uses

a shift from indirect speech to direct speech for two additional statements by God to the soul. The poetic version provides a very similar expansion in the first membrum, adding *and wige beluc wraðum feondum.* This repeats the thought of *wið unholdum...þe min ehtend ealle syndon* which renders the Latin **conclude adversus eos qui me persequuntur.** However, where the prose version picks up the direct address of God to the soul, and retains its impact with *Ne ondræd þu þe* and an expansion, the poetry uses a bland third person clause introduced by *þæt.* The similarity in the way these versions provide the translation is more interesting because of the parallel to *Beowulf* ll. 1770-2:

1770 weold under wolcnum ond hig wigge beleac
manigum mægþa geond þysne middangeard,
æscum ond ecgum, þæt ic me ænigne

It seems unlikely that the *Beowulf* poet would have access to either the metrical or prose psalters, or that the authors of the translations knew *Beowulf.* All three texts perhaps reflect the standard vocabulary of the psalms.

40.4 Ego dixi domine miserere mei; sana animam meam quia peccavi tibi.

Ic nu mægene cweðe miltsa me drihten;
hæl mine sawle forðon me hreoweð nu
þæt ic firene on ðe fremede geneahhige.

Ic cweðe Drihten to þe, Gemildsa me and gehæl mine sawle; for ðon ic gesyngode wið þe.

Psalm 40.4 is one of the few verses appearing in Terce in the *Office.* It is common in the liturgy, often appearing as a versicle. Both versions follow the Latin in the shift to direct speech and use the same vocabulary in the first membrum. The

poetic version has to add *me hreoweð nu* for *h*-alliteration, but the expression of repentance does not interfere with the sense of the verse. In the last line, the versifier translates **peccavi** with the subject-direct object-verb combination *ic firene...fremede.* The prose version accords very closely with the Latin, following the same vocabulary as the glosses and even rendering **peccavi**: *gesyngode*, a prosaic word which does not appear in the metrical psalter.

43.27 Exurge domine adiuua nos; & libera nos propter nomen tuum.
(Ga, He redime)

Aris drihten nu and us ricene do;
fælne fultum and us æt feondu*m* ahrede
forðon we naman þinne nyde lufiað.

Aris Drihten and gefultuma us, and alys us for þinum naman.

The last verse of the psalm, 43.27 closes a song used for public confession. The poetic version expands this for alliteration with *ricene, fælne, æt feondum,* and *nyde lufiað.* The prose renders it word by word.

50.1 Miserere mei deus; secundum magnam misericordiam tuam.

Mildsa me mihtig drihten; swa ðu manegu*m* dydest
æfter ðinre þære mycelan mildheortnysse.

Miltsa me, Drihten, æfter þinre mycelan mildheortnesse.

There are five verses from Psalm 50, the **Miserere**, in the *Office*, verses 1 and 10 to 13, but the Paris manuscript is missing two folios at this point, so that only the translation to the opening verse remains. The opening half-line is hypermetric. Both texts here unusually render **deus**: *drihten* rather than the standard translation *god.* The poetic version adds an alliterative half-line in the clause *swa ðu manegum dydest*, after

which both texts render the Latin word by word.

The prose rendition, then, is as likely as the poetic one to cut material from the source or to rearrange verses in the translation. But, what this comparison makes clear is that the changes in the prose text are more readily comprehensible. Often, they sharpen the expression or focus the text in a particular way. If both versions of the psalter are for devotional use, the prose rendition provides a more personal direction, using simple imperatives and clear language to drive home a few points. Alfred does not encompass all of the meaning of the psalter in his vernacular version; rather, he chooses to emphasize its importance for the individual, shaping the material to reflect his rhetorical ends. The poetic version, as it is represented in these fragments, is a more diffuse text. The translation reflects mechanical poetic need rather than purpose, and the changes that the poet made to his source show not the controlling hand of a Wulfstan or an Alfred, but the pragmatic approach of a translator trying to make Old English poetry out of a Latin poetic text. The stylistic coherence, the sense of intent or of purpose present in the prose version is not present in the poetic version. The *Paris Psalter* poet is less intrusive than Alfred is, but is also less helpful.

The manuscripts and the texts in which passages parallel to the *Paris Psalter* appear are a mixed group. Two have connections with Canterbury; one is a Worcester

product. One is part of an elegant display manuscript, one appears in prefatory material to an historical text whose origin is probably in Alfred's reign, and the last appears in a hodge-podge monastic text, of little liturgical use, in a manuscript which is a copy of Archbishop Wulfstan's own private collection of ecclesiastical and canonical materials. The 1906 catalogue of Worcester manuscripts comments that they are 'not in any sense fancy productions'.[89] Both the *Paris Psalter* itself and the *Canterbury Psalter* are 'fancy productions', both are complete versions of the psalter in more than one language, and both owe their layout to the originally Continental tradition of double and triple psalters, with the text arranged in narrow columns. The manuscripts have a great deal of white space, with the texts neatly laid out and with careful integration of the decoration with the material. *The Benedictine Office* appears in a manuscript full of disparate texts, written through to f. 110 in a single hand but thereafter with additional texts in several other hands, with each folio filled top to bottom, such that where one text ends another begins. The *Menologium* occurs in a *Chronicle* manuscript, marked off from the poem following it only by the majuscule lettering used for the first line of *Maxims II*. This method is, of course, standard practice in late Anglo-Saxon manuscripts—it is the *Paris Psalter* which is the oddity in this context. The manuscripts, and the texts in them, vary widely in date, provenance and purpose.

There seems only one possible link among all these materials: the idea of vernacular understanding of important texts and times of the Church. The

---

[89] Floyer and Hamilton, p. xv.

Menologium may have its origin in the notion of the Benedictine Reform that important feasts should be compiled into a poem which would clarify the liturgical year both for the clergy and the laity. *The Benedictine Office* is not so much a model for the celebration of the hours in a monastery or a nunnery as it is a sketch, an explanation in the second generation of the Benedictine Reform of how the liturgy is shaped in the Offices. It is not specific enough to suggest that the Offices were to be celebrated in the vernacular; rather, it exemplifies the material usually found in the daily services, so that the fundamentals of this part of the liturgy can also be understood by both the clergy and the laity. The *Paris Psalter* goes even farther, presenting a complete text of the psalter, which is the basis of the liturgy for the Offices. This manuscript is not a liturgical one, but it presents the Latin and vernacular versions of the psalter laid out side by side, for easy comparison of the texts. Also, the prose version of Alfred which begins the manuscript not only provides the text but also includes prose introductions of the psalms. In the prose psalter, Alfred not only translates the text, but also explains both the universal and the individual application of the material, reforming the Latin psalter so that the vernacular version explains and clarifies the text for the reader, whether clerical or lay. Finally, in the *Canterbury Psalter* the desire to understand and to study the text is taken in a different direction, so that a number of variant texts and several glosses provide an opportunity for more sophisticated reading of the text, and for more advanced explication of its meaning. The desire for literacy in the vernacular can be traced from Alfred's Winchester to the Benedictine Reform all over England to Wulfstan's Worcester, and to the unknown

southwestern monastery or nunnery which produced the *Paris Psalter* in the second quarter of the eleventh century.

Chapter Three — Method of Translation

The study of translation includes, for each text, a varying mix of several senses of the noun 'translation': physical shifting without a lateral or rotational movement, a cultural shift from one art to another, a process, a transposition of sense, with or without explanation in appropriate terms, the shift of a text from one language into another. For the metrical psalter the significant problems associated with translation include the status of the Psalms as a sacred text, the potential for cultural shift from a Hebrew original by way of a several translations into an Anglo-Saxon context, the difficulty of analysing the translation as a process and determining the characteristics of that process, and the problem of the content of the psalter being forced into the form of poetry.

The first of these difficulties, that of the sacredness of the divine word, cannot be resolved except from internal evidence as far as the *Paris Psalter* is concerned. The poet left no prologue to illuminate his approach to the material. There survive no other poetic translations of the psalter from England or the Continent until a later date, in some countries much later. The first unequivocal statements about translation of the Bible into English (which express no reservations about the decision) are those

found in the *Prologue* to the Wycliffite Bible and in Richard Rolle's explanation of his translation of the *Psalter*. For the Wycliffite text, the translators conclude:

> þe best translating is, out of Latyn into English, to translate aftir þe sentence, and not oneli aftir þe wordis, so þat þe sentence be as opin eiþer openere in English as in Latyn, and go not fer fro þe lettre; and if þe lettre mai not be suid in þe translating, let þe sentence euere be hool and open, for þe wordis owen to serue to þe entent and sentence.[1]

The need for clarity may lead to the reordering of words, the changing of the syntax.[2] On the other hand, Rolle explains very carefully that the word order, and the words, of the divine text must be preserved:

> In þis werk I seke no strange Inglis, bot lightest and comunest and swilke þat es mast like unto þe Latyn...In þe translacioun I folow þe letter als mekil als I may, and þere I fynde na propir Inglys I follow þe witte of þe word.[3]

This contradiction in the approach to biblical translation at the end of the medieval period is paralleled by the contradictory interpretations and re-visions of the words of Cicero and Horace as they are perceived by Jerome, Boethius and Augustine at the beginning of the medieval period.[4] Thus, Boethius describes himself as making the

---

[1] Anne Hudson, ed. *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings* (Cambridge, 1978), p. 68.

[2] For a reconsideration of the meaning of the passage see J.D. Burnley, 'Late medieval English translation: types and reflections' in R. Ellis, ed. *The Medieval Translator* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 1989), pp. 37-53 at pp. 50-1.

[3] 'Prologue' to the *Psalter* as excerpted in Hope Emily Allen, ed. *English Writings of Richard Rolle, Hermit of Hampole.* (Oxford, 1931), p. 7.

[4] See Rita Copeland, 'Rhetoric and Vernacular Translation in the Middle Ages' *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 9 (1987), pp. 44-57 and 'The fortunes of "non verbum pro verbo": or, why Jerome is not a Ciceronian' in Roger Ellis, ed. *The Medieval Translator: The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 1989), pp. 15-35.

fault of the faithful translator (**in qua quidem uereor ne subierim fidi interpretis culpam cum uerbum uerbo expressum comparatumque reddiderim**) but explains that this is a necessary evil when translating philosophical texts.[5] Similarly, John Scotus Eriugena prefaces his early ninth century translation of **De Caelisti hierarchia** with the statement, **Ubi valde pertimesco, ne forte culpam fidi interpretis incurram.**[6] The medieval tradition apparently became one of actively pursuing slavish translation, contradicting the clear warning given by Horace in the *Ars poetica*: **nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus interpres.**[7] Schwarz concluded that 'the word-for-word method of translation became the dominant if not the only method during the Middle Ages'.[8]

However, the confusion evident in the late Middle Ages and recent reconsiderations of medieval translations suggest that the approach to translation, even biblical translation, was not nearly so monolithic as Schwarz suggests. Janet Bately points out that for Alfred the task of translation was also one of exposition, concluding that 'what in the hands of a less adventurous and highly motivated writer might have been a simple translation, becomes translation and commentary rolled into

---

[5] *In Isagogen Porphyrii*, Ed. S. Brandt. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 48 (Vienna, 1906), p. 135.

[6] *PL* 122, col. 1032.

[7] ll. 132.3 in *Satires, Epistles, and Ars Poetica.* ed. and trans. H. Rushton Fairclough, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1926).

[8] W. Schwarz, 'The Meaning of **Fidus Interpres** in Medieval Translation' *JTS* 45 (1944), pp. 73-8 at 78.

one, an interpretation, in a limited sense a transformation.'[9] Other translators as well may have been concerned as much with explicating the text as with rendering it into the vernacular. Indeed, although translation of the Bible certainly should have been **verbum pro verbo**, such was not always the case. In the metrical psalter, as will be discussed later, the translation is not so much word-for-word as clause-for-clause.

The second problem is that of cultural shift. Other Old English poets made the world of the Old Testament into the heroic world of the Anglo-Saxon, transforming their material from one cultural milieu to another. Even translations of non-biblical texts such as Felix's *Vita Sancti Guthlaci* made the Christian saint into an Anglo-Saxon hero who could actually do battle with death:

> Ða wæs Guðlace on þa geocran tid
> mægen gemeðgad, mod swiþe heard,
> elnes anhydig: Wæs seo adl þearl,
> hat *ond* heorogrim hreþer innan weol,
> born banloca;
> (*Guthlac B*, 976-80a)[10]

The language is that of the grim and bitter world of battle, of a warrior stern in the face of death. The shift from Latin to Old English, even though both texts are

---

[9] J. Bately. *The Literary Prose of King Alfred's Reign: Translation or Transformation?* (Inaugural Lecture, King's College, London, 1980), p. 15.

[10] See J. Roberts, *The Guthlac Poems of the Exeter Book.*(Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), p. 112. Whether *Guthlac A* depends upon Felix is uncertain, but *Guthlac B*, describing the saint's death scene, is based on Chapter 50 of Felix (Roberts, p. 36). For a discussion of the personification of death in the passage see J.L. Rosier, 'Death and Transfiguration: Guthlac B' *Philological Essays: Studies in Old and Middle English Language and Literature in Honour of Herbert Dean Meritt.* (The Hague, 1971), pp. 82-92.

Anglo-Saxon in origin, means a shift from one mode of perception to another. This kind of cultural shift is not really present in the metrical psalter. The comparison at the end of the previous chapter between the psalm fragments of the *Benedictine Office* and the prose psalter revealed that, of the two texts, the prose version was more likely to explain or to situate the material for the reader or listener. Although no text can be seen as culturally neutral, the *Paris Psalter* makes little of its position as a mediator between cultures.

Thirdly, the metrical psalter can be considered in terms of the process of translation. Translation theory as a practical matter concerns itself with the analysis of translation as 'free' or 'literal'. The purpose of translation is to reproduce, as far as possible, the invariant core of the text from the source language into the target language.[11] Aside from the cultural nexus already discussed is the linguistic aspect, because translation from one system of signs to another automatically leads to both loss and gain of meaning and of form. The process of translation, then, is a pragmatic one in which the translator exerts the minimum of effort to bring about a solution with the maximum of effect. This way of perceiving translation sees it as a technique producing a text which serves an equivalent function in the target language.[12] The

---

[11] See S. Bassnett-McGuire, *Translation Studies*. (London: Methuen, 1980), p. 21. For other general discussions of translation see R. Brower, ed. *On Translation*. (Cambridge, Mass., 1959) and W. Arrowsmith & R. Shattuck, *The Craft and Context of Translation*. (New York, 1964).

[12] For the theory behind producing equivalence in translation see J.C. Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation; An Essay in Applied Linguistics*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1965).

medieval approach to translation is, of course, based on this principle—that texts which are needed in the vernacular, or in a second language, are transmitted into that language. Perhaps a better word for the process is transposition, which clarifies the concept by emphasising the direct correspondence rather than any mutation in sense or purpose.

In the early Middle Ages translation, then, was perceived solely as a conjunctive act, serving as a bridge between two languages. Theorizing about the philosophical effects of translation did not begin until the Renaissance, when translation became not just a matter of rendering the necessary words into the target language, but also of reproducing and replicating a philosophy, even perhaps of displacing the original texts in favour of reworked better ones.[13] The translation, especially for a sacred text like the Bible, could not replace the original.[14] Only later did it develop this potentially separative function, so that a translation could, in theory at least, improve upon an original, while still obtaining its authority from that text. The complex translation acts of Chaucer and his contemporaries were far removed from the functional rendition of necessary texts which marks the work of Æthelwold,

---

[13] For an analysis of the medieval rhetorical tradition and the shift occasioned by the Renaissance see Eric Jacobsen, *Translation: A Traditional Craft. An Introductory Sketch with a Study of Marlowe's Elegies.* Classica et Medievalia. Dissertationes 6 (Copenhagen, 1958). A good introductory history is L.G. Kelly, *The True Interpreter: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West.* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1979).

[14] Although the Latin texts of the Bible did come to be seen as the originals. See Eugene A. Nida, *Toward a Science of Translating with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translation.* (London, 1964) and W. Schwarz, *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation.* (Cambridge, 1955). Also, see F.R. Amos, *Early Theories of Translation.* (New York, 1920).

Ælfric, Wulfstan, and the anonymous translators of Anglo-Saxon England.

Finally, the metrical psalter is an example of a poetic translation. Translating into poetry is perhaps the most difficult of all translation processes. It involves the most complex set of systems, and establishing linguistic equivalence between the source and target texts is complicated by the required emphasis on structure.[15] For the modern poet C. Day Lewis, the translator's prime motive is the desire to gain fuller knowledge of a poem.[16] Translation here is an act of discovery, of learning. Day Lewis argues that the audience must demand two things of a verse translation which sets itself up to be more than a versified crib: it must be alive as a poem in our own language, and it must have caught something of the tone of the original.[17] These, of course, are twentieth century notions about the translation of poetry, but to some extent the metrical psalter was a vehicle of discovery, the verse a new way of perceiving familiar material. Whether it was alive or if it recaptured the tone of its original cannot now be determined. The context for such analysis does not exist.

There do remain, however, two contexts for analysis of the metrical psalter as

---

[15] See Samuel R. Levin, *Linguistic Structures in Poetry.* Janua Linguarum 23 3rd ed. (The Hague: Mouton, 1969) for the argument that poetry has a special unity of structure characterized by couplings or convergences between semantic, phonic, metric and other elements in the text. A consideration of the history of poetic translation in English is Paul Selver, *The Art of Translating Poetry.* (London: John Baker, 1966). See also Ed. J. Biguenet & R. Schulte, *The Craft of Translation.* (Chicago, 1989). An excellent bibliography of translation works appears in Jeanette Beer, ed. *Medieval Translators and Their Craft.* Studies in Medieval Culture 25 (Kalamazoo, 1989), pp. 373-410.

[16] C. Day Lewis, 'On Translating Poetry,' Second Jackson Knight Memorial Lecture. Exeter, 1969 (Abingdon, 1970), p. 4.

[17] Day Lewis (1970), p. 7.

a translation. These are the Latin psalter (the source text in the language of translation theory) and the body of Anglo-Saxon cribs of the psalter which are known as the glossed psalters. The possible relationships between the metrical psalter and the glossed psalters are examined in more detail in Chapter Five, but the glossed psalters can be useful here as a means of checking the context of a given translation. They provide what were the common equivalents for many of the Latin words in the psalter, and suggest ways of translating the material. Sometimes the psalter poet uses words which correspond to the glossed psalters; sometimes he does not. Using one or more glossed psalters as a check on the psalter poet's method of translation will corroborate some of the conclusions of this analysis. For ease of reference, the psalter used most frequently here is D, the Regius Psalter. This is one of the more complete glosses, and it usually provides a single gloss for each Latin lemmata, a gloss which is thoughtful and scholarly. It is the psalter-gloss for which the D-gloss tradition is named, because it provides the most coherent example of the learned tradition of psalter-glossing. Finally, it is the psalter gloss of the D-tradition which is probably the best edited.[18] Where necessary, other psalter glosses will also be used for comparison. The most important text for any discussion of the text as a translation is, however, the Roman psalter.

This chapter will consider the translation as a phrase-for-phrase, even a clause-for-clause version of the Latin. It will consider first of all the omissions the

---

[18] The edition by F. Roeder is a critical one, whereas most of the rest of the D-tradition editions are diplomatic.

poet made from his source, then his additions to the text, particularly those additions which affect the meaning. Thereafter the chapter will examine other changes the poet made to the text in the process of translation: changes in tense, person and voice. Finally, the chapter will analyse a few common phrases of the Roman psalter, considering how they are translated in the *Paris Psalter*, and whether any changes in the poet's method of translation can be discerned in the surviving text. The next chapter will attempt a closer analysis of the rendition of each word of the Latin text; this chapter attempts to establish the general approach of the poet to his material.[19]

i) Omissions from the source

At different points in the verse the psalter poet fails to translate material from the Latin, adds half-lines or more to the original, and changes the text in other ways to clarify the sense or to satisfy the requirements of alliterative verse. He even borrows directly from the Latin for some words and phrases. Comparison of the Old English of the *Paris Psalter* with the Latin of the *Vespasian Psalter* reveals occasional changes in the method of translation, but a general uniformity of approach to the Latin. This uniformity of approach, however, and the changes the psalter poet makes, can help to explain some of the odd translations, the twisted syntax, and the fuzzy sense of many of the psalm verses.

Omissions of the Latin range in length from a word or two to a phrase, a

[19] I use the masculine pronoun throughout for references to the poet, but do not wish to preclude the possibility that the translator was a nun.

clause and even, on occasion, an entire psalm verse. Most commonly they occur towards the end of a psalm verse, perhaps so that the poet could avoid another whole line of text in order to translate one word. At other times these cuts towards the end of a verse seem simply to avoid unnecessary repetition. (There is some contradiction here, for repetition is a striking feature of the psalms.) Some phrases which repeat well in Latin do not do so in Old English. The first half of a Latin verse generally appears to be better served than the second, for the first statement of the idea is more carefully translated than the second membrum, the second statement of the theme. Also, the omissions change somewhat in the course of the translation, such that the poet appears to gain in economy, and improve in expression, towards the second half of the text. Sloppy work including a great deal of repetition and a correspondingly high number of cuts, becomes less prevalent after the first two thousand lines of the extant text. Finally, the poet omits part of the Latin at difficult or awkward verses in the text. Many of the cruces in the *Paris Psalter* arise because one or more Latin words are not translated at all or are taken together in translation, and textual critics have to determine which parts of the source were left out. The result of such an array of cuts is a text which is, at best, unclear and, at worst, baffling.

In the first metrical psalm to appear in the *Paris Psalter* manuscript, the poet omits a phrase from the last verse:

51.8 Ic þe andette awa to feore
on þære worulde ðe þu geworhtest her;
forþan þu eart se gooda gleaw on gesyhðe
þe þinne held curan, þara haligra.

Confitebor tibi domine in saeculum quem fecisti et expectabo nomen

tuum quoniam bonum est ante conspectu sanctorum tuorum.

Here the Latin **et expectabo nomen tuum** is passed over. It occurs at the end of the first half of the verse, and would add at least another half-line, possibly more, of Old English. By omitting it the poet starts the second half of the Latin verse in the a-verse of the next line.

Early in Psalm 53 the poet omits two words from the source:

53.2 God, min gebed gearuwe gehyre,
and earum onfoh min agen word.

Deus exaudi orationem meam; auribus percipe uerba oris mei.

The omission of **oris mei** (A and D have *muðes mines*) means a shorter verse. Again, translating the Latin to emphasise the individuality and the physicality of the speaker's prayer would add a half-line to the verse, and would require the poet to add a filler half-line, probably alliterating on *m*, something like *of muðes mines mægene gehyr me*.

In the next psalm the poet omits an entire clause in the longest verse:

54.19.1-4 Nis him onwendednes on woruldlife
ne him godes fyrhtu georne ondrædað.
Heo besmitað swylce his sylfes
þa gewitnesse, þær hi woh fremedon;

Non est enim illis commutatio et non timuerunt deum; extendit manum suam in retribuendo illis; contaminauerunt testamentum eius.

Here the clause **extendit manum suam in retribuendo illis** disappears from the middle of a verse which runs for an unusually long seven lines, and renders nearly two and a half Latin verses. Given the length and complexity of the verse, it is certainly possible (as it always is) that the clause was translated and the lines

rendering it were lost in transmission. The presence of an editorial full stop in the middle of the Old English verse would seem to support such an argument, since only very rarely does the verse come to such a close that the editors, especially Krapp, put a full stop in the middle of a verse. An entire clause disappears from the translation, and the Old English translation is awkward and long. However, the clause that is omitted is an opening statement of God's retribution, a theme that runs through the next several verses. It repeats the ideas that appear more concretely in the ensuing lines, and it would add length to an already long verse. The full stop at the end of the fourth line, however, may be the relic of an earlier copy of the text when this verse was actually two psalm verses.

In the next psalm some of the complexity resulting from the poet's treatment of his source becomes evident:

55.4 Ic wealdend god wordum herige,
and on god swylce georne gelyfe
þæt minre spræce sped folgie
æghwæs ealne dæg; eac ic swylce
on god drihten gearewe gewene;
nis me ege mannes for ahwæðer.

In deo laudabo sermones meos tota die; in deo sperabo non timebo quid faciet mihi homo.

In this verse the first five lines, encompassing four clauses, all translate the first clause and a half of the Latin, as far as **sperabo.** The poet goes over the material again and again, although he could probably have completed an adequate version in two lines. What is particularly interesting here, though, is that after five lines of repetition and variation, using filler words, epithets, stretched word meanings, and

awkward formulae, the poet renders the last clause of the source in a single line, cutting and changing its meaning considerably from that of the Latin original. All that is left of the psalm verse is the barest notion of fear, with *ege* partially rendering **timebo**. In spite of the excessive repetition of the paraphrase in the first half of the verse, the poet cuts the latter part substantially.

These techniques are by no means confined to the first few psalms, for the rest of the text reveals the same approach. In Psalm 104, for example, the poet makes even more cuts, perhaps to avoid repetition. For example, in the ninth verse, a substantial quantity of the source is disregarded. Three opening clauses of the verse are conflated:

> 104.9 Þæt he mid aðsware to Abrahame
> and to Isaace eac gesohte,
> and gleawlice Iacobe bead,
> þæt awa to feore Israheles cyn
> his gewitnesse wel geheolde.
>
> Quod disposuit ad Abraham; et iuramenti sui ad Isaac; et statuit illud Iacob in praeceptum; et Israhel in testamentum aeternum.

The paratactic structure of the source is lost, and the poet cuts or changes every verb in the passage. The poet omits or rearranges every aspect of the original except the proper names. Also, despite the difficulties of alliteration, the arrangement of the Latin is preserved to the extent that each proper name has a line of verse to contain it. Here the cuts are greatest in the first half of the verse, and the second half, while rearranged, appears otherwise relatively unchanged in translation. Perhaps this is because the promise referred to is more important for its prophecy than for its origin.

In the next verse a more typical pattern emerges:

104.10 And him þa mid soðe sægde cweðende:
"Ic eowrum cynne Khananea land
on agene æht yrfe gesylle."

Dicens tibi dabo terram Chanaan; funiculum hereditatis uestrae.

Here the first clause is expanded and carefully translated, so that the direct speech of God is set off and emphasised, and the gift clearly explained. However, the second part of the verse is shortened in translation, with the poet ignoring **funiculum** (accurately rendered in most of the glosses as *rapincel*). The sense is already clear, so the second clause is treated less completely than the first, the difficult word omitted.[20]

A third example from this psalm might show how, at the halfway point of the extant text, the poet has fully developed the technique of omitting material from the end of a verse.

104.31 Syþþan he æfter sloh æghwylc frumbearn
þe on Egyptum wæs ahwær acenned,
and frumcynnes heora frean swylce.

Et percussit omnem primogenitum in terra aegypti; primitias omnis laboris eorum.

Here the first clause is carefully rendered, with a whole line to explain **in terra aegypti**, but the second clause is ignored following **primitias**. *heora frean swylce* is a half-line with little or no meaning, bearing no resemblance to **omnis laboris eorum.**

---

[20] The difficult Latin word is not translated, presumably because either *rapincel* would be difficult to alliterate with, or because the poet did not know or could not find the Latin. The first possibility certainly seems the more likely, although alliteration on *r* is rare in the metrical psalter.

Explaining the passage would take at least another line; the poet omits the part of the source which would not easily fit in his closing line.

This technique, which shows signs of still being developed in the earlier part of the metrical psalms, is fully operational by the final quinquagene. One final, much abbreviated, set of examples from a psalm which otherwise would involve a great deal of repetition will show the the poet's omissions. In the Roman psalter, Psalm 135 is clearly intended for chanting, even incorporating a kind of refrain into the antiphon itself, with gradual repetition and slight variation of each theme. What the psalter poet appears to be doing, from verse four onwards, is recreating the sense of the original with verses of one, or at the most two, lines. This means, of course, some omission. For example:

135.4 He wundur dyde weorþlic ana.

Qui fecit mirabilia magna solus quoniam

Here **magna, quoniam,** and the pronominal adjective (and its implied clause) **Qui** disappear. Similarly, the repetition **diuisit...diuisiones** in verse 13 disappears:

135.13 He readne sæ recene todælde,

Qui diuisit Mare Rubrum in diuisiones quoniam

quoniam also disappears here, as it does throughout the Old English version of this psalm.[21] The sonorous inclusion of all the Israelites and of all mankind is lost, and with it the pattern of the repetition at the end of every verse. Similarly, the poet

---

[21] except where *eall* appears, as much for alliteration as for sense, in verses 10,11,14 and, if *eallmiht* counts, 12.

omits part of the Latin in the twenty-sixth verse:

135.26 He eac afedeð flæscea[22] æghwylc

Qui dat escam omni carni quoniam.

Here, unusually, the poet even cuts a noun, **escam**, using *flæscea* for **carni** (as do the psalter glosses) and omitting **quoniam** to keep the translation to a single line.

The first three verses of the psalm present a text which is carefully translated from the source in verses of three, two and four lines. The opening incantation **Confitemini domino** (v. 1)[23] is translated in each verse by *andettan*, but slight variation in each (v. 1.1 *Ic andette ecum drihtne*, v. 2.1-2a *Eac ic andette ... ealra godena god*, v. 3.1-2a *Andette ic swylce ... drihtna drihten*) suggests that the poet may have chosen not to attempt to imitate the parallellism of the source. What he does, in each verse, is add half-lines ending in *wat* in the b-verses of each psalm verse. Thus 135.1.2b *and ic ful gearwe wat*, 135.2.2b forðon ic hine godne wat, and 135.3.3b *and ic gearwe wat*--all these are added half-lines. Had the poet chosen to continue translating the Latin carefully, and adding his version of a refrain, *ic...wat*, the psalm in Old English would have been very long. Instead, the psalter poet abbreviates the Latin, packing the sense into as little space as possible, and omitting his potential refrain.

Omissions from the Latin, then, seem to have been generally executed for

---

[22] MS *flæcsea*, metathesis of *s* and *c*. See G.L. Brook, 'The Relation between the Textual and the Linguistic Study of Old English' in *The Anglo-Saxons*. ed. P. Clemoes. (London, 1959), pp. 280-91.

[23] v. 2 **Confitemini deo**, v. 3 **Confitemini domino**

expediency's sake: to end a verse without another line, most of it filler; to avoid repetition of an idea already clear from the first part of the verse; or to avoid a construction that worked in the source but not the target language. Such are most of the omissions so far discussed. The poet's facility with these cuts appears to increase in the course of the text. He is more confident and more predictable in his changes towards the latter half of the translation. Finally, deletions from the Latin are more likely to occur when the poet encounters a difficult or obscure passage. Where the sense is unclear or the Latin unusual, the poet tends not to translate it completely.

What the psalter poet appears to find difficult, however, is far from obvious. The Latin noun **cornu** occurs four times in Psalm 74, but the poet does not translate it for three of those occurrences, and for the fourth produces the difficult *hapax legomenon fyhtehornas.*[24] In both 75.4 and 88.15 he again avoids **cornu**, giving no impression in his translation that horns had anything to do with the sense of the text. **Cornu** appears in relevant Latin verses fourteen times, and OE *horn* translates it only seven times in the metrical psalter.[25]

In 103.24 the poet appears to find **reptilia** a problem, and reworks the verse so much that its meaning changes:

> 103.24 His is mycel sæ and on gemærum wid,
> þær is unrim on ealra cwycra
> mycelra and mætra; ofer ðæne mægene oft
> scipu scriðende scrinde fleotað.

---

[24] D has 74.5 **cornu**: *horn*, .6 **cornu**: blank; .11 **cornua**: *hornas* (twice).

[25] 68.31, 88.22, 91.9, 111.8, 117.25, 131.18, and 148.14.

Hoc mare magnum et spatiosum; illic reptilia quorum non est numerus;
animalia pusilla et magna; illic naues pertransibunt.

The poet's efforts to render **reptilia**[26] by combining it with **animalia** and translating *ealra cwycra* reverse the sense of the verse, since **non est numerus** becomes *þær is unrim* (D has *nis gerim*). The cuts to avoid **reptilia** in the middle of the verse lead to a last line which is far too close to the poetic *topos* of ships travelling across the sea. Also, the poet uses the *hapax legomenon scrinde*, meaning 'swift course?'. The difficulties earlier in the verse lead the poet into producing a surprising last line.

ii) Additions

Besides omitting elements of the Latin for various reasons, the psalter poet also adds occasionally to the source in his translation. The new material is almost always in the spirit of the source, providing additional information or repeating material already in the translation. However, most of the poet's additions are a result of the decision to translate into alliterative verse: whether a given addition is an overt means of fitting the sense to the Old English verse form or a covert attempt at writing poetry or amplifying the text is often difficult to determine. Some of the poet's

---

[26] **reptilia** occurs three times in the Roman Psalter: here, 68.35 and 148.10. At 148.10 the Anglo-Saxon psalters read **serpentes**, glossed usually, as in D, *nædran*. At 68.35 **reptilia** is left blank in D (which means only that the Latin word could serve as an Old English word). The word does not appear in *PPs* 68.34:

Herige hine swylce heofen and eorðe,
side sæflodas and þa him syndon on.
Laudent illum caeli et terra; mare et omnia reptilia in eis.

At 103.24 **reptilia** is glossed *snicende* A B, *slincynde* C, *wyrmas* D F J K, *gripende* E and *slincendu* I. None of these glosses resembles P.

additions seem to reflect his understanding of the text as well as the conventions of his form, but others tread close to the borders of expediency, and some are frankly unnecessary except to fulfil the exigencies of the verse form. The latter additions, those which are unnecessary except for their role in the verse, are treated in Chapter Six, since they bear no discernible relationship to the Latin. However, those additions to the source which try to recreate the poetry of the source, or which add factual material, or which slant the text in some way are discussed here. They not only reflect the poet's attitude to his source, but also shed light on the kind of material he uses as an appropriate extension of the original.

Some of the poet'a additions to the text seem to try to reproduce the poetry of the Latin. From very early in the translation the poet omits the paratactic **Et** at the beginning of many psalm verses and clauses. Occasionally, he does use *And* at the beginning of the verse, but normally the poet simply begins each verse as a new syntactic whole. Very occasionally, however, and not always signalled by the source, he adds the enunciative *Hwæt* to start the verse. For example:

61.2.1 Hwæt he is god min and gearu hælend
Etenim ipse est deus meus et salutaris meus
76.13.1 Hwæt, þe, wuldres god, wæter sceawedon
Uiderunt te aquae deus
90.5.1 Hwæt, me soðfæstnes min scylde wið feondum
Scuto circumdabit te ueritas eius
138.8.1 Hwæt, me þin hand þyder ofer holma begang
Etenim illuc manus tua deducet me[27]

Only the first and last of these examples (D has **Etenim**: *7 soþlice*) offer any warrant

[27] See also 55.5, 59.5, 61.6 (possible translation of **Quia**), 72.7, 85.14, 91.3, 101.6, 104.6, 107.10, 118.123, 118.138, 118.172, 129,5, and 136.8.

for the inserted *Hwæt.* The personal emphasis of each of these verses, often a shift from preceding generalizations, may provide a clue as to why the poet chose to add the interjection in these places.

Additions to the Latin which remain closely associated with the source include the use of doublets and the plethora of epithets in the text. As Koskenniemi notes,[28] the use of doublets is as characteristic of the Hebrew language and of biblical vocabulary, especially in the psalms, as it is of Germanic expression. Doublets, including alliterative and rhyming pairs, remain common in the Latin versions of the text. In the metrical psalter, some are lost, but many more are added, particularly verb doublets. The psalter poet seems to have fastened on the use of a doublet as a means of further explaining the Latin and of creating an easy half-line. Some of these doublets, if not most, are simply padding, even descending to the level of what must have been cliche even in Anglo-Saxon times. Such, for instance, is 102.19.4a *habbað and healdað*,[29] an addition to the text following which the poet makes substantial cuts to the Latin. Similarly, in 104.32.4b *yldra ne gingra* is an addition to the text which, while not perhaps properly a doublet, serves to pad out a verse and add some emphasis to the sense.[30] Earlier in the psalm, in 104.23, **uerba** is rendered as *worda*

---

[28] Inna Koskenniemi, *Repetitive Word Pairs in Old and Early Middle English Prose* (Turku, 1968), pp. 24-7 concerning the *Vespasian Psalter.*

[29] 102.19.3b-4 þa his mære word
habbað and healdað and hyge fremmað.
facitis uerbum eius, ad audiendam uocem sermonum eius.

[30] 104.32.3b-4 næs þæra leoda ða
ænig untrum yldra ne gingra.

and weorca, a standard doublet of liturgical language. All of these doublets are simple additions to the text.

Doublets are particularly useful in the b-verse, where an added or padded half-line could finish off an idea without being obtrusive. In addition, the use of doublets, like the use of some words or phrases, was a useful shortcut to the end of a verse. Doublets are sparse at the beginning of the extant translation unless they are signalled by the Latin. However, the poet seems gradually to become aware of their potential. In 64.1.3 *gylde and gehate* renders **reddetur uotum**, a useful and relatively accurate use of a verb pair. Shortly afterwards **mirabile in aequitate** becomes *ece and wræclic* in the vernacular (64.5). Four psalms later, however, the poet translates *sarig þearfa* for **pauper et dolens** (68.29.1b, and again *sarie þearfan*, 68.32.1b) and the Latin doublet becomes only an adjective-noun combination in the vernacular. In these early cases both components of the doublet, whether verb or adjective, are necessary for the sense to be transferred properly into the vernacular, and both translate a part of the original.

Soon, however, the poet appears to realise the use of doublets as innocuous b-verses. In Psalm 75, verb pairs that are additions to the Latin occur twice in the second half of the verse: 75.6.5b *meteð and findeð*, and 75.9.2b *wealdeð and healdeð*. Two psalms later doublets appear twice in the same psalm verse, overuse of the construction even by the psalter poet's standards:

77.7 þa he fæste bebead fæderum ussum,

---

et non erat in tribubus eorum infirmus.

> þæt hi heora bearnum budun and sægdun,
> and cinn oðrum cyðden and mærden.
>
> Quam mandauit patribus nostris ut notam facere ea filiis suis ut cognoscat generatio altera.

Neither doublet here is required by the Latin but both verb pairs do translate one verb of the source. This pattern, of having in each doublet one verb that translates the original and one that the kind-hearted would call amplification (the cynical, padding), becomes the standard for the text.

The doublet, then, becomes a useful tool, at once connected with the Latin and freewheeling as an alliterative or metrical device. Such are the doublets in Psalm 82, where **cogitauerunt** becomes *syredan and feredan*[31] (K *yfelmyndan*) in the third verse and **persequeris**: *ehtest and drefest* (D *þu ehtst*) in the eleventh. In the next twenty psalms or so the use of doublet verbs, and less commonly adjectives, becomes more common, although sporadic. In Psalm 93, for instance, three instances occur within twenty-eight lines of each other:

> 93.8.1a Intelligite: Onfindað þæt and ongeotað (D ongytað)
> 93.11.6b no Latin: deorc and ðystre (end of verse)
> 93.14.2b stabit: winne and stande (D standeþ)

Other such accumulations occur.[32] Such clusters of doublets suggest that the poet did not greatly vary his technique.

In the last forty-odd psalms the use of doublets appears to be less pronounced, and they are more likely to be a necessary part of the translation. In 118.88.2, for

---

[31] The poet may follow the Gallican reading here: **malignauerunt**.

[32] For example, in Psalm 102.

instance, **uiuifica me** is given as *weorð me...milde and bliðe*, a very weak rendition in which both adjectives of the doublet are necessary even to approach the sense of **uiuifica**. Giving life and a reason for living to the prophet meant making him gentle and happy, a reasonable, if not theologically accurate, translation. In Psalm 122.2.3b *hereð and cwemeð* provides a useful added b-verse. Finally, in the first verse of Psalm 135, **misericordia** is given by a pair of adjectives as substantives: *wis and mildheort.*[33] Doublets, then, may be nothing but additions to the text with no warrant from the original, but they can also be justifiable extensions of meaning from the Latin original. They provide both translation and alliteration.[34]

Similarly, epithets, in which an adjective expressing a quality or attribute precedes a noun and becomes a repeated title, a standardized appellation for the person or thing described, are frequent in both the Latin psalter and in vernacular poetry. Many of the epithets in the *Paris Psalter* are direct translations of the source, since the use of epithets is a very common technique in the psalms. A second group are partial translations of the Latin, usually of the noun with an added adjective to produce a half-line of poetry. Some are additions to the Latin, or extrapolations from material in the text. Thematically, by far the largest group of epithets includes those describing God; the original author or authors of the psalms enjoyed a very close

---

[33] again as a b-verse to end the psalm verse.

[34] The use of doublets in Old English texts, of course, begins in glossed texts and translations like the Old English version of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* and the Lindisfarne Gospels. They are particularly common in Old English prose, and are often associated especially with Wulfstan. See especially D. Whitelock, 'The Old English Bede' *PBA* 48 (1962), pp. 57-90.

relationship with the Creator, and frequently addressed Him in such terms as would show respect for Him and for His authority. The psalter poet retains most of these epithets, and adds a few of his own, so that the extant text has over four hundred epithets for God. Appendix Three includes a list of these epithets. The first three epithets in the text are *halig drihten* (52.3.1b, 52.7.4b), *mihtig drihten* (52.6.1b) and *ece drihten* (53.4.2b), and these remain the most common throughout the text. They normally occur in the b-verse, and often, not always, translate **dominus**. The psalter poet either renders the Latin precisely into the corresponding epithet, or adds such standard offerings as *mægena god, Israela god,* or *wealdend god.* Only occasionally does the adjective follow the noun, and the most common Old English poetic technique for producing an epithet—using a genitive noun-noun combination—occurs only in very common constructions. Not for the psalter poet any stirring depictions of God as a warrior, or even as a kind of gift-giver; the metaphors that add depth and complexity to such poetic paraphrases of the scripture as *Exodus* or *Judith* do not appear here.

As with other tricks of translation in the psalter there seem to be clusters of usage. For example, the occurrences of *ealdor* (*aldor, ealdur*) in the nominative singular case are all the second element of a genitive noun-noun compound in this text. There are thirteen of these compounds in the extant metrical psalms, divided for their first elements between *lifes* and *wuldres. Wuldres ealdor* is a well-known poetic epithet, appearing in, for example, *DR* l. 90 *Hwæt me þa geweorþode wuldres Ealdor* and in *Seaf* l. 123 *þæt he usic geweorþode wuldres Ealdor*, for example. In both of

these cases the epithet provides a b-verse, is collocated with *geweorþode* in a light verse, and appears in a context including a series of epithets (e.g. *DR* l. 91b *heofonrices Weard*, l. 93a *ælmihtig God*). In the metrical psalms the epithet similarly always occurs in the b-verse, but only very rarely in the context of other epithets, and it never translates any Latin. Interestingly, of the six appearances of *wuldres ealdor*, two are collocated with the verb *geweorðian*:

65.3.1b Geweorðie wuldres ealdor
85.8.2b þa þe weorðiað, wuldres aldor

Neither a-verse follows the verb tense of the two very similar collocations of the epithet in the lyrics.

Finally, the distribution of *wuldres/lifes ealdor* through the text is of interest. It apears first in 53.7.1b as *lifes ealdor*, but after that are four consecutive occurrences of *wuldres ealdor* (65.3.1b, 70.8.1b, 85.8.2b, 101.2.2b). In Psalm 105, however, where the construction is used four times, the poet returns to *lifes ealdor* for three of those occurrences (105.8.3b, 105.10.1b, 105.31.3b; *wuldres aldor* 105.19.1b). Shortly thereafter *lifes ealdor* appears again (106.6.1b), and then the construction disappears until very near the end of the translation. A final cluster of three occurrences within a hundred and fifty lines of each other (138.21.3b *lifes ealdor*, 139.4.4b *lifes ealdur*, 142.7.3b *wuldres ealdur*) completes the group. The distribution, including the switch to *wuldres* for a block in the middle, shows occasional use of the epithet up to the middle of the translation, and its use in two groups thereafter. *wuldres ealdor* is a common poetic epithet elsewhere, especially in Christian texts, yet here it is used only thirteen times in a text of over 5000 lines.

Similarly, *heofonrices weard* occurs only three times in the text (90.1.2b, 91.7.2b, 98.10.4b). After this point the epithet never appears again, but *weard* has five more occurrences in this sense,[35] including three with *heofenes*, perhaps a diluted form of the epithet:

101.1.2 gehyr, heofenes weard, and gehlyde min
101.2.5 gehyr, heofenes weard, helpys benan.
104.37.2 halig heofenes weard, þe he hleoðrade

As soon as the epithet is diluted it shifts to the a-verse and becomes a part of the half-line, not a discrete verse. The poet shifts even farther away from the standard epithet for the last two occurrences of *weard*:

106.2.2 alysde, lifes weard, laðum of handa,
108.22.1 Alys me, lifes weard, forþan ic eom lama þearfa;

Here, as for *heofenes weard*, the poet has moved so far from the conventional epithet that Krapp sets the construction apart in commas. This is the last use of *weard* as the second element of an epithet; within twenty psalms, it seems, the poet begins to use a conventional epithet, changes to a dilute form, changes that for an even less recognisable construction, and drops the epithet altogether. Only once does the epithet translate anything from the Latin.[36]

There remain three kinds of additions to the text: wholly invented half-lines; lines or half-lines which provide extra information, more than that provided in the

---

[35] In its last occurrence, in 126.2, *weard* means 'protection, watch' (**qui custodit eam**: *weard gehealdan*). The other eight occurrences of the noun are the epithets discussed here.

[36] On its first occurrence, in 90.1, *heofonrices weard* translates **coeli**.

Latin text; and the additions, few in number, which suggest the traditional allegorical interpretation of the text. Some of the material added in this way is primarily for metrical and alliterative reasons, but, again, it is difficult to draw a line between additions which are purely for sense and for better comprehension of the Latin, and those which are purely a result of the verse form. Examples may clarify the kinds of additions that the poet makes.

The half-lines which are without Latin equivalent share a restricted syntax and lexicon. Many, as discussed above, are epithets or constructions based on epithets. A large number are in the b-verse, as would be expected. Some are half-lines added at the end of a psalm verse to fill out the line, as in 70.19.6 *þysse eorðan, þe we on buiað* where the final adjective clause translates nothing from the source. It does not detract from the line, but could be said simply to emphasise our earthly and bodily presence in this world where we must dwell.[37] An adjective clause could also be constructed around an addition, as in 71.12.3-4, where the poet creates similar emphasis:

71.12.3-4 and þæne wædlan, þe on worulde næfð
ahwær elles ænigne fultum.

et inopen cui non erat adiutor

Here *ahwær elles* is added, along with *ænigne*, to provide vowel alliteration and to make clear the dependence of 'the poor, who in the world have no other refuge,

---

[37] 70.19.5-6 and me of neowelnesse eft neoðan alysdest
þysse eorðan, þe we on buiað.
et de abysso terrae iterum reduxisti me.

anywhere else'. The addition of *ahwær elles* again makes explicit the isolation of mankind.

This kind of extrapolation occurs at times throughout the text. In Psalm 121.5 the third line is all addition, describing *Dauides hus* in line 2b: *þæt on heofenum siteþ heah gestaðelod.* This kind of addition, an adjective clause referring to the previous noun or idea, is common. In 54.19.4b the added clause stands almost in apposition to the preceding clause: *Heo besmitað swylce his sylfes/ þa gewitnesse, þær hi woh fremedon.*[38] The last half-line here finishes off the translation of one clause and allows the poet to start the next clause in an a-verse. The half-line added clause becomes a common technique, extrapolating from the translation which is already completed, and perhaps further explaining it. Also common is an adjective-noun combination such as that found in 101.17.2b:

> 101.17 Forðon he fæstlice forð locade
> of his þam hean halgan setle;
> drihten geseah of heofenum her on eorðan.
>
> Quoniam prospexit de excelso sancto suo; dominus de caelo in terram prospexit.

Here **de excelso** (D has *of mærum*; K has *of heahnesse*) is expanded into a whole line, of which the b-verse is pure addition. *halgan setle* extrapolates from the Latin without doing violence to the sense; it could, with some difficulty, be argued that providing the deity with a specific place makes the image of his looking forth from the heavens into a more concrete one. In the same psalm an adverb phrase also

---

[38] Contaminauerunt testamentum eius.

serves as an addition to the text which does not really advance the sense:

101.14 Eft timbrade ece drihten
and gesette Sion þurh his sylfes miht,
ðær was gesyne his seo soðe sped.

Quoniam aedificabit dominus Sion; et uidebitur in maiestate sua.

Here the need to translate **Sion** to finish the first membrum occasions the whole second line, in which *þurh his sylfes miht*, an obvious repetition of the act of volition and strength which created Sion, occurs primarily for the alliteration on *sylfes*. Additions to the text, then, are often adjectival or adverbial in nature, and usually consist of half-line phrases or clauses, or adjective clauses which add a whole line to the text in further explanation of one point.

Late in the translation the poet produces a b-verse which is a single adverb. This more conventionally poetic practice occurs rarely in the metrical psalter:

118.58 Ic bidde þinre ansyne ungemete georne
mid ealre gehygde heortan minre,
þæt þu me on mode milde weorðe
æfter þinre spræce spowendlice.

Deprecatus sum faciem tuam in toto corde meo; miserere mei secundum eloquium tuum.

Here the b-verse of the first line is an adverb phrase serving only, if that, to add emphasis to the sincerity of the prophet's prayer. In the second line **miserere mei** is expanded in the long periphrasis *þæt þu me on mode milde weorðe*. Reversing the noun and adjective over the caesura is unusual. The final line of the verse, necessary only because **eloquium tuum** must be translated, ends on the adverb *spowendlice*. The adverb occurs only three times in the text: here, earlier in the same

psalm in precisely the same context 118.41.3 *æfter þinre spræce spowendlice*, and in 147.4.1 where it ends not the whole verse but the first line *He his spræce hider spowendlice*. In none of these cases does the adverb translate anything, and it always appears in the b-verse collocated with the noun *spræc*, rendering **eloquium**. These adverbial additions, like the adjective clauses discussed earlier, all provide emphasis or repetition of a point in the source.

Occasionally, the poet appears in these additions to lead forward to the next psalm verse, as in 118.141:

118.141 Ic wæs on geoguðe, grame me forhogedon;
þæs ic ofergittol æfre hwæðere,
þæt ic þin soð weorc symble heolde.
118.142 Is þin soðfæstnes symble, drihten,
seo soðfæste, and seo symble bið
on ecnesse awa to feore;
is þin swylce æðelnes and æ soðfæst.

.141 Adolescentior ego sum et contemptus; iustificationes tuas non sum oblitus;
.142 Iustitia tua iustitia in aeternum; et lex tua ueritas.

These verses are rather awkward, with three repetitions in the third stave of *symble*, four occurrences of *soð* and its compounds, **in aeternum** expanded to a whole line *on ecnesse awa to feore*, and a shift in the first line from the first person singular to the third person plural. Where the problem really occurs, however, is in the b-verses of verse 141. In the first line *grame* makes little sense in the third stave; the second line has the adverbial phrase *æfre hwæðere* for alliteration; and the last line, as a result, also needs an added b-verse and an added clause to put **iustificationes**: *soð weorc* in context. The poet uses a noun clause, anchoring the alliteration with *symble*

as an adverb both convenient and appropriate to the next verse. He does not, it seems, look far enough forward to realize that *symble* would become invaluable for alliterating with two more translations of **iustitia**. He does, however, choose to keep the source's threefold repetition of **iustitia**: *soðfæste* (rather than using *rihtwisnesse* or other possible synonyms), retaining at any cost the sense of the Latin. The result is unfortunate: the poet does seem to look forward to the next verse and the repetitions of **iustitia**, but this does not improve the translation. The choice of keeping the sense of the Latin results in especially repetitive verse.

Finally, additions to fill out the text could be made by looking back at recent verses, and reusing vocabulary developed earlier. For example, in 118.105 **lucerna** becomes *fæle blacern*, a slightly unusual choice of vocabulary but an adjective-noun combination useful for alliterating with *fotum minum* in the b-verse. The psalter glosses vary in their versions, most using some version of D's *leohtfæt*. Seventy-five lines later *blacern* appears again:

> 118.130 Worda me þinra wise onleohteð,
> beorhtnesse blæcern, and þu bealde sylest
> andgit eallum eorðbuendum.

Declaratio sermonum tuorum inluminat me; et intellectum dat paruulis.

Here the added noun is incorporated into the verse much more successfully than in 118.105, for it forms part of a Type 2A verse with double alliteration.[39] Since, like the psalter glosses, he was rendering **declaratio**: *beorhtnesse*, the poet chose to

[39] The verse could also be scanned as a Type 3A, because the first foot is longer than the second, but this type never appears in *Beowulf*.

augment the alliteration with the word he used to render **lucerna** sixty lines earlier. The word does not interfere with the sense, but augments it, so that the image of God's word as illumination becomes a concrete one—the lamp of illumination itself appears. The addition expands the Latin to clarify meaning, making it more accessible to the reader.[40] For its next and last appearance in the text, in 131.18, *blacern* again translates **lucerna.**[41]

Elsewhere, the poet sometimes makes additions to the text which provide information not immediately available in the Latin. These additions are neither frequent nor especially illuminating. For instance, in Psalm 104.15, the poet identifies more closely one of the major Old Testament figures:

104.15.1-4a He him snoterne beforan sende æryst
ful wisne wer to scealce,
and þa bebohtan bearn Iacobes
Ioseph on geoguðe;

Misit ante eos uirum; in seruum uenundatus est Ioseph.

For alliteration of *bebohtan...bearn*, Joseph is described first as the son of Jacob. It would be too optimistic to suggest that the poet is here displaying the biblical and Germanic love of genealogy, or even to suggest that the *sunu* x-genitive formula is consciously being used for effect.[42] The formula appears only one more time in the

---

[40] On the other hand, *blæcern* does provide alliteration and does not interfere with the sense, two qualities standard to most of the additions to the text.

[41] These are the only relevant occurrences of **lucerna** in the Latin psalter.

[42] **filius** appears 75x in the Latin, rendered by *bearn* 53x, *sunu* 8x. *sunu* only occurs 9x in text (8x for **filius**, once for **puer**), *bearn* 81x. The poet clearly prefers *bearn*.

text.[43] The text emphasises that those sent before God as servants are wise men, an emphasis not especially present in the Latin. Similarly, in 98.6.1 the poet describes *Moyses et Aaron mære gebroðor*, adding the fact of their being brothers in order to emphasize their relationship and their importance.[44]

The material added to the text is only that which would be available to any reasonably literate and observant Anglo-Saxon. In 67.24.4, when describing one of the instruments of praise used by the congregation of the faithful, the poet refers to *on tympanis togenum strengum*. This renders the Latin **tympanistriarum**, and the added detail of the 'stretched strings' is an obvious one.

The last category of additions to the text is undoubtedly the smallest. Very infrequently, the poet slightly alters or adds to the original in order to reflect the prevailing allegorical interpretation of the text. What is of interest here is not that such additions were made, but that so few of these pointers are adjoined to the literal text. The psalter poet only rarely makes any attempt to explicate the text. For

---

[43] 104.15.3b is the only completely added version of the formula in the text, and even it is probably influenced by 104.6.3a **filii Iacob**: *Iacobes bearn*. The only other candidate for this formula is 113.21.3b *bearn Israheles*, translating **domui Israhel**:

113.21.3-4 þu gebletsudest bearn Israheles,
Aarones hus eac gebletsadest;
Benedixit domui Israhel; benedixit domui Aaron.

The use of the x-genitive formula here is clearly partly translation and partly need for alliteration with *gebletsian*, which precludes **domui**: *hus* or *sele*. If genitive-noun formulae are allowed two other possibilities exist, but both are word-by-word translations: 77.11.1a **Filii Effrem**: *Effremes bearn*, and 82.7.3b **filiis Loth**: *Loðes bearnum*. Elsewhere the most common collocation of *bearn* is in *x-bearn(um)*, in which form the word appears 15 times in the metrical psalter.

[44] The following line suggests their role in the society: 98.6.2a *soðe sacerdas*.

instance, where **Crist** appears in the Latin text the poet more readily uses *crist* (ten times) than the allegorical *þa halgan* (e.g. 104.13.1) as a translation.[45] Similarly, in Psalm 83.1.3b the poet adds *þet ic him wunude onn*, so that rather than the soul's simply contemplating life with the Lord (**concupiuit et defecit anima mea in atria domini**), the prophet expresses the desire that 'he be allowed to live with Him'. The shift is a very small one, from contemplation of what might be to the personal hope that the prophet's soul attain the ideal. The application to the individual is made explicit, but not in such a way as to suggest any strong allegorical bias to the text.[46] One final example may suffice. At the end of 131.18, after the Latin verse has been rendered, the poet adds the line *criste gecorenum, þe ic hine cuðne wat*, referring to the descendants of David, 'the chosen ones of Christ, that I knew well about', those among whom the prophet and his reader hope to include themselves. The connection of ideas is a traditional allegorical one, but the development of those ideas has a personal focus.

The additions to the text, then, take somewhat more notice of the sense of the original than do the cuts made by the poet. Sometimes the addition of words, phrases

---

[45] *crist* 67.24, 84.5, 108,24. 118,146; *criste* 88.33, 88.45, 131.18, *cristes* 83.8, 133.2, 134.2. *PPs* also includes a rare occurrence of the adjectival form *cristene* in 106.31. See H.S. MacGillivray, *Christianity and the Vocabulary of Old English.* (Halle, 1902) for a complete listing and some analysis. The adjective appears for alliteration as *cristenes folces.*

[46] The psalter glosses can be much more strongly interpretive and allegorical than the psalter poet ever is, even those glosses which are said to be a part of the practical tradition.

and clauses owes more to the problems of the verse form than it does to the meaning of the Latin, but most of the material added develops in some way from the source. The Roman psalter includes various poetic devices, uses many doublets, and provides many epithets: the use of all these in the vernacular is thus at least sanctioned by the original. Where additions have to be made because the translation of the psalm verse is not complete, the poet appears to use phrases or clauses which set off the important part of the line. Where additions are made for other reasons, the poet seems to turn those materials to his own purposes, subsuming them in the characteristic verse of the metrical psalter.

c) Other Changes to the Latin

The poet makes other changes to his text, the reasons for which cannot be guessed at. The metrical psalms often change the person of the original, whether from first person singular to plural, second person to third, third to second, or other variations thereof. The tenses of verbs change—sometimes, it would appear, from a misunderstanding of the Latin, sometimes for metrical reasons, and sometimes, in a remarkably short space in the text, for no apparent reason. The poet also shifts from direct to indirect discourse and *vice versa*, and it is especially common in the later psalms for the poet substantially to rearrange the word order of the Latin in order to make better sense in the vernacular. There is little to show that, even in the early part of the psalter, the poet subscribed to the view that the word order of the sacred text was sacrosanct, but there is less wholesale rearrangement of the text in the first fifty

psalms of the *Paris Psalter* than occurs in the last fifty. Sometimes the poet reorders the text so much that he loses track of its meaning, and produces a translation suggesting the opposite to what is intended. Certain constructions in particular appear to trouble the translator, causing unusual or wrong renditions. The poet makes, as necessary, various changes other than additions or deletions.

The number of pronoun shifts in the text seems unusual, and in many cases the poet appears to consider person irrelevant. For example, in 54.16 the poet shifts from the third person singular to the second:

> 54.16.3b-4 þæt þu bliðe me
> mine stefne stiðe gehyre.
>
> et exaudiet uocem meam.

Here the change in person may reflect a more direct, personal attitude to God; rather than 'he hears' the poet starts to say 'you must hear', using the present subjunctive for his verb. In the next verse, the poet retains the second person, where the Latin is in the third.[47] A few verses later in the psalm the poet changes not person but number, translating **uiri sanguinum** as *Se blodhreowa wer* (54.23.1a). The same translation is repeated in 58.2 where **uiris sanguinum** is translated as the genitive singular *blodhreowes weres*. D has 54.23 *weras bloda*, 58.2 *werum bloda*, reflecting the plural. Why the same shift to the singular should be used remains obscure.

---

[47] 54.17 A ðu symle sawle mine
lustum alyse, laðum wiðferige,
forðon me manige ymb mægene syrewað.
Liberabit in pace animam meam ab his qui adpropinquant (A Adpropiant) mihi; quoniam inter multos erant mecum.

A reverse shift to that of 54.16 occurs in 61.12, where the poet switches from the second person singular of the Latin to the third person, referring to God in the impersonal form:

> 61.12 Miht is drihtnes ofer middangeard
> and him þæs to worlde wuldor stande
> and mildheortness, þæt he manna gehwam
> æfter his agenum earnungum demeð,
> efne swa he wyrceð on worldlife.
>
> quia potestas dei est et tibi domine misericordia; quia tu reddes singulis secundum opera eorum.

For this, the last verse of the psalm, the shift in the source from third person to second is sudden but emphatic, and is retained for the final clause as well. The poet chooses to leave his translation in the third person, and to expand the lines to the fullest. Here the poet sacrifices personal focus in favour of a more impressive ending with repeated alliteration (m-w-m-vowel-w) and traditional phrases such as *ofer middangeard.*[48] The personal preference, however, returns in 63.4.4b when the poet shifts from the third person plural (preterite) to the first person plural (present), rendering **quis uidebit eos** as *Hwa gesyhð usic*?

Changes in person and number occur throughout the text. In 105.1.1a the poet shifts at the opening of the psalm from the first person plural to first person singular:

---

[48] *middangeard* occurs only eight times in the text, always as part of an adverb phrase, and always as an addition to the text. The phrase is *ofer middangeard* seven times, of which five are b-verses, and *on middangeard* once, again a b-verse: *ofer middaneard* 137.6.2b, 144.12.3b; *ofer middangeard* 58.13.2a, 61.12.1b, 67.18.5a, 89.2.1b, 113.21.7b, *on middangeard* 88.41.2b. Note the clusters of occurrences, including the only two occurrences without medial -g- being the last two in the psalter, close together.

confitemini: *Ic andette* (D *andettað*). In 105.8, the poet retains the direct approach, shifting from the third person of the source to a direct appeal to God:

> 105.8 Hi bysmredan, þa hi on brad wæter
> on þone readan sæ randas bæron,
> þær ðu hi alysdest, lifes ealdor,
> and hi generedest on naman þinum,
> þa ðu þine miht mycle cyðdest.
>
> Et inritauerunt eum ascendentes in rubro mare; et liberauit eos propter nomen suum, ut notam faceret potentiam suam.

Here the source clearly remains a factual description of God's actions in parting the Red Sea and saving the Israelites, but the translator shifts after two lines to direct address, doubly rendering **liberauit** as both *alysdest* and *generedest.* He also shifts from the past tense to the much more immediate present. The pronoun shift and tense shift together make the vernacular version appear more direct.

Tense shifts like the one mentioned above are, like pronoun shifts, common in the text and in the psalter glosses.[49] Most frequently the poet shifts from the preterite to the present tense, but shifts in the other direction occur also. Midway through 110.3 the poet writes in the present tense to translate a past one:

> 110.3 He gemynd dyde mærra wundra;
> mildheort he is and modig; mihtig drihten
> syleð eallum mete þam þe his ege habbað.
>
> Memoriam fecit mirabilium suorum; misericors et miserator dominus;

---

[49] Discrepancies in tense are common in the various Latin versions of the psalter. They may result in part from two features of the Hebrew: the provision of consonants only (vowels were provided by the reader) in the written literature before the development of the Massoretic system of vowel-pointing in the sixth to ninth centuries A.D., and the existence of only two forms of the verb—the Imperfect and the Perfect. These forms do not readily coincide with notions of present, past and future tenses.

escam dedit timentibus se.

Here the poet starts correctly in the preterite with **fecit**: *dyde* but shifts to the present when he adds a verb in the noun phrase, staying in the present tense for the second membrum with **dedit**: *syleð*. However, less than a hundred lines later, in 113.2, he shifts from the present to the past:

113.2 þa wæs geworden werude Iudea,
þæt heo hæl gehlutan haliges syþþan;
hæfdan ealdurdom ofer Israhelas,
mihta mære and mycel rice.

Facta est Iudaea sanctificatio eius, Israhel potestas eius.

The Latin of the previous verse has no verb, but starting with the following verse the psalm shifts to the past tense. Were it not that elsewhere the poet has no difficulty following the psalms in their (and his own) rapid tense shifts, it could be argued that he chooses to make an early shift here to avoid confusion. However, the tense shifts back to the present in the fourth verse and the poet follows suit, and confusion of the Latin tenses seems a less likely argument. The poet simply shifts tense, and produces a light verse with a construction that is not uncommon at the opening of a sentence or large unit.

Many other tense shifts occur in the text, some for metrical reasons and some for no apparent reason. Most do not interfere greatly with meaning. One which does, and which may be a case of overlooking the tense of the Latin, occurs in 120.4:

120.4 Efne se on hygde huru ne slæpeð
ne swefeð swyðe, se þe sceal healdan nu
Israela folc utan wið feondum.

Ecce non dormitabit neque obdormiet; qui custodit Israhel.

Here the purposeful change in the source, **dormitabit neque obdormiet,** is lost in the double use of the present tense *ne slæpeð ne swefeð.* The psalter poet is not alone in missing the significance of God neither sleeping in the past nor in the present, since the glossator of D has misread not only tense but number: *na hnappað 7 na slapeð.* For the poet God neither sleeps nor slumbers; for the glossator they (the Trinity? or the faithful?) do not nap and He does not sleep. It seems that the poet and glossator do both.

The poet also shifts from indirect to direct discourse (or *vice versa*) in his translation. In 89.3, for instance, where the Latin is indirect, the vernacular gives a direct quotation:

> 89.3 Ne ahwyrf þu fram mænn heah eadmedu;
> and þu cuðlice cwæde sylfa:
> 'Ic manna bearnum mod onwende.'
>
> Ne auertas hominem in humilitatem; et dixisti conuertimini filii hominum.

Where the source reminds God of his promise to convert mankind, the translation repeats the promise itself, making it more concrete.

Such changes as these to the Latin argue that the poet's approach to details of case, number, person and tense varies. On some occasions these changes do at least provide a sharper focus for the reader, making the text more direct, more immediately applicable. Such are also the changes in which the sense of the original is preserved but presented as a reverse of the Latin, or where the word order of the source is ignored in favour of a wholly new arrangement of the material, not always—but often, even with the poet's infelicities of expression—preferable for the vernacular version.

These changes, affecting the word order of the text, become more prevalent later in the translation, although they do occur throughout the metrical psalter.

Changes where the same meaning is provided by an inverted expression include such verses as Psalm 54.15, where the Latin **exaudiuit** (not glossed in D; given in K *hæl* following the Gallican **saluabit**; given in A *geherde*) is changed into the first element of an epithet as *me cuðlice gehyrde hælend drihten.* In 65.7.3 **obaudite** in the source becomes *asecgean* in the translation, and the poet rearranges the rest of the line to accord with the idea that those who hear the Lord become those who must say his praises.[50] In 68.1.3 **non est substantia** (D *nis sped*) becomes the apparently less strong *hafað lytle sped.* This may, on the other hand, be the poet using *litotes*, so that having little success means having no success.[51] However, the translation remains an example of where the use of an idiom in the vernacular, or any shift of word order, obscures the intent of the source, no matter how readily understandable the vernacular may be on its own terms. A longer version of the same kind of reversal of meaning occurs in 84.3.2 where the Latin **auertisti ab ira indignationis tuae** is shifted around to *na ðu ure gyltas egsan gewræce* (D has *þu*

---

[50] 65.7 Bletsigen þeoda blíðe mode
ealle eorðbuend ecne drihten
and mid stefne lof strang asecgean.
Benedicite gentes deum nostrum; et auditam facite uocem laudis eius.

[51] This is not, however, a frequent construction in the text. But, cf. 138.13.3b *lytle ðrage*, another addition to the text, but also collocated with **substantia.** Perhaps contemplation of his **substantia**: *lichama* (138.13.3a), *lytle sped* (68.1.3b) brings out the spirit of understatement in the poet. cf. also *DR* 69 *mæte weorode, BrB litle weorode*, and possibly *PPs* 54.15.2a *cleopode on corðre.*

acyrdest fram eorre æbylgnisse þinre). Here the sense of the original is kept with care, so that 'you turn away from anger your indignation' becomes 'you do not avenge (punish) by anger our sins'. The vernacular version focuses more directly on the objects of anger and their failings, *ure gyltas.*

At times, however, the ease with which the poet reorders the source leads him into error. In 85.1 he rearranges the Latin, but complicates the sense:

> 85.1 Ahyld me þin eare, halig drihten;
> forðon ic eom wædla, þu me wel gehyr,
> and ic sylfa eom sorhfull þearfa.
>
> Inclina domine aurem tuam et exaudi me; quoniam egenus et pauper sum ego.

The insertion of *þu me wel gehyr* in the second clause to render **exaudi me** is unfortunate, since it separates *wædla* from *sorhfull þearfa*, making the Latin doublet **egenus et pauper** into a much more complex construction. Also, *sorhfull þearfa* is not an accurate translation for **pauper**, and its separation from *wædla* only makes its deficiencies more apparent.[52] Similarly, in 87.18 the poet uses the verb *geyrmdest* (*yrman*) for the only time in the poem, perhaps meaning to rearrange the sense of the Latin. What he produces, however, is a verse which means exactly the opposite to what is probably intended:

> 87.18 þu me afyrdest frynd þa nehstan
> and mine cuðe eac cwicu geyrmdest.
>
> Elongasti a me amicum et proximum; et notos meos a miseria.

---

[52] *eare* shifts to the singular from **aurem** as well.

The first clause in the vernacular is an accurate rendition, although *and* might better translate **et** than *þa.*[53] However, rather than providing something like D's *fram yrmðe* to translate **a miseria**, the poet uses the verb *geyrmdest.* He thus produces a translation in which God vexes and harasses rather than delivers from vexation.

In 90.15.2b-3 the poet also changes the meaning of the original, so that rather than being with him in his torments, God will be releasing the prophet from tribulation:

> 90.15 He cigde me, and ic hine cuðlice
> hold gehyrde, and hine hraðe syþþan
> of earfoþum ut alysde.

Inuocabit me et ego exaudiam eum; cum ipso sum in tribulatione.

Perhaps the shift is intentional: having company in tribulation is not nearly as endearing a prospect as being released from suffering altogether.

These alterations continue throughout the text. Difficulties that cannot be solved any other way do not arise so frequently that changing the word-order of the original or shifting it becomes a commonplace, but the poet clearly will rearrange the syntax. For instance, he can stray so far from the original that the translation loses any connection to the source, as appears to happen in 99.2.3b:

> 99.2 Gangað on ansyne ealle bliðe;
> witað wislice þæt he is wealdend god;
> he us geworhte and we his syndon.

Intrate in conspectu eius in exultatione; Scitote quod dominus ipse est

---

[53] Small changes like this are as likely to be scribal as authorial, and no conclusions can be based on such minor shifts.

deus; ipse fecit nos et non ipsi nos.

Here the climactic statement of the verse, that God made man, and **non ipsi nos**, is lost when the psalter poet blandly finishes the line with *and we his syndon.* The careful statement of man's inferiority and lack of creative ability is lost in a much weaker statement of subordination to God.

A similar loss of sense is even more apparent in 101.21.5-6 where the poet renders **ne reuoces me** as *þu me meaht...gecigean* (D *ne gecig ðu mec*). Emendation of *me* to *ne* would resolve the problem of the vernacular version's being diametrically opposite to the original.[54] However, the loose approach of the poet to his source does argue for caution in emendations of this sort. The poet may well have mistranslated, and *me* could be authorial. For paleographically small changes such as this, it is impossible to determine whether the author or the scribe wrote the text as it now appears.

Reversals of expression which are simpler include such changes as 102.11.3

---

[54] In this case emendation of *me* to *ne* is supported by the reading of D, as the word order of the glossed psalter is the same as the emended metrical version would be: þu ne meaht [me]. The whole psalm verse reads:

He him andwyrdeð eallum sona
on wege worulde, þær his gewis mægen
fæste standeð: "Ic þe feawe dagas
minre mættra mode secge,
þæt þu me meaht on midle minra dagena
sona gecigean, gif þu sylfa wylt."
Earon þines anes gear awa to feore.

Respondit ei in uia uirtutis suae; paucitatem dierum meorum enuntia mihi; Et ne reuoces me in dimidio dierum meorum; in saeculum saeculi anni tui.

D heo andwyrde him on wege mægenes his gehwædnesse daga minra gecyþ me 7; ne gecig ðu mec on middele - - on woruld worulde gear þine.

super timentes eum: *þam þe lufedan þe* (D *ofer andrædende hine*) where those who fear God are those who loved him; 118.139 **obliti**: *noldan wel gehealdan* (D *ofergeaton*) in which those who forget God are only those who did not hold well (to His commandments); and 118.157 **a testimoniis tuis non declinaui**: *þine gewitnesse wræste forlætan* (D *spræca þina na hy heoldon*) where those who did not ponder his words become those who abandoned His teaching. Shifts which do not involve reversing the sense to keep the meaning include such weak renditions as 121.8 **loquebar pacem**: *þæt we sibbe on ðe symble habbon* (D *ic spræc sybbe*), where peace may be held but is no longer spoken about; and 147.7 **liquefaciet ea**: *to wætere weorðeð* (D *he gemelteð þa*) where instead of melting them he simply turns them to water, a somehow far less impressive feat. Many shifts of expression, then, weaken the sense of the original in some way.

These shifts and changes in the text are often caused by difficulties with a particular verse or expression in the text. One Latin phrase which causes the poet difficulty at each encounter is **conuersus est retrorsum.**[55] Rendering this phrase

---

[55] This is a difficult phrase, and the Gallican and Hebrew psalters give different versions:

PsG 39.15 convertantur retrorsum
55.10 convertentur inimici mei retrorsum
113.3 Iordanis conversus est retrorsum
113.5 quia conversus es retrorsum
128.5 convertantur retrorsum

PsH 34.4 convertantur retrorsum
39.15 convertantur retrorsum
55.10 tunc convertentur inimici mei retrorsum
69.4 convertantur retrorsum
113.3, .5 as PsG

causes shifts of expression, new words, awkward syntax and general confusion for the poet and the reader. For the first two occurrences the poet uses a *hapax legomenon* in order to keep the Latin word-order:

55.8.1-2a þonne on hinderling hweorfað mine
feondas fæcne,
55.10 conuertantur inimici mei retrorsum

69.3.1-2a Hi on hinderlincg hweorfað and cyrrað;
eall hiora scamien,
69.4 Auertantur retrorsum et erubescant

In order to render **conuertantur** and **auertantur**: *hweorfað* and retain some of the source's word-order, the poet needs *h*-alliteration, so produces *hinderling*. The adverb phrase *on hinderling* is translated by Bosworth-Toller as 'backwards', but the poet must intend the whole phrase *hweorfað on hinderling* to mean 'to turn their backs', which is not really the same thing.

On the phrase's next occurrence the poet uses a different approach:

113.3.2 for him Iordanen gengde on hinder.

Iordanes conuersus est retrorsum

Here *hinderling* is dropped in favour of the preposition *hinder*, which carries the force of a noun. Using *gengde* for **conuersus** does not help the sense, but 'he went to his back' or 'he went backwards' is at least as successful as earlier attempts. Two verses later the same idea appears:

113.5.2 Oððe þu, Iordanen, for hwi gengdest on bæcling?

113.5 et tu Iordanes quare conuersus es retrorsum

Here the poet shifts to the adverb *bæcling*. Normally *bæcling* implies a sense of

being driven backwards which is not really applicable here, but the poet keeps his word-order, keeps his simple verb *gengdest* and only substitutes a different adverb in the fourth stave. Whether this was the final version of the phrase will remain unknown, as **conuersus es retrorsum** does not appear again in the Roman psalter. The collocation is rendered in several different ways, none of which is especially successful.

The poet's shifts in word order and in approaches to the translation can often be deduced from the immediate context, but sometimes the poet encounters a difficult word or phrase for the second or third time, and attempts it differently each time. He may also be developing ways to simplify the translation, ways to make it more readily accessible to his audience.

d) Some Latin Phrases and their translation

A salient feature of the metrical psalter is its remarkable coherence—its uniformity of approach, of metre, of vocabulary and of syntax. The sameness of the verse can give rise to the impression that the poet nowhere modifies his techniques. Earlier in this chapter a slight tendency toward fewer additions and more cuts was demonstrated, but the only convincing proof of any change in the translator's method would be a pronounced change in his rendition of the stock phrases and expressions of the Latin psalter. Such a development, however, is more evident in some phrases than in others, and nowhere is there enough variation to suggest any radical shift in approach by the translator. Sometimes, analysis of the translation of a particular Latin

expression reveals the gradual evolution of a successful equivalent; at most times, the poet simply seems to render the expression in the way that is most convenient in a given verse.

For example, the expression **iubilate deo** occurs in the Roman psalter eight times (46.1; 65.1; 80.2; 94.1,2; 97.4,6; and 99.2), of which the extant metrical text renders four (65.1, 94.1, 94.2, and 99.2). The treatment of the phrases varies greatly:

65.1 Ealle eorðbuend ecne drihten
wordum wislicum wide herian,
94.1.2 wynnum drihten wealdend herigean
94.2.3 and we sealmas him singan mid wynne.
99.2.1-2 Nu ge mycle gefean mihtigum drihtne
ealle þeos eorðe elne hyre,

The common verb *herian* appears in two of the translations, and the noun *wynn* also in two. The weakest rendition is that of 94.2, which loses all sense of jubilation as it 'sings with joy' and the most successful may be the simple Type A verses of 94.1, which is the only version to include both *wynn* and *herian.* Interestingly, the first three versions of the phrase all alliterate on *w*, while the most elaborate rendition, that of 99.2 with its opening *Nu* and the less common *gefean*, does not. However, these different versions of the expression do not really show any significant advances or shifts in the translation.

An expression which does change over the course of the translation is the formula 'from generation to generation', 'from now to every age'. The treatment of its Latin original, **in generatione ad generationem** (and its variants) evolves through the text. There are seventeen occurrences of the phrase in the Latin corresponding to *PPs*, rendered as follows:

60.5 and þær to worlde wunian ece
71.5 þurh ealra worulda woruld wunað him ece
76.7 æfre to worulde...on woruldlife wera cneorissum
78.14 and þe on worulda woruld
84.5 of cynne on cynn and on cneorisse
88.1 fram cynne on cynn and on cneorisse
88.3 þæt ic his cynne and cneowmagum
89.1 of cynne on cynne and on cneorisse
99.4 (omits altogether)
101.10 þenden woruld standeð
101.21 awa to feore (which might be an added half-line)
105.24 of cynna gehwam and on cneorisse
118.90 And on worulda woruld wunað ece forð
134.13 on ealra worulda woruld
144.4 Cneorissa kynn
144.13 of cynne on cynn and on cneorissum
145.9 awa to feore ... symble to worulde

The first four times (extant) that the poet encounters the phrase in the extant text he uses a version of *worulda world.* For the next four occurrences he expands the phrase into a filler line with *cynn* and *cneorisse* (once *cneowmagum*). The next occurrence disappears in the translation, and for the appearances of the phrase in the last fifty psalms the poet mixes up the translation, not simply repeating a useful phrase. The language in the final portion of the translation, insofar as translation of **in generatione ad generationem** is concerned, loses some of its cliched repetitive character. The same phrases are used, but they are mixed around, shortened and less obtrusive. What is, however, lost in such verses as 101.10, 101.21 and 144.4 is the literal meaning of the original. The poet omits the Latin altogether, as in 99.4, or severely prunes it such that the shorthand *cneorissa kynn* (144.4) stands for the whole expression. The one translation that the poet never uses is the otherwise common *awa to worulde.*

Elsewhere, in Psalm 95, the poet makes a series of additions which recreate

the spirit of his source. The Latin here is not so much a repeated phrase as a repeated structure, and the poet's treatment of that structure, even within the confines of a single psalm, is of interest. Retaining the opening imperatives of the Latin in verses 1,2,3,7,8, and 12, the poet also adds the adverb *nu* on four occasions, to accentuate the antiphonal sense of the psalm. The psalm is a sustained call on the listener to praise God and to do so by describing all his attributes. *Nu* seems to add an element of urgency, suggesting that the praise must take place at once. Like the opening *Nu* of *Cædmon's Hymn*, it focuses the text to an immediate time and need, which is a shift from the more generalized exhortation of the Latin. For example:

95.1.1 Singað nu drihtne sangas neowe;
Cantate domino canticum nouum
95.2.1 Singað nu drihtne, and his soðne naman
Cantate domino et benedicite nomini eius
95.7.1 Bringað nu drihtne bu ætsomne
Adferte domino patriae gentium
95.9.2 secgað nu on cynnum and on cneorissum
dicite in nationibus dominus regnabit.

In all of these occurrences *nu* is an unaccented adverb in the first drop of a Type A verse.[56] The repetition of *nu* is certainly not a particularly effective technique. If the poet really wished to create a rhetorical effect he could have placed the word in the first stress of each line, providing anaphora and a much clearer pattern. Here, a slight effect with little displacement of word order is all the poet achieves.

A similar kind of slight rhetorical effect is evident in the poet's treatment through the text of the clause **Saluum me fac dextera tua (et exaudi me)**. There are

[56] All these lines lack the double alliteration that they would normally have.

five treatments of this clause, or a variant, in the metrical psalter, and the first three all begin with the imperative *Do*, and produce lines with numerous unaccented syllables:

59.5.1-2a Do me þin seo swyðre hand symle halne;
gehyr me, halig god.
Saluum me fac dextera tua et exaudi me.
89.14.1 Do us þa þine swiðran hand, drihten, cuðe.
dexteram tuam domine notam fac nobis
107.6.1-2 Do me þin swyðre hand swylce halne
and me gehyre, hælynd drihten,
Saluum me fac dextera tua et exaudi me.

The first and third of these examples come from psalms which are virtually identical for ten verses including these. They do produce very similar translations, with alliteration on *s* and *h*, and both carry over *halne* to *halig* so that the *h*-alliteration is prepared for in the preceding line. Both produce long Type B a-verses in both lines, and in 107.6 the poet adds the redundant epithet *hælynd drihten* to produce a Type A verse. In 89.14 the imperative leads to a very similar a-verse to those of 59.5 and 107.6, even though the Latin is quite different. After that extended opening, the b-verse provides alliteration on *d* (which means the a-verse is hypermetric). Also, *cuðe*, which ordinarily might be an adjective modifying *drihten*, or even *hand*, must here be an adverb associated with *Do*, so that **notam fac** is translated *Do...cuðe*. It is possible for a verb phrase to envelop the line as this one does, but only rarely does the second part of the phrase appear so ambiguous.

This construction occurs two more times in the metrical psalter. On both occasions the poet improves the opening and develops less repetitive ways of translating the clause:

117.16 Dyde gedefe mægen dryhtnes swyðre,
and me seo swyðre swylce drihtnes
ahof hrædlice æt heahþearfe.
dextera domini fecit uirtutem; dextera domini exaltauit me.
137.7.5-6 þu me geræhtest recene mid handa
and me þin swyðre sneome hælde.
extendisti manum tuum et saluum me fecit dextera tua.

In 117.16 the *swyðre...swylce* alliteration of 107.6 is repeated, and the verb is the same, but no longer an imperative: *dyde*. There are fewer unaccented syllables in the translation. The verb changes to *hælde*, which appears in the fourth stave, and *swyðre* again alliterates with an added filler word, but *sneome* is less common than either *symle* or *swylce*. These differences among translations of a repeated clause show that, as the text went by, the poet appears to develop more coherent, shorter versions of the Latin, and in less difficult verse. Any difference, however, is not of a large order of magnitude.

Finally, one of the most common expressions in the Latin psalter is **Miserere mei dominus**. It recurs throughout the text at regular intervals. How it is translated, and whether any changes occur in its translation, would show how the poet treats a Latin tag which could readily be rendered in a half-line, at most a line, of Old English verse. The first two appearances of the phrase provide exactly that:

55.1.1a Miltsa me drihten
56.1.1 Miltsa min, god, and me milde weorð,

The next two occurrences show the poet developing slightly more complex ways of rendering the tag. Both, however, use the verb *miltsian*, and in both the Latin originals the elaboration in the vernacular is prepared for:

66.1 Miltsa us, mihtig drihten, and us on mode eac

gebletsa nu; beorhte leohte
þinne andwlitan, and us on mode weorð
þuruh þine mycelnesse milde and bliðe.
Deus misereatur nobis et benedicat nos; inluminet uultum suum super nos et misereatur nobis.
76.8 Ny byð æfre god ungemyndig,
þæt he miltsige manna cynne,
oþþe on yrre æfre wille
his milde mod mannum dyrnan.
Numquid obliuiscitur misereri deus aut continebit in ira misericordiam suam.

Also, in both of these verses the translator uses the adjective *milde* to fill in *m*-alliteration in the last line of the verse. These versions of the Latin original expand the text in length, but without adding anything to the translation.

The next occurrence of the phrase is identical to that in 55.1: 85.3.1a *Miltsa me drihten.* A few lines later in the same psalm, the poet changes the vocabulary, using *milde*, but also employing *Beseoh*, thereby asking God to look down on him kindly, rather than entreating mercy. The same locution appears later in the text:

85.15.1-2 Beseoh nu on me, and me syþþan weorð
milde on mode, mihtig drihten;
118.132 Beseoh þu on me, and me syððan hraðe
mære gemiltsa, swa ðu manegum dydest,
þe naman þinne nyde lufedon.

The opening lines of these widely-separated verses are surprisingly alike; both also have *m*-alliteration, provided by filler adverbs and conventional phrases, in the second line.

The rest of the translations of **Miserere mei** are a varied lot:

101.11.1 Aris nu, mihtig god, miltsa Sione;
101.12.3-4 forðon þe þu stiðlice stanum and eorðan
eallum ætgædere ær miltsadest.
111.5 Glæd man gleawhydig, god and mildheort,

seteð soðne dom þurh his sylfes word,
se on ecnysse eadig standeð.
114.5.3-5 þæt þu wære mildheort, mihtig dryhten,
and ure god æghwæs soðfæst;
mihta us þine milde weorðan.
118.29.2 and me on þinra æ geweorþ ealles milde.
118.58.3-4 þæt þu me on mode milde weorðe
æfter þinre spræce spowendlice.
122.3.5 oþþæt us miltsige mihta wealdend.
122.4.1-3 Miltsa us nu ða mihtig drihten,
miltsa us swylce, forþon we manegum synt
forhogednessum hearde gefylde.

The translations vary in length, in metre, and in vocabulary after the first few versions of the phrase. Many of the renditions use the verb *miltsian* or the adjective *milde*, but these are appropriate translations for the Latin, used in the psalter glosses and elsewhere. The translator, then, after a few tentative, rather short, versions of the tag, uses a variety of different methods of translation. Occasionally he repeats himself, but in general the translations of **Miserere mei dominus** towards the end of the text show great variation. Some are better translations than others, and some correspond more closely to the Latin than others. In general, however, they all convey the sense of the original, and the differences among them are less striking than the similarities.

Chapter Four - Lexicon and the Method of Translation

The previous chapter concerned the more general matters of what larger features of the original are left out or added to the translation, and included some discussion of changes in tone, tense and person. In this chapter, perhaps most importantly, is a word-by-word analysis of the Latin psalter to consider how each word of the source text is translated in the target text. The chapter concerns whether and how each Latin word is rendered into the vernacular. The analysis here starts with the Latin text, the Roman Psalter as it appears in the Vespasian Psalter, B.L. MS Cotton Vespasian A. i.[1] To get a representative sample large enough to suggest useful conclusions but small enough to be manageable, Psalms 101 through 115 are analysed here. These incorporate 1003 lines of Old English verse, one fifth of the total Old English text and approximately one fifth of the Latin original as well. Choosing a connected passage in the middle of the text meant that some repetition would occur—for instance, several of the Gradual Psalms, which are very similar texts, appear in this section of the psalter—but the section also provides an opportunity for some continuity of analysis. Other sections of the psalter would equally suffice for this preliminary analysis, but this passage has the merits of not

[1] Sherman M. Kuhn, ed. *The Vespasian Psalter.* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965). The facsimile, ed. D. Wright, was checked for difficult readings. See also the edition of the Vespasian gloss and Latin text in Henry Sweet, ed. *The Oldest English Texts* E.E.T.S. o.s. 83 (Oxford, 1885), pp. 183-420.

being at the beginning of the extant text (the most frequently discussed section), of not including either of the two longest psalms (77 and 118 in the Roman psalter) which might distort analysis with undue consistency, and of including a variety of psalm types (historical, prophetic, penitential and devotional as well as the gradual psalms). More pragmatically, it also leads to a sample which is as close to a fifth of the text as could be found using complete psalms.

The analysis, whose results are summarized in Table 2, begins with the Latin text, determining only whether and how each word of the original is rendered in the translation. This leads to difficulties in four areas: the choice of Latin text, possible contamination with the Gallican psalter, a spurious sense of accuracy in the translation, and the problem of what constitutes an accurate translation. For the first three of these points, little can be done in a preliminary analysis except identify the points at which problems arise. Since the Latin text in the *Paris Psalter* manuscript is not that from which the Old English was translated but a later, more Gallicanized, recension,[2] determining exactly which of the surviving Latin texts of the Roman Psalter in England and on the Continent comes closest to being the Latin from which the metrical psalter originated is difficult. None of the glossed psalters shares an identical Latin text, and the difficulties of tracing the changes in the Latin are many.[3] In insular psalters at least, the

---

[2] Initially shown by J.D. Bruce, *Anglo-Saxon Version*, pp. 123-6; followed by H. Bartlett, *Method of Translation*, pp. 15-40. This is now a generally accepted view.

[3] For a clear analysis of the Latin texts, see C. & K. Sisam, eds. *The Salisbury Psalter.* E.E.T.S. o.s. 242 (Oxford, 1959), pp. 47-52, especially p. 50. Other references appear in the following chapter.

process was not one of gradual replacement of Roman texts by Gallican ones, and minor differences among the texts abound.[4] For example, the opening **Et** seems to occur more frequently at the beginning of verses in the Vespasian Psalter than it did in the Latin text behind the metrical psalter—except, of course, that it may not always have been translated. Weber chooses the Vespasian Psalter for his copy-text in the definitive edition of the Roman Psalter, and provides examples of the major variant texts, acknowledging that establishing a single correct text is virtually impossible.[5] This analysis uses the Vespasian Psalter for the same reasons.

One major family of variants is the insular one. The *Paris Psalter* corresponds sufficiently to these texts to make it clear that it was translated from an insular version of the Roman Psalter. Whether a closer relationship to any one of the insular psalters can be established depends upon careful analysis of the minor discrepancies between the Old English and Latin texts. Most useful will perhaps be the differences in the punctuation and separation of the psalm-verses themselves. Although the punctuation of the *Paris Psalter* manuscript is not very useful, especially since it seems to have been revised, the separation between psalm verses is very clear, carefully marked by versals. Careful analysis of the Old English text will also produce a list of Gallican translations (and of

---

[4] although many, including Ure, *Benedictine Office*, p. 20 assume it to be so. See the review of Ure by C. Sisam, pp. 197-8.

[5] See Weber, *Le psautier*, especially pp. viii-xxi.

dubious Gallican readings), which may also help to define more closely the text from which the psalter was translated. In the meantime, there remain discrepancies in the analysis of this sample caused by the uneven fit between the Vespasian Latin and the Old English verse.

The third problem, that of spurious accuracy, is best explained by way of an example:

> 103.24 His is mycel sæ and on gemærum wid,
> þær is unrim on ealra cwycra
> mycelra and mætre;
> Hoc mare magnum et spatiosum illic reptilia quorum non est numerus animalia pusilla et magna

Here the phrase **non est numerus** is wrongly rendered as *þær is unrim.* However, in a word-by-word analysis such as this one, only **non** is not translated, so the renderings **est:** *is* and **numerus**: *unrim* both count as accurate translations, even though they contribute to a reversal of the apparent sense of the original.[6] These anomalies, where one word which is omitted or mistranslated in the metrical psalter changes the sense of a phrase or even a clause, do not show up sufficiently in a word-by-word analysis, a problem which also tends to affect the results. Passages like this one occur more frequently than might be expected.

---

[6] The poet does translate the spirit and not the letter of the Latin here. The Hebrew Psalter corrects the discrepancy by offering the clearer and more accurate **inumerabilia**, thus avoiding the difficulty of wondering whether the animals are too few or too many, so that they are not numbered.

Fourthly, and most importantly, is the problem of determining what an accurate translation is, and in the event of less than accurate renditions, deciding the degree of error. This study divides the translation into six categories: A, B, C, D, N and Z.

Category A is for accurate rendition. If the sense is clear, then other parameters which might ordinarily have been considered are ignored. A noun can be accurately translated by a verb-adjective combination, or a verb by an adverb-verb combination. Also, if a verb tense or the person of a pronoun changes, the translation still belongs to Category A if the meaning is apparent. For example, both the tense and person of the verbs vary in 114:1-2,

> 114.1 Ic lufie þe, eofa drihten,
> forþan þu mines gebedes bene gehyrdest.
> .2 And þu þin eare to me eadmodlice
> hold ahyldest and gehyrdest me,
> þa ic on dagum minum dyrne cigde.
> Dilexi quoniam exaudiuit dominus uocem orationis meae; Quia inclinauit aurem suam mihi et in diebus meis inuocabo eum.

Here, the verbs **Dilexi**: *Ic lufie*, **exaudiuit**: *gehyrdest*, and **inclinauit**: *þu...ahyldest* are all marked as Category A translations, even though the first changes tense, and the next two verbs change in both tense and person, from past third singular to present second singular. Similarly, **aurem suam** becomes *þin eare*, and the possessive pronoun counts as a Category A translation. The meaning is clear. Were such matters as tense, person, form, and number to be considered important features of the translation—which normally, of course, they would be—the translation would emerge as an extremely inaccurate one. Leaving these features out of the lexical analysis makes the translation appear more accurate than it is, but the variation is less than that which would result if new categories

were developed for all of these features. So, if the basic meaning of the original is rendered into the translation, whether it be in all respects as above in **quoniam**: *forþan* (conjunction, meaning 'because') or **orationis**: *gebedes* (genitive singular noun meaning 'prayer') or in its lexical meaning only, then the word is counted as a Category A translation.

This category also includes those translations which are lexically accurate but somewhat unexpected or in some way unusual. Some translations do not correspond to standard psalter vocabulary, or add some nuance to the interpretation which was not present in the original. Unusual but accurate translation is in many ways good translation, and these renditions belong in Category A. For example, in 113.11 **caelo** is translated *heofondreame*, an alliterative compound in which *heofon* renders **caelo** accurately, and the addition of *-dream* creates a noun compound. Later in the same psalm (v. 19), the verb **sperauit** is rendered *leofne gelyfdan*, such that the combination verb and adjective clearly renders the original, but not in the most common way.

For a translation which is one step removed from the sense of the original, Category B is used. This category encompasses those readings where the sense of the original text is present but not rendered exactly; the translation is close—in the sense of near—to being accurate but is not quite correct. For example, in 102.18, there are two Category B translations:

102.18 On heofenhame halig drihten
his heahsetl hror timbrade,
þanon he eorðricum eallum wealdeð.
Dominus in caelo parauit sedem suam et regnum eius omnium dominabitur.

Here, the translations are all Category A except **parauit**: *timbrade* and **et:** *þanon.* The notion of building is not quite the same as that of preparing, nor is 'when, afterward' exactly the same as 'and'. In both cases the meaning is similar and fits the context of the verse well, and the two translations are Category B. Similarly, in the previous verse the noun **mandata** is translated as *wisfæst word,* a combination which comes near rendering the meaning of 'order, commandment', but does not quite do so. These translations are close, nearly accurate, and retain most of the sense of the original.

Category C translations are not accurate or near accuracy, but they do suggest the original text in some way. These are the translations where, often, the constraints of the form have forced a considerable departure from the Latin text in the translation, but the sense of the original is in some way suggested. For example, in 101.14 there are three Category C translations:

101.14 Eft timbrade ece drihten
and gesette Sion þurh his sylfes miht,
ðær wæs gesyne his seo soðe sped.
Quoniam aedificabit dominus sion et uidebitur in maiestate sua.

Quoniam: *Eft*, **et**: *ðær* and **maiestate**: *seo soðe sped* are all C renditions. For the first two, only the barest impression of a connective is left, but since these are function words rather than lexical ones, the intention of the original remains to some extent. Similarly, rendering **maiestate** by referring to God's 'true power, sway' or 'complete success' rather than to His 'majesty' does not produce all of the sense of the source.

A Category D translation is an outright error or a translation which is so far from being accurate that it cannot be said to have any connection with the source. Often, only

the context of the word reveals that a translation is likely, such as in 111.1, where the context requires the rendition of **nimis** as *bealde*:

111.1 Eadig byð se wer se þe him ege drihtnes
on ferhðcleofan fæste gestandeð,
and his bebod healdeð bealde mid willan.
Beatus uir qui timet dominum in mandatis eius cupiet nimis.

Because **cupiet** is translated *healdeð...mid willan* the only possible translation of the adverb **nimis** is *bealde* in the head stave of line three. Although *bealde* is one of the poet's stock adverbs and its meaning can be stretched in several directions, it could not mean 'never'.[7] However, *bealde* does provide the function of being an intensifier, emphasizing the meaning of the verb. On the other hand, *bealde* could simply be an addition to the text, like the added adverb *fæste* in the previous line of the psalm verse. **Nimis**, then, is either not translated at all or it is translated very poorly by *bealde*. In this verse, *bealde* does at least fulfill the intensifying function of the adverb, so the translation counts as a Category D one, uncertain but partially explained by the context.

Two other examples may make the criteria for this category clearer. In 110.2, the verbal adjective **exquisita** must be rendered by the verb-adverb combination *wylle georne swyþe secean*:

110.2.1-2 Swylce ic his willan wylle georne
swyþe secean, samed andettan,
Exquisita in omnes uoluntates eius; confessio et...

---

[7] See Breitzer, **Study**, pp. 11-28 for an analysis of every occurrence of *bealde* in the metrical psalter. There are 42, and the collocation *bealde...bebod* occurs eight times.

The translation bears little relation to the original here, including the Category D rendition of **Exquisita**, which attempts to translate the verbal rather than adjectival aspect of the Latin word. In any case, the translation does not make much sense. Two verses later, in 110.3.2 the Latin phrase **misericors et miserator dominus** becomes *mildheort he is and modig mihtig drihten.* The word order makes it clear that **miserator** is rendered by *modig* here, but it cannot be that an adjective whose primary meaning is 'proud' could be stretched to mean 'merciful', no matter what the context. However, since the context makes it clear that *modig* must translate **miserator**, (even if only for *m*-alliteration) this too is a Category D translation.

Two categories remain: N and Z. Both include words which are not translated, but Category N refers to words which are not translated because they are subsumed into the material, while Category Z has words which the poet simply does not translate. For example, Psalm 104.37 has examples of both categories:

> 104.3 Ac he wæs þæra worda wel gemyndig,
> halig heofenes weard, þe he hleoðrade
> to Abrahame, his agenum hysse.
> Quia memor fuit uerbi sancti sui quod locutus est ad Abraham puerum suum.

Here, **sancti** is not translated, and belongs to Category Z.[8] The verbal with auxiliary expression **locutus est** is translated by the finite verb *hleoðrade*, and **locutus** thus is classified as Category B (since the translation is near but not exact) and **est** is a Category

---

[8] *halig* in l. 2 is not modifying *worda*, and must be referring to the epithet *heofenes weard.* It cannot be a translation of **sancti**. For another odd treatment of **sanctus** see Diamond, p. 21 concerning 73.3, in which **in sanctis tuis** 'in Thy sanctuary' is translated *þinum þam halgum*, which probably means 'to the saints'.

N word, which disappears in the vernacular, not because it is skipped over, but because it is included in the syntax of the translation.

The six categories provide some of the criteria necessary for determining more about the details of the translation. In particular, they separate the words the poet was translating from those which are left out altogether, and establish a preliminary set of criteria for the kind of translation being accomplished. Because the *Paris Psalter* provides a verse-by-verse rendition of the Roman psalter, it is usually called a close translation. The development of these categories helps to determine whether the text merits such a designation, and if so, what that designation means in terms of the words in the source text.

Table 2 also incorporates a division of the words in the text based on traditional, possibly now outmoded, grammatical categories. However, these categories do provide another means of analysing the translation of individual words in the text, a means which, in addition to breaking the material down into more manageable units, allows for the crucial distinction between lexical and functional words. Two other reasons for using traditional grammatical distinctions are also relevant here. First, these are the distinctions with which the translator was probably acquainted. The findings of J.D.A. Ogilvy and the work of Vivien Law on medieval grammar show that both Priscian and Donatus were widely studied in Anglo-Saxon England after the seventh century.[9] If the poet was aware

---

[9] J.D.A. Ogilvy, *Books Known to the English 597-1066 A.D.* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967); a revised version of this is currently being prepared. For the manuscript evidence see H. Gneuss, 'Preliminary List'. See also Vivien Law, *The Insular Latin Grammarians.* (Woodbridge, 1982), and, for an historical view of the question, V. Law, 'Linguistics in the earlier Middle Ages: the Insular and Carolingian

of grammatical considerations, he knew his grammar in terms of the seven parts of speech, case, tense and person. Secondly, modern grammatical analysis, including function grammar and the analysis of deep structure propounded by transformational grammar, largely fails when it attempts to consider poetry. The syntactic structures of poetry are removed from the structures of everyday speech and of prose, the material most easily analyzed by recent approaches. Since both the Latin psalter and the Old English translation are poetic texts, and they use completely different techniques to produce the poetry, modern grammatical analysis is faced with two distinct texts, neither one of which is conducive to this kind of approach. As a result, traditional grammar provides the most useful analysis of the individual words of the Latin psalter as they are translated in the metrical version.

The grammatical categories used here are a slight refinement of the traditional seven parts of speech. They are: nouns; adjectives; adverbs; ordinary (lexical) verbs; auxiliary (function) verbs; verbals including participles, gerunds and infinitives; pronouns which are partially lexical, including personal, demonstrative, possessive and reflexive ones; pronouns which are largely functional, including relative and interrogative ones; prepositions; and conjunctions. Of these, the conjunctions, prepositions, auxiliary verbs, and relative and interrogative pronouns are primarily functional. The nouns and adjectives are purely lexical, providing the content. The other groups fit on a continuum

---

Grammarians' *TRPS* (1985), pp. 171-93. For an excellent review of Anglo-Saxon considerations of language see Helmut Gneuss, 'The Study of Language in Anglo-Saxon England' *BJRL* 72 (1990), pp. 3-32.

between the functional and the lexical, so that the four types of pronouns mentioned above, ordinary verbs, adverbs, and verbals vary. Verbals and ordinary verbs tend to be more lexical, while the pronouns and adverbs tend to be more functional. What effect these divisions have on analysis of the translation will be considered below. The discussion which follows begins with the purely functional grammatical forms, and works through to the purely lexical ones.

Table 2: Lexical Comparison of the Roman Psalter with the Metrical Psalter

	A	B	C	D	N	Z	Total
Nouns	1041	80	18	7	0	79	1225
Adjectives	97	19	4	1	1	14	136
Adverbs	58	6	7	4	1	19	95
Ordinary Verbs	369	103	52	12	2	26	564
Auxiliary Verbs	61	0	10	1	29	11	112
Verbals	71	42	16	4	0	12	145
Pronouns (p.d.ps.rf)	420	24	1	0	1	113	559
Pronouns (rel.int.)	59	6	3	0	2	18	88
Prepositions	254	31	20	0	7	93	405
Conjunctions	197	44	24	0	1	161	*427*

a) Conjunctions

Conjunctions are not well treated in the *Paris Psalter*. Of the 427 forms, predominantly **et** or **ut**, appearing in the Latin, only 197 are translated accurately. An additional 68 are partially rendered, with such translations as **ut**: *þa*, **et**: *syððan* and **et**: *þurh þæt*. 161 conjunctions from the source disappear in the translation.

Only 46% of conjunctions, then, are Category A translations, while as much as 38% are not translated. The remaining 16% are largely Category B and C translations, with no outright errors, and only one conjunction subsumed into the text of the vernacular. Conjunctions tend either to be translated or ignored. Why they are ignored seems likely to be a result of the form of the text itself. Although the Latin psalter often marks a new verse or membrum with a conjunction, the punctuation and the use of a versal to start the verse do provide that break which may be regarded as the function of the conjunction. In the translation a new psalm verse is similarly marked with a versal, and the verse form itself, with its heavy reliance upon metre and alliteration, may perhaps provide the punctuation which the conjunction would otherwise present. If the conjunction was neither translated nor eliminated, it was translated very loosely.

b) Prepositions

Prepositions, while more translated than conjunctions, still have a one in four chance of not being rendered. Of the 405 prepositions in the sample, 23% are not translated, while 63% receive Category A versions. When the majority of clauses is

introduced by a conjunction and completed by a noun and verb, or at most by a noun and verb with modifier, there is not always any use for additional phrases introduced by prepositions. Also, many of the untranslated prepositions introduce phrases at the end of a clause or a membrum of the Latin. As is shown in the previous chapter, material at the end of the psalm verse is more likely to be lost. Of the Category A translations, the majority of these are **in**: *on* renditions, with the occasional **a, ab**: *fram* or **ad**: *to*. 51 occurrences of prepositions are partially translated or translated in slightly unusual ways, including for example **ad**: *and*, **in**: *mid*, **propter**: *þær*, or **super**: *oð*. These renditions retain the function of the preposition, but connect the phrases they introduce to the main clause differently. They account for 12.5% of the prepositions in this sample. As with conjunctions, there are no outright errors, although a few more prepositions are subsumed into the translation. Generally, the poet either uses a correct translation of the preposition, or he omits the whole phrase.

c) Pronouns: personal, demonstrative, possessive and reflexive

Pronouns in general are subject to change in the text simply because the poet shifted person so frequently. Such instances where for example the Latin pronoun is in the third person but the Old English is in the second are treated here as accurate translations, as has been already stated. Similarly, if the Latin is in the accusative case but the vernacular shifts to the nominative, the translation is considered accurate.

Personal, demonstrative, reflexive and possessive pronouns, of which the Latin has 559 occurrences in this passage, are quite well served, as 420 or 75% are accurately translated. 113 (20%) are not translated, usually because the subject is stated again

explicitly in the vernacular, rather than implied by the pronoun, or because a phrase including the pronoun has been omitted. Only 5% of these pronouns are translated loosely or inaccurately, most of those being Category B renditions. For example, one personal pronoun which is given unusual treatment is 106.33.3b **ea**: *þe hire on lifdan.* Here the poet needs a half-line, not a single pronoun, so the pronoun is translated as a clause. The function of the part of speech does remain, so this is a Category B translation.

Similarly, there are a number of instances of **eorum**: *þam* (rather than *heora*). Four instances of this translation occur in Psalm 106, in verses 5,12, 16, and 18, in nearly identical contexts. In 106.5, for example, the verse reads:

106.5 And hi þa on þære costunge cleopedan to dryhtne,
and he hi of þam earfeðum eallum alysde.
Et clamauerunt ad dominum cum tribularentur; et de necessitatibus eorum eripuit eos.

Here, 'their' necessities become 'those' or 'the' necessities, which does fulfil the function of the pronoun. These pronouns, then, tend either to be translated accurately, or to be left out, so that this part of speech has a high rate of accurate translation, and a high rate of non-translation.

d) Pronouns: relative and interrogative

This is a much smaller category, and because it is a functional one it suffers, like the conjunctions and prepositions, from not always being considered necessary (or so it would appear). The sample has only 88 relative pronouns, of which 59 are well rendered, 2 are dropped because the source is rewritten into a main clause, and 9 are translated with some degree of difficulty (such as **quas**: *swa* and **quas**: *syðþan*). Relative pronouns are

thus subject to a high rate of poor translation—only 67% are Category A renditions. However, only 20% of these words are not translated at all, leaving a higher percentage of relative pronouns spread through the categories of approximate or inaccurate translation. Relative pronouns, like the other function words, are not invariably translated, but unlike the other parts of speech already discussed, they are represented across a wider range of Table 2. These pronouns are, however, the last of the categories not containing an outright error (Category D), of which each of the remaining six parts of speech has at least one.

e) Verbals

There are 145 verbals in the sample, and the translation of a grammatical form which is partly noun or adjective and partly verb is of particular interest given the differences already apparent in the poet's approach to different parts of speech. A verbal is partly function word, partly lexical item. Of the 145 verbals, then, 71 or 49% are translated accurately, 42 or 29% are close or approximate translations, 12 (8%) are not translated, and there are 20 cases (14%) of inaccurate or very loose translation. The low percentage of Category Z verbals suggests that those verbals which are not translated tend to be part of clauses or phrases which are omitted in entirety. Comparably to the function words discussed above, the percentage of Category A translation is low, but unlike the parts of speech earlier discussed, there is a much higher percentage of verbals in Categories B and C.

Three of the Category B translations are unusual rearrangements of the syntax. In 105.5, for instance, the poet substantially cuts the Latin, changing the gerund

uidendum into the verb *sceawige* and omitting the following phrase, as well as **laetandum**, the ensuing gerund:

105.5.1-3 And us tidlice teala sceawige,
ceose mid gecorenum, þenden we cwice lifgen,
þæt we mid þinre ðeode þær blissian.
Ad uidendum in bonitate electorum tuorum; ad laetandum in laetitia gentis tue.

The first gerund expresses an independent idea which cannot be ignored altogether; therefore, the poet emphasises its verbal aspect, placing it in the fourth stress of the line as an imperative. It is, however, less stressed than the preceding adverb. The intent of the Latin is gone, but the idea of seeing remains. Because **laetandum** presents the same notion as **laetitia**, the second gerund is ignored, and the noun becomes the verb *blissian*. Shortly following this verse is one of the odder translations of the text, in which the substantive **ascendentes** becomes *þa hi...randas bæron*:

105.8.1-2 Hi bysmredan, þa hi on brad wæter
on þone readan sæ randas bæron,
Et irritauerunt ascendentes in mare Mare Rubrum.

The gerund **ascendentes** is extended to a lengthy clause which incorporates much of the rest of the verse, but the part which directly translates **ascendentes** is 'those who carried shields.' The idea of ascending is lost, but the underlying sense of marching forward into the path through the Red Sea remains, and is made marginally more vivid by the vaguely poetic image.[10] The translation is certainly not exact, but it is close enough to the spirit

[10] Tinkler, **Vocabulary and Syntax**, pp. 78-9, cites two parallels: *Bwf* 2653-4, where the locution may simply mean 'to go', and *Exodus* 331-5, where, as in *PPs*, the lines refer to the crossing of the Red Sea by the Israelites. This is a unique parallel.

of the original to evoke a similar reaction. The last of these not quite acceptable translations occurs in 105.33:

> 105.33 Swa he furðum oncneow þæt heora fynd ehtan;
> he heora bene bealde gehyrde.
> Et uidit cum tribularentur; et audiuit orationem eorum.

Here **tribularentur**, glossed in K as *hi wæran swenced*, becomes *heora fynd ehtan*, so that the afflictions and sufferings are more actively bestowed by their enemies (who) attacked or persecuted them. The sense is similar, but again not quite exact, and the word-order is rearranged.

The verbal nouns which are accurately translated often change grammatical form to fit in the vernacular line, as in 106.4 **Esturientes et sitientes**: *Hæfde hi hungor and þurst.* In fact, while some of the verbal nouns retain their grammatical form in the Old English—such as 105.20 **comedentis**: *etendes*—the majority are rewritten to make a clause or to emphasize the sense, including 106.5 **tribularentur**: *costunge*, 106.8 **essurientem**: *þa hungrian*, and 106.9 **sedentes**: *þa þe...sæton.* The majority of the Latin verbal nouns, then, are translated into Old English, but many change in grammatical form, becoming nouns or being expanded to subordinate clauses. Unlike the function words above, they do not usually enter the vernacular as the same part of speech, and unlike the lexical words discussed later, they have a higher percentage of approximate or inaccurate translation.

f) Auxiliary Verbs

Translations of auxiliary verbs, in the psalter most often appearances of esse, 'to be', reflect a different pattern from those of ordinary verbs and are best analysed

separately. Because they are function words, their pattern of translation accords more with those already discussed (except perhaps verbals). Of the 112 occurrences of auxiliary verbs in the source, 61 or 54% are translated accurately, 29 or 26% are subsumed into the vernacular—that is, an active verb replaces an adjective-esse combination, or in some other way the verb indicating a state of being is absorbed into the text—11 (10%) are not translated, 10 (9%) are inexactly translated, and only one is an error.[11] Because the auxiliary verb is a means to an end, a linking word in some ways like prepositions and conjunctions, it is hardly surprising that the poet translates it in only about half of the relevant cases.

g) Ordinary Verbs

Like the verbals, the ordinary or lexical verbs spread out across the categories much more widely than the other parts of speech discussed so far. Of the 564 ordinary verbs in the sample text only 369 are accurately translated, for a low total of 65%. 103, or 18%, are translated quite closely, so that a total of 81% of the Latin verbs are translated in such a way as to be recognizable—that is, Categories A and B. An additional 64, or 11%, are translated but not at all closely, and only 26 ordinary verbs (4.6%) are ignored entirely or appear in passages which are cut from the translation. Categories B, C, and D, which make it more difficult or even impossible to determine the

---

[11] 105.22.1 Hi Belphegor bædon are
Et initiati sunt Beelphegor.
bædon are makes little sense, and **sunt**: *bædon* seems impossible.

correspondence with the source, thus account for a high of 30%, nearly one third of the verbs from the source.[12]

Not only is the accuracy of the translation often in question but also the poet frequently uses a word which may be accurate but which is not a common equivalent. This, of course, could well be a sign of thoughtful translation. The result is an unusual number of rare verbs in the metrical psalter. They appear for a single occurrence or for a cluster of occurrences in one part of the text, and never recur unless the circumstances in which they originally appear repeat themselves, or unless the poet finds himself in especially difficult conditions. As is common in Old English poetry, verbs very often occur in the fourth stave and of course do not alliterate, a circumstance which allows the poet even more licence in his use of this part of speech.

For example, the last three verses of Psalm 106 reveal the circumstances in which the poet will translate accurately, approximate the original, or ignore the source and rework the text:

106.40 þær he þearfendra þa miltsude,
and hi of wædle wean alysde,
sette heora staðol sceapum anlice.
.41 Syþþan þæt soðfæste geseoð, sniome æfter
bliðe weorðað, beot geþenceað,
þæt unrihta gehwylc eft oncyrreð
and his sylfes muð symble hemneð.
.42 Hwylc is wisra nu wel snotera,
þe þas mid gehygde healdan cunne,
and milde mod mihtigan drihtnes
full gleawlice ongite syþþan?

---

[12] Category B is counted doubly here, with the recognisable translations and with the more difficult ones, because it stands in the middle, relevant to both sides.

> Et adiuuit pauperem de inopia; et posuit sicut oues familias. Uidebunt recti et letabuntur; et omnis iniquitas oppilabit os suum. Quis sapiens et custodiet haec; et intelleget misericordias domini.

The first Latin verb **adiuuit** is ignored by the poet, who uses *miltsude* instead. For **posuit** he translates accurately with *sette*. Early in verse 41, he accurately renders **uidebunt**: *geseoð*. For **letabuntur** the poet weakens the impact of the verb with the half-line *bliðe weorðað*, an approximation of the original with an adjective-verb combination. The next Latin verb is a problem, and the poet offers two equally inaccurate alternatives for **oppilabit**, meaning 'to stop' or 'to fill up against'. He provides *oncyrreð* and *hemneð* (an editorial emendation of the MS *nemneð*). *hemman*, 'to stop, to close' is very close to the meaning of the Latin, much better than K's *fordyde*, for instance. However, this is the only occurrence of the word in the metrical psalter, and since it appears only by emendation from the manuscript *nemneð*, it has no authority. It does appear, as many of these unusual equivalents do, in the fourth stress of a line and at the end of a psalm verse. If the unrighteous are both 'turned away' and their mouths are 'closed up', then the poet has succeeded in using two verbs, each expressing part of the sense of the original. The result is hendiadys, often regarded as a grace in rhetoric.

In the last verse of the psalm the poet again uses verb phrases or verbs with adjectives and adverbs to clarify his translation. Rendering **custodiet**: *healdan cunne* is not quite correct, since knowing how to protect and protecting are slightly different aspects of the same idea. The equivalent verb *healdan* is quite accurate, but the use of a modal makes the translation somewhat less direct, and, incidentally, somewhat more typical of the metrical psalms. The last verb is **intelleget**, cogently given as *gleawlice*

ongite, and the added adverb both points the intent of the verb and provides alliteration. Many of the verbs in this passage, as throughout the text, are translated not by one word but by phrases or combinations of words. The equivalents in the vernacular are not necessarily those which might be expected, and the poet quite commonly brings in a verb which appears once only in the entire text. He also makes great use of auxiliaries, modals, and passive periphrastics to make complete half-lines out of his verbs;[13] sometimes the stretching of the verb makes a change to its sense and at other times the poet makes the extension more carefully so that the meaning is emphasized rather than lost or shifted. At times, as with **adiuuit**, the poet ignores the verb which appears in the Latin in favour of a more convenient verb in the vernacular.

At other points the poet must use a familiar verb for a somewhat difficult Latin word and stretch its meaning just beyond the limits of its usual contexts.[14] For example, the reading of **prosterneret**: *todrifan* in 105.21 is technically a mistranslation:

105.21 He his handa ahof and hi hraðe wolde
on þam westenne wide todrifan
and heora swæs cynn sendan on wid land.
Et eleuauit manum suam super eos; ut prosterneret eos in deserto;
Et ut deiceret semen eorum in nationibus.

---

[13] For a detailed discussion of these problems see Daniel Donoghue, *Style in Old English Poetry: The Test of the Auxiliary.* (Yale, 1987). For the *Paris Psalter* in particular see pp. 32-6, 73-4, 88-9, and for statistical information on the frequency, position and grammatical function of the auxiliaries see pp. 166-8.

[14] This leaves aside, as it must, the question of whether the psalter poet thought that the word meant what he made it mean, or whether he knew that it did not. Alternatively, the verb could have meant what he said, and the meaning is now lost.

Bartlett argues that *todrifan* here is apparently suggested by the following **deiceret**, although that verb has its own correspondence in *sendan on wid land.*[15] She is certainly right in suggesting influence from **deiceret**, which is normally glossed *awurpe*, but *todrifan* does come close to some of the glosses available for **prosterneret**: *gefælde* A B, *aðenede* C D F J K, *foreastrehte* E, *he astrehte* I. The glosses of E and I, with the idea of 'stretching out' or 'extending', and of C and the D-gloss tradition, *aðenede*, which also means 'stretching out' are not too far away from *wide todrifan*, 'to drive far away'. In fact, the meanings of **prosterneret** include both the sense 'to overthrow, bear down, cut down' and 'to strew, spread'. It is clearly the second meaning that the glossators choose to use; the poet chooses the same but uses a verb with a stronger meaning. The result stretches the meaning of *todrifan* from 'to drive out' to 'to cast away, to throw out'. The context expands the meaning of the verb slightly, and provides a fair approximation of the sense of the Latin.

Another mistranslation which has occasioned some comment occurs in 106.17:

106.17.3 þæt hy wið deaða duru drencyde wæran
et adpropinquauerunt usque ad portas mortis.

Here the translation must be an error. The glosses offer some variant of K's *neahlæhton*, and the poet really cannot have thought that the unrighteous were drunk at death's door. Greenfield's argument that the poet misread **adpropinquauerunt** as a form of **propinare**

[15] Bartlett, pp. 30-1.

'to give to drink' and translated it transitively as *drencan* is likely to be correct.[16] This, despite the other occurrences of **adpropinquo** where it is more accurately treated: 54.19 omitted; 54.22 reworked, not translated;[17] 87.4.3b *hylded geneahhe*; 90.7.3b *sceaðeð*, 90.10.3b *sceþþan*, 118.150.1 *Me syndon...ungemete neah*; 118.169 *genealæceð*, 148.14 *hi forð heonan/ on his neaweste neod wunian.* The verb *sceððan*, 'to scathe, injure, vex' is an unusual choice, less odd for its being repeated than for its initial use. It occurs four times in the text, elsewhere in 88.20.2b **non opponet nocere**: *ænig sceððan* (K *na asette derian*) and 104.12 **nocere**: *sceððan* (K *derian*).[18] *Sceððan*, then, is a much stronger expression than **adpropinquare** needs, but once developed it is reused. *Genealæceð* in 118.169 is the only occurrence of the prose verb *nealæcan* in the text; elsewhere the poet uses the periphrases of 118.150 and 148.14, or cuts the verb altogether. The poet, then, knows elsehere how to translate **adpropinquare.** Here, he produces a Category D translation.

Most of the verbs in the metrical psalter, however, do at least suggest a part of the meaning of the Latin. In some cases, the poet produces a doublet verb, hendiadys, in

---

[16] S.B. Greenfield, *The Interpretation of Old English Poems.* (London, 1972), p. 99. Equally likely is the possibility that the Latin source was in error, but this would produce the same result.

[17] 54.19.5-7 forðon hi synt on yrre ut adælde,
ne hi sylfe wel geseon æfre,
forðon hit wæs his heortan gehygde neah.
diuisi sunt ab ira uultus eius et adpropiauit (adpropinquauit) cor eius.

[18] This is certainly an odd translation for **nocere**, which occurs four times in the text—twice here and in 88.34 and 118.121, in both of which verses it is translated as *syllan.*

which one or both elements of the doublet translate the source. Two successful doublets are those in 105.2 **loquetur**: *asprecan and aspyrian*, in which *asprecan* does the work and *aspyrian* 'to investigate' adds the slightly confusing suggestion that one cannot discover the extent of God's virtue;[19] and 105.13 **dedit**: *brohte and sealde*, where *brohte* provides the alliteration and *sealde* the translation. Less successful is 105.20 **murmurauerunt**: *granedan and grame spræcon*, in which those who 'murmured' and 'grumbled' become those who 'groaned' or 'lamented' and 'spoke angrily'. Other cases of inaccurate translation, usually involving a weakening of the sense, include 105.25 **exacerbauerunt**: *wæs...gram*;[20] 105.30 **oderunt**: *on feondscipe fæste gestodon*; 106.31 **laudent**: *secgean to worulde* and 107.8 **extendam**: *þyder sendan þence*. In all these cases it takes at least one extra word even to approximate the original. For verbs, as later for adjectives, the poet rearranges and reworks his material. He changes the sense around in such readings as 105.20 where **non exaudierunt** becomes *noldan wel gehyran* ('they did not hear' to 'they did not wish to hear well' or perhaps 'they did not in the least (*wel*) desire to

---

[19] 105.2.1-2a Hwylc mæg æfre mihta drihtnes
asprecan and aspyrian,
Quis loquetur potentias domini;

[20] The comma after *wæs* in Krapp's edition must be removed for the translation to make sense:
105.25.3-5a þær Moyses wearð mægene gebysgad
for heora yfelum, swa he oftor wæs
on his gaste gram.
et uexatus est Moyses propter eos; quia exaceruauerunt sanctum eius.

hear');[21] 106.25 **descendunt**: *gefeallað* where the ascent to heaven followed by a descent to hell becomes a fall to hell; and 107.1 **cantabo**: *cweme*, when *singe* would be a better equivalent but renders **psallam** in the same verse (*cweme* appears again in the next verse in the better translation **exsurgam**: *gecweme*). In 106.8 the poet renders **satiauit**: *gesedeð*, an unusual but accurate equivalent explained by the appearance of **satiauit**: *gefylleð* (the more common translation) later in the same verse. Other odd renditions appear for verbs in this section of the psalter, including one of only two appearances in the text of *abylgan* in 105.32 where **exacerbauerunt**: *abylgdan*,[22] and of *yfelian* in 106.37 where **minorauit**: *geyfelad*, 'to become ill'.[23] The poet, then, will use unusual or unexpected equivalents wherever necessary.

h) Adverbs

This is the one of the least common parts of speech in the Latin text of the psalter, but one of the more common forms in the translation. For example, in one passage of the sample amounting to three hundred lines, there are only five adverbs in the source:

105.11.3	**Cito**: *hraðe*
105.32	**sepe**: *oft*
105.32	**autem**: not translated
106.16	**enim**: *ær, wraðe?* (K *soplice*)
106.37	**nimis**: l.1 *brade*; l. 2 *weorðlice, wide?* (K *swyþe*)

[21] although a meaning of 'in the least' for *wel* would be unprecedented.

[22] In 77.41 *abylgan* also translates **exacerbauerunt.**

[23] On its other occurrence, in 82.3 *yfelian* means 'to hurt, to do evil'.

With adverbs, the problem of just what constitutes function arises. In the first two cases here, Category A translations are given, and the third example is a Category Z. However, in 106.16 both *ær* and *wraðe* serve as intensifiers, and fill at least that function of **enim**. Here the exact translation (*soðlice*) cannot be used because the metre did not allow it, so the poet tries unsuccessfully to approximate it.[24] For the last adverb, **nimis**, the poet again provides all the force of the intensifier, making the adverb's purpose even more explicit with *brade* and *wide*, and adding *weorðlice* for alliteration and for another slight amplification of sense.[25]

Of the 95 adverbs in the sample, 58 or 61% are accurately translated, 17 appear in Categories B, C, and D (18%), and 19 are not translated (20%). Adverbs in the source are thus translated accurately in three-fifths of the cases, ignored in one-fifth, and approximated with a choice of two or more other intensifiers in almost one-fifth of the cases. They most closely resemble prepositions, except that they exhibit higher percentages of mistakes or very loose translations.

i) Adjectives

Adjectives from the source tend to be translated well or, at least, closely. Very few are not translated at all, and few also are mistranslated or translated not at all closely. The sample has 136 adjectives, of which 97 or 71% are accurately rendered and an

---

[24] 106.16.3 þær hi wæron on woo ær wraðe besmitene.
propter iniustitias enim suas humiliati sunt.

[25] 106.37.1-2 þa he bletsade, and hi brade þa
weoxan weorðlice, wide greowan;
Et benedixit eos et multiplicati sunt nimis;

additional 19 or 14% are at least partially translated. Of the remaining 20 adjectives (15%) in the sample, 5 are poorly or wrongly translated, and 15 are not translated. Adjectives, then, are a high priority for the poet, since 85% of the adjectives in the source are translated fully or approximately.

The choice of vernacular equivalents for adjectives may, however, differ slightly from the careful diction used for nouns. While the majority of the adjectives from the source are words such as **bonus** and **omni**, given almost always as *god* and *ealle*, there are occasional opportunities for variation, and the poet uses what seem unusual equivalents, perhaps more so for adjectives than for nouns. In 106.33 **Terra fructiferam** becomes *weaxende wende eorðan*, so that the earth which was to bring forth fruit, be fructiferous, becomes the earth which turned to growing. The poet does not use the common equivalent *wæstmbære* for **fructiferam**.

j) Nouns

Nouns are by far the most common part of speech in both the Latin and the vernacular. There are 1225 nouns in the sample, of which 1041, just over 85%, are accurately translated. Another 80 (6.5%) are Category B renditions. As many as 91.5% of the nouns from the source, then, are accurately or closely rendered in the vernacular. There are only 18 Category C translations (1.5%), and 7 outright mistakes (.5%). A further 79 nouns from the source are not translated (6.4%), almost all of them repetitions of an idea already rendered, or part of a prepositional phrase omitted in the translation. Nouns appear to be a very high priority for the translator.

Furthermore, the vernacular nouns which the translator uses are often familiar or common words. They correspond closely to the nouns of the glossed psalters, and it is clear from the position of nouns in the line that the noun came first, with alliteration built up around it as the centrepiece of the line. The technique, an obvious one, is particularly clear for the placing of proper nouns, such as those in Psalm 107: the accented portion of each proper noun corresponds exactly with the accented part of the half-line, and the rest of the line develops around it, preserving the Latin word order where possible, and preserving accurate translation of other parts of speech where possible. From 107.6.5 to 107.8.3, a total of eight lines, there are eight proper nouns, one per line except for 107.7.1 which has two, and none in the third line of the verse. The proper nouns are clearly the most important feature of these verses.

Elsewhere, this emphasis on nouns remains. For example, Psalm 106.14-17 reveals the importance of nouns and the ease with which they are translated.

106.14 Forðan hi mildheort mod mihtigan drihtnes
ealle andettan, and eac cweþan
mycel wundur his ofer manna bearn.
.15 Forðon he æren dor eaðe gescæneð
and iserne steng ana gebigeð.
.16 He hi of unrihtum ealle swylce
þam wraðan wege wis alædeð,
þær hi wæron on woo ær wraðe besmitene.
.17 Hi onhysctan æghwylcne mete,
mode mægen heora, oð unmihte,
þæt hy wið deaða duru drencyde wæran.
Confiteantur domino misericordie eius; et mirabilia eius filiis hominum.
Quia contriuit portas aereas; et uectes ferreos confregit;
Suscepit eos de uia iniquitatis eorum; propter iniustitias enim suas humiliati sunt.
Omnem escam abominata est anima eorum; et adpropinquauerunt usque ad portas mortis.

Here the nouns are carefully rendered: (.14) **domino**: *mihtigan drihtnes*, **misericordie**: *mildheort mod*, **mirabilia**: *wundur*, **filiis**: *bearn*, **hominum**: *manna*; (.15) **portas**: *dor*, **uectes**: *steng*; (.16) **via**: *wege*, **iniquitatis**: *unrihtum* (aided by *wraðan*), **iniustitias**: *woo*; (.17) **escam**: *mete*, **anima**: *mode mægen*, **portas**: *duru*, **mortis**: *deaða*. With only three possible exceptions, all of the vernacular words are good translations of the Latin, clear and unsurprising renditions placed in accented syllables, usually of the first half-line. Of the possible exceptions, the first, **iniquitatis**: *unrihtum* provides an adjective as a substantive which is a shortened version of the more common *unrihtwisnesse*. *unrihtum* does accurately convey the sense of the Latin, and the meaning of the passage is made even more clear with the adjective *wraðan* modifying *wege*. The second slightly unusual translation in the passage is **iniustitias**: *woo*, when again the prose word *unrihtwisnesse* is the most common gloss. Here the poet reuses *wraðe* to emphasise the sense, and reuses *w*-alliteration for the third line of the verse. *Woh* is not perhaps the most expected word for **iniustitias**, but its second meaning is 'wrong, iniquity', which does express the sense of the Latin. In its eight occurrences in the text *woh* is a clear addition on three occasions (54.19, 61.9, and 136.3), translates **iniquitatem** with *unnyt* in 93.4, renders **peccata** with *gewyrhtum* (102.10), and translates **iniquo** twice (119.2, 139.l). This is the only occasion on which the word renders **iniustitias**. The one noun in this passage which, it might be argued, is translated not accurately but partially is **anima**: *mode mægen*. Here a reading of *mode mægen* as the sense in which *mod* has the same meaning as *sawl* is clearly intended. However, the gloss of **anima**: *sawl* is the most common both in the metrical psalter and in most direct translation. The translation here, then, is a

Category B. On the whole, then, the nouns of the sample are translated with care both for their accuracy and for their prominent location in the syntax.

Only very occasionally do nouns appear in the translation which must represent errors or difficulties in the text. For example, in 105.16, **flamma** is translated by *maansceaðan.* This is the only appearance of *mansceaða* in the metrical psalter, which is normally the Old English reflex of **persequens** or **affligens.** The noun is, however, often associated with the Egyptians, as it is here, and it provides an opportunity for word-play with *mann/man*:[26]

105.16 þær fyr abarn frecne swylce
on heora gemetinge and þær maansceaðan
þa synfullan sniome forbærnde.
Et exarsit ignis in synagoga eorum; flamma combussit peccatores.

Translating **flamma** with a noun suggesting 'the evil persecutor' or 'the dread afflictor' does work both literally and figuratively in the verse.[27] Fire can be a terrible destroyer, and the flame of God persecuting the unrighteous is an allegorical suggestion of the wrath of the Lord falling upon the backsliding Israelites. *Maansceaðan* is not an exact translation, and it counts as a Category B translation.

---

[26] R. Frank, 'Some Uses of Paronomasia in Old English Scriptural Verse' *Speculum* 47 (1972), pp. 207-26, notes similar *mann/man* puns in 61.3, 61.9, 63.8, and 139.4 (p. 221). They emphasise the potential for both sin and holiness in the individual.

[27] **flamma** occurs twice in the source: here and 82.15, where it is rendered by the common equivalent *lig.*

Other nouns for which the translation is not accurate but is relatively close include renditions such as 105.7.5 **multitudinis**: *on ðære mægðe manige*; 105.9.3 **abyssis**: *wætera weallas*; 105.10.4 **aqua**: *flod*, and 105.13.2 **animas**: *muþas*. In each case the context makes it clear that the poet has the right general idea, if not the precise translation. So, for instance, the 'multitude' of those who should be mindful of God's mercy becomes 'the many races' or 'many generations', and the abyss opened in the Red Sea is suggested by the 'walls of water', the 'water' as a 'mass of water, a flood' and the 'souls' who are sated by the fulfilment of God become 'mouths'. The Latin **misericordia** is translated throughout the text by a wide variety of equivalents, including *mildheortnesse, milde mod, miltsa, mildheort mod* and even by the adjective *milde*. *Milde* alone cannot be an accurate translation of **misericordia**, but the frequency of its appearance as part of more complete translations of the noun, and its context on the occasions where it appears alone, make it a recognisable equivalent, a Category A rendition. In 106.20, for instance, the adjective clause makes the sense clear:

106.20.1-2 Forðon hi nu andettan ecum drihtne,
þæt he milde wearð manna cynne;
Confiteantur domino misericordie eius.

The same construction occurs shortly thereafter in 106.30. Again, *milde* provides an acceptable equivalent for **misericordia**.[28]

Close rather than accurate translations could also be a result of diction, of a small vocabulary range. The word choice of the text (in both Latin and Old English) is on the

---

[28] 106.30.1-2 Hi andettan ealle drihtne,
hu he milde wearð manna cynne;
Confiteantur domino misericordie eius.

whole a limited selection, with few occasions of careful distinctions of meaning. Where such repetition with variation did occur in the Latin, the translator either repeated the same Old English equivalent, or produced awkward alternatives. For instance, **mirabilia** occurs a number of times, and is almost always translated *wundor*.[29] On one occasion, however, the source uses **magnalia**, **mirabilia** and **terribilia** in close succession (105.18). The poet uses *æðele wundur* for **magnalia**, and *recene wundur* for **terribilia**, both accurate translations. For **mirabilia** he produces a very awkward line—105.18.4 *and on Chananea cymu worhte*—in which *cymu* might be taken for an adjective modifying *Chananea* and meaning 'lovely' or 'beautiful'. However, this would leave **mirabilia**, an important noun, untranslated. More likely, *cymu* is a substantive rendering **mirabilia**, and means 'a splendid thing' or 'a glory'. Old English, like other Germanic languages and Latin as well, often uses adjectives for nouns in such places, including the poet's *milde* for **misericordia** as just discussed, and taking *cymu* for a noun here places the stress of the line on the two important substantives, allowing the poet to reinforce the sense with *recene wundur* in the next line, without any intervening added half-lines.

Similarly, there are a number of translations for nouns which appear to be alliterative inventions.[30] In all the cases in this section of the psalter, at least one

---

[29] in the sample seven times, six of which are translated *wundur*.

[30] For a more complete list, see Tinkler, pp. 48-57, the section entitled 'Alliterative Anomalies'. Some of the words Tinkler discusses elsewhere might fit better in this section, however, and it is worth noting that Tinkler treats the prose and poetic versions of the Psalms in the *Paris Psalter* as very similar texts, which they are not.

element of the noun compound is a direct and common translation of a word from the source. The other element of the *hapax legomenon* is a repetition or emphasis of the sense. For example, some of the noun compounds of this kind which occur in this passage are: 105.2 **laudes**: *lofmægen* (where *lof* clearly renders **laudes** and *mægen* is an extension suggesting not only God's praise but also his virtue, or a repetition of **potentias** from the previous clause, or both); 105.17 **uituli**: *hæðenstyrc* (in which *styrc* translates **uituli** since *cealf* had been used earlier in the verse, and *hæðen-* provides *h*-alliteration and useful emphasis on the calf's pagan status); 105.24 *feondæt*[31]; 105.30 **manus**: *handgeweald* where *-geweald* emphasizes the wielding of power; 106.22.2 **aquis multis**: *wæterðryþum*, a word-for-word translation; 106.23.2 **profundo**: *wætergrundum*, where *grundum* renders the Latin and *wæter* is repeated from the previous verse to produce a very similar alliterative compound; 106.24 *egewylm*, an alliterative addition; and 107.7 **susceptio**: *heahstrengðu* or *heah strengðu*.[32] All of these *hapax legomena* are nouns, and nearly all of them translate at least one word from the source as accurately as possible. If the poet was forced to invent a new noun by the verse form or by problems with the translation, he used common equivalents for at least the element of the compound that was translating from the Latin.

---

[31] Tinkler lists 105.26.4 *laðweorc* as a ghost-word, but no editor suggests *laðweorc* as an *hapax legomenon*. It is normally left as two words, with *weorc* rendering **opera**. *lað weorc gode* is, however, a somewhat contradictory phrase.

[32] See pp. 324-5 for further discussion of this possible *hapax legomenon*.

Study of the metrical version of the psalms using the Latin original as a starting point, then, reveals a number of points about the text that starting with the vernacular does not. These include the identification of a hierarchy in translation of parts of speech, with lexical items at the top and purely functional items at the bottom. Also, identification of the Latin text, in the unlikely event that it is extant (or at least establishing the family of texts from which the metrical psalter was translated) is possible by comparing some of the details of the translation. Third, problems or errors in translation tend not to come singly, but in clusters. Fourth, this analysis reveals little adherence to the medieval notion that even the word order was sacred, which raises, again, the problem of the translation's purpose. Fifth, what analysis beginning from the Latin text cannot really bring to light are the difficulties when the poet misreads the source or translates so loosely that correspondences are difficult to establish. Finally, this kind of analysis of the metrical psalter raises a number of questions about literacy in Anglo-Saxon England.

First, lexical items are translated carefully, with Category A or B renditions, and are usually, as would be expected, stressed words. Function words are omitted about a quarter of the time, translated with care about a quarter of the time, and have their function transmitted into the grammar or syntax of the target language in some way the remaining half of the time. This conclusion is an obvious one, but its ramifications are not always acknowledged. Where interpretation of a difficult passage hinges upon accurate rendition of the function words, the metrical psalter can be confused. Normally, translators and their critics assume that function words, being easy to translate, are

translated accurately, and that the more difficult part of a translation (particularly a poetic one) is the recreation of meaning and tone. For the *Paris Psalter*, and probably for other Old English translation poetry, these assumptions are erroneous. The lexical words, words producing meaning—which of course carry special import in a sacred text—are most likely to be accurately rendered, with the function words left out, reconsidered or subsumed in the translation. Thus, for instance, the nouns in the metrical translation tend to alliterate and to translate accurately the original. They are more likely to reflect common usage, or to correspond with the somewhat more specialized language of the glossed psalters. The verbs, being partly functional and partly lexical, tend not to be translated with absolute accuracy, but to have their meaning suggested, at times vaguely. Where adjectives and adverbs are important in the source, they are accurately translated, but as parts of speech adjectives and adverbs are much more common in the metrical psalter than in the Latin one.

Some of these results are best exemplified; the collocation *costung...cnyssan* is unique to *PPs*, where it appears eight times:

58.17.3 þonne me costunge cnysedon geneahhige;
63.1.2 nu me costunge cnyssað geneahhe
65.13.2 þær me costunge cnyssedan geneahhe
114.4.1 Me costung and sar cnyssedan geneahhe
118.143.1 Me costunga cnysdan geneahhe,
119.1.2 þonne me costunga cnysdon geneahhe,
137.7.2 þær me costunga cnysdan geneahhe,
70.19.2-3 on costunge cuðra manna,
and me yfela feala oft oncnyssedest;

Costung, a noun meaning 'trial, tribulation, testing' invariably translates the Latin **tribulatio** in the *Paris Psalter*,[33] while *cnyssan*, meaning variously 'to press, toss, strike, beat and hew to pieces' is usually an addition to the text.[34] In Psalm 114.4 the collocation appears and it recurs in 118.143.[35] However, *cnyssan* in these two verses renders the Latin **inuenio**, 'to meet with, to come together.' For the sake of using a familiar collocation the poet has forced *cnyssan* to weaken in meaning such that it translates here, for this verse only, as something like 'to meet, to test.' The sense only pertains to this collocation, to the two times when it translates **inuenio**, and to this text.

Similarly, a stretched meaning for a single occurrence, but used to produce an intensification of meaning rather than a weakening, appears in Psalm 73.4-5:

---

[33] *costung* 15x in *PPs*, all rendering **tribulatio** or **cum tribularentur**, when K usually has *geswinc*. See 58.17, 63.1, 65,13. 70.19, 106.5, 106.12, 106.18, 106.27, 106.38, 114.4, 117.5, 118.143, 119.1, 137.7, 142.12. The noun is collocated with *cnyssan* seven times, *oncnyssan* once, *cleopedan* four times (all repetitions of same verse in 106.5, .12, .18, and .27), once each with *becwom* (106.38), *cigde* (117.5), and *clæne* (142.12).

[34] *cnyssan* occurs ten times in the text, seven of them collocated with *costung*. Five of seven occurrences the verb is an addition to the text, and twice translates **inuenio** (K has *gemete*). For the other three occurrences: addition in 83.5; addition in 85.6, where collocated with *cleopode*, and in 117.13 oddly translates **impulsus uersatus**. *oncnyssan* occurs only once, in 70.19 as addition to the text.

[35] 114.4 Me costung and sar cnyssedon geneahhe,
þonne ic naman drihtnes nyde cigde.
Tribulationem et dolorem inueni; et nomen domini inuocaui.
118.143 Me costunga cnysdan geneahhe,
and nearonessa naman gelome;
ac ic þine bebodu efnde and læste,
eac on minum mode hi metegade georne.
Tribulatio et angustia inuenerunt me; mandata tua meditatio mea est.

73.4 Settan hiora tacen soþe ne ongeaton,
swa hi on wege wyrcean sceoldon
wundorbeacen, swa hi on wudu dydan.
.5 Hi mid æxum duru elne curfan,
and mid twyecgum teoledan georne
þæt hi mid adesan ealle towurpan.
Posuerunt signa sua signa et non cognouerant; sicut in exitu super summum; quasi in silua lignorum securibus.
Exciderunt ianuas eius in idipsum, in securi et ascia deiecerunt eam.

The translator has difficulty here, possibly because of the poetic image.[36] The poet stretches the meaning of the verb *teoledan*, preserving both the heroic compound *twyecgum* and the alliteration. *Teoledan*, from *teoldian*, a form of *tilian* (the result of back mutation), means 'to spread (a net)' or 'to set (a trap)' and is so used or weakens in meaning on its two other appearances in the psalter text, in Psalms 108.30 and 118.23.[37] In this verse, however, *teoldian* renders the Latin **deiecio**, meaning 'to tear down, destroy.' The sense of *teoldian* is intensified here to suggest that not only has a trap been set, but it has been sprung and the axes are 'tearing down, cutting down and destroying' the *wundorbeacen.* The poet has had to extend and even to change the meaning of a word, again for purposes of a single occurrence.

---

[36] Note the similarity to *DR* 29-30a
þæt ic wæs aheawen holtes on ende,
astyred of stefne minum.

[37] 108.30.1-2 He sylfa gestod on ða swyðran hand,
þær he þearfendra þinga teolode
Qui adstitit ad dextris pauperis.
118.23.4-5 hwæðere þin esne elnes teolode,
þæt he þine soðe word snotur beeode.
seruus autem tuus exercebatur in iustificionibus tuis.

The parts of speech, then, are treated very differently in the metrical psalter, to such an extent that great care must be taken when looking at equivalents for verbs, verbals, and to some extent adjectives. For some parts of speech the poet preserves common equivalents or invents logical translations, while for others careless or partial rendition is sufficient. A hierarchy of the parts of speech seems to be present, at the top being nouns, then adjectives, verbals, verbs, adverbs, prepositions, pronouns and conjunctions at the bottom. This hierarchy corresponds to metrical rank, especially in the lower-ranking parts of speech. Analysis of the word-by-word correspondence of Psalms 101 to 115 reveals differences in the treatment of grammatical forms and shows how frequently the poet would use two or three words to explain one word from the source. As a result, the distinctions between accurate renditions, approximations, and versions not at all close to the original can become difficult, since at many points the poet is using a different kind of expression to produce the same result or rendering a word with an unexpected but nevertheless accurate equivalent.

Secondly, the introductory remarks to this chapter discussed the possibility of more closely identifying the Latin psalter from which the text was translated. Although function words such as the opening **Et** may be useful for such a purpose, more useful as a result of this analysis will be the places in the text where the translator omits a phrase which appears in the Roman but not the Gallican Psalter, or renders a word in a way that corresponds more to Gallican than to Roman usage. One example from the sample is 106.26 where the reading of A is **degluttita**, but the metrical psalter renders the Gallican reading of K **devorata** as *forglendred*, 'to devour, to swallow up'. An example which

is not susceptible to the argument that the poet was attempting to render the Roman Psalter but accidentally came up with a reading that looks closer to the Gallican Psalter occurs at 105.23 where the Roman reading **in studiis suis** is clearly not intended by the metrical *on heora gemetincge*. This translates the Gallican **adinuentionibus** (glossed in K *geceornesse*). An example where the distinction is not in a lexical element is 107.11 et: *forðon* when the Gallican reading is **quia**. Here too, it seems likely that the poet was depending upon a Gallican reading. Some of these readings may well be coincidence, but a list of all the Gallican readings in the metrical psalter obtained by way of this kind of analysis would lead to a clearer consideration of the intermixing of Roman and Gallican forms in the text from which the verse translation was rendered.

One other possibility needs consideration here: that the *Paris Psalter* may be a poetic version of an intervening prose translation of the psalms. Rather than providing, as the *Metres of Boethius* do, a prose rendition followed by a versified version of the same text, the *Paris Psalter* goes one step further, providing only the metrical version. This argument relies upon two main difficulties with the text, one syntactic and one lexical. The syntactic argument, which is discussed further below, simply says that the presence of prose syntax in the *Paris Psalter* is best explained by the existence of a prose intermediary. The lexical argument points out the frequency of prose words in the text, compares that with the paucity of poetic words and the low frequency of *hapax legomena*, and suggests that a good explanation of the prose-influenced vocabulary is a prose version partway between the Latin and the fully poetic text of the metrical psalter.

First, the prosaic nature of the syntax could result simply from the poet's pedestrian approach to the source.[38] He renders the Latin piece by piece, a technique which leads to prose syntax automatically. The prose vocabulary may also be a result of the text's being a close translation. The genre would in this case place as many restrictions on the material as did the requirements of form and content. There is in the metrical psalter little real addition to the text, and less attempt at interpretation or commentary. If the metrical version really were at one remove from the Latin, it seems likely that more additional material would have crept into the text. Also, the text might be expected to be a more consciously poetic one. In the *Metres of Boethius*[39], for example, the metrical versions use more metaphors, more epithets, and more rhetorical devices, partly in order to point up the difference between poetic and prose versions of the same text. The parallel is an uncertain one, but the metrical psalter does seem in some ways remarkably unpoetic for a verse translation. In any case, none of these arguments is conclusive. If the *Paris Psalter* is a versified version of a prose translation, it still remains possible, although at one remove, to identify the features of the text from which it was translated.

---

[38] This approach is exemplified in the analysis of Diamond, but he draws conclusions only about the formulaic background of the text.

[39] There is a high percentage of prose vocabulary and syntax in the Metres of Boethius, but rarely the ugly syntax which is a hallmark of the metrical psalter. See also A.A. Metcalf, *Poetic Diction in the Old English Meters of Boethius*. Janua Linguarum Series Practica 50 (The Hague, 1973) for a preliminary study of the changes in diction made as prose became verse in the *Metres of Boethius*.

Thirdly, this analysis reveals a tendency for problems of translation to come in clusters. The most notorious example of this feature is the opening passage of Psalm 101, a section fraught with difficulties in the psalter glosses, in the *Paris Psalter*, and even in modern versions of the text.[40] A difficult concept or image leads to problems in translation, and often overlaps into further problems, so that errors in translation, additions to and deletions from the text, and odd choices of language including *hapax legomena* all tend to concentrate themselves into certain sections of the translation. In this sample, a cluster of difficulties also occurs at 108.10-11:

108.10 Syn his bearn swylce toboren wide,
and he ut weorp earme þearfan,
þonne hi to his huse hleowes wilnian.
.ll Ealle his æhta unholde fynd
rice reðemann rycene gedæle,
and his feoh onfon fremde handa.
Commoti amoueantur filii eius et mendicent eiciantur de habitationibus suis;
Scrutetur fenerator omnem substantiam eius et diripiant alieni omnes labores eius.
D drefede syn astyred suna his 7 hy wædlien aworpen of eardungstowum
ascrudnie borhgiend ealle spede his 7 reafien fremde ealle geswinc his

The verb **commoueo** occurs eighteen times in the Latin text, but this is the only occurrence of *toberan* in the metrical psalter. Already at the beginning of the verse the translator is using a verb which is new to the text, and which is unusually placed in the head stave for alliteration with *bearn*. The translator uses neither D's *drefede* nor A's *onstyrede*. The choice of *toboren* is probably influenced here by the choice of *bearn* for **filius**, since *bearn* occurs 81 times in *PPs*, *sunu* only 9 times. The next two lines change the sense of the original, so that rather than the mendicant children of the unrighteous

[40] See pp. 327-8 for a discussion of some of these difficulties.

being thrown out of their houses, the translator has God (*he*) throwing them out when they come asking for protection at His house. **habitationibus suis** is shifted to the dative singular *his huse*, and a new clause is added for the last line of the translation. This leads, however, to the somewhat stretched use of *wilnian* as 'to beg for' in the literal sense of asking for bread, rather than in its more common usage of 'to wish for, to supplicate, to entreat'. Also, *hleo* is added to the text (for alliteration with *hus*), another word which occurs once only in the metrical psalter. The psalter poet normally reuses his vocabulary, and where he chooses a new or uncommon word like *hleo*, it may be a sign of difficulty with the translation or the original.

This difficulty is very clear in the next verse, in which *rice reðemann* must translate **fenerator.** **fenerator** here is the reading of both the Roman and Gallican psalters, while the Hebrew has **exactor.** These words, and all the commentaries about the verse, refer to usury and its horrible, even diabolical, implications. The translator here jumps directly to these allegorical implications with the double translation *unholde fynd/ rice reðemann*, elaborating by repetition and variation the power, violence, and unfaithfulness of this fiend, this man. Rarely except when referring to God does the translator provide two adjective-noun combinations to render a single noun, but **fenerator** is clearly a problem, and *reðemann*, a *hapax legomenon*, the best solution. The problems of this verse are, to some extent, foreshadowed in the preceding verse.[41]

---

[41] It is, however, likely that the clusters of difficulties the translator has are associated with similar clusters in the Latin text.

Another feature of the metrical psalter which this analysis proves, although in a sense it hardly needed proving, is that the vernacular version does not follow the syntax of the source. Although it was a commonplace of biblical exegesis that not only the word but also the word order (and even the letter order) was sacred,[42] the metrical psalter shows little sign of even an attempt to keep the order of the Latin. For instance, in 111.4, the first word in Old English is the fifth in the Latin, the first word of the Latin is placed at the end of the first line of the verse, and the intervening phrase **in tenebris** is not translated until the second line:

111.4.1-3 Leoht wæs on leodum leofum acyðed,
þam þe on ðystrum þrage lifdan
and hiora heortan heoldan mid rihte;
Exortum est in tenebris lumen rectis corde;

lumen: *leoht*, **Exortum**: *acyðed* and **in tenebris**: *on ðystrum* change the word order in translation so much that it is clear that the synthetic syntax of the Latin gives way to the analytic syntax which is more or less developed in late Old English. The translation is not a replacement for a gloss, because the words do not occur in the same order as in the source. Occasional phrases appear latinate, and others are sometimes thought to be prosaic, but the Latin influence on the syntax of the metrical psalter is not pervasive, nor is the effect of the developing prose style of late Anglo-Saxon England. The method of

---

[42] See, for example, Hrabanus Maurus on the holy task of copying the law of God:

Sunt, fuerant, mundo venient quae forte futura,
Grammata haec monstrant famine cuncta suo.

The letters themselves reveal all knowledge. From P. Godman, *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance.* (London: Duckworth, 1985), p. 248, 'On Writing'.

translation, on the other hand, results in expression which is at times strikingly similar to the rhythmical prose of Ælfric. See, for example, the way in which Ælfric explains the Creation in the *Hexameron*:

> In principio creauit Deus celum et terram;
> Dæt is on Englisc: God ælmihtig gesceop
> ærest on anginne heofonan and eorðan
> (ll. 31-3)[43]

Later in the same text he quotes verses from the Psalms and translates them with additions:

> Be ðam upplicum wæterum awrat se witega ðus:
> Laudate eum celi celorum et aque que super
> celos sunt laudent nomen domini:
> Heriað hine heofonas ðæra heofona heofonas,
> *and* eac ðe wæteru ðe bufan heofonas synd
> herian hi Godes naman; ðus segð ðæt halige gewrit.
> (ll. 156-61)

The rhythmical prose is, not surprisingly, very close to the metrical version of Psalm 148.4:

> Heofonas hine heofena herian georne,
> and þa wæter swylce ðe ofer wolcnum synt
> on heofenhame, herigen drihten.

The similarity shows, perhaps, how close is good prose to poor verse.

The *Paris Psalter*'s syntax, however, is a result primarily of its function as a versified version of a devotional text, and it has most in common with the other liturgical

---

[43] *Exameron Anglice* or *The Old English Hexameron.* ed. S.J. Crawford. Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa Vol. 10. ed. C.W.M. Grein & R.P. Wülker. (Hamburg, 1921), ll. 31-3. For analysis of Ælfric's rhythmical prose see J.C. Pope, ed. *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection.* E.E.T.S. o.s. 259 (Oxford, 1967), pp. 105-136.

poems of the period. The frequent use of passive expressions, as above in 111.4, the presence of anacrusis, and the frequency of unaccented syllables as the poet makes the connections between ideas clear: these are features of late Old English liturgical poetry, of *Judgment Day II*, and to some extent of translation poetry.

Fifth, one of the side effects of doing this kind of analysis is the discovery of the places in the text where word-by-word correspondences cannot be established, where the connection between source and translation is too loose for accurate analysis. For example, the most well-known of these cruces is 107.6, where the translation is loose and the poet misunderstands both **conuallem** and **metibor**. In 105.24 the poet renders what must be a second clause of the verse as *he þæs hæl gehleat and helpe fand*, but the source bears no resemblance to this reading and has **et placauit et cessauit quassatio; Et reputatem est ei in iustitiam.**[44] Word-by-word analysis cannot explain such problems as these, nor can it quite understand such wholesale weakenings of the original as 105.29 **et fornicati sunt in adinuentionibus**: *Eall hi forheoldan heahweorc godes*. In 106.36 the translation is very loose:

> 106.36 Hi wingeardas wyrcean ongunnon,
> sæde seowan, syþþan growan
> lungre land heora aloden wæstmum.
> Et seminauerunt agros et plantauerunt uineos; et fecerunt fructum natiuitatis.

The correspondences in this passage are uncertain, in that *wingeardas* translates both **agros** and **uineas**, while *wyrcean ongunnon* renders **seminauerunt**, *sæde seowan* gives

---

[44] There is no question but that the poet was working from a different version of the Latin than either the Roman or Gallican Psalters, both of which have essentially the same reading here.

plantauerunt, and *growan* translates, unusually, **fecerunt**. This kind of verse cannot be analysed except as a whole.

Word-by-word analysis can also lose track of the syntactic peculiarities of the text, and even assumes that most of the poet's oddities of expression are a result of the need to translate and to write verse at the same time. While this is often true, it is not invariably so. In 106.11.3 the problems of poetic diction lead, as Rissanen argues,[45] to *ane*, meaning 'a single' being unusually placed in opposition to the governing noun: *næfdon þe on foldan fultum ænne.* The need for *f*-alliteration and for a Type A verse require the syntactically unexpected reading. In 107.6.3-5, Grein-Kohler takes *bu* to mean 'both', but Kock suggests that it is parallel with *þa selegesceotu*, so that the translation would be 'I will rejoice, I will divide the homes, the halls, which glorious stand...'[46]

107.6.3-5 'And ic blissige, bu gedæle,
þa selegesceotu, þa on Sycimam nu
and on Metibor mære standað.
Exultabo et diuidam Sycimam; et conuallem tabernaculorum dimetiar.

Here, knowing that the poet never looked forward unless it was unavoidable makes possible yet another translation for *bu*—as a conjunction replacing **et**, and providing alliteration. The translation as a result would be 'And I will rejoice, (and also) divide the halls, which now glorious stand on Sycimam and Metibor.' Given the extent to which

---

[45] Matti Rissanen, *The Uses of One in Old and Early Middle English.* (Helsinki, 1967), p. 40.

[46] See Ernst A. Kock, 'Interpretations and Emendations of Early English Texts XI' *Anglia* 47 (1923), pp. 264-73 at 71.

the poet misunderstood the text here, no interpretation can make complete sense of the verse.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, analysis of the way individual words are treated in the text leads to questions of literacy both at the time when the metrical psalter was first produced, and at the time when it was written into an eleventh century manuscript. What the original purpose of the text was remains unknown. If it was a direct translation intended for those whose knowledge of Latin was scant, its purpose would have been better served by a glossed psalter for several reasons. The level of translation accuracy in this word-by-word analysis is between 75% and 80%, lower for verbs and higher for nouns. If a reader can only discern every three out of four, or even four out of five, words from the Latin text by reference to the Old English, that reader will have great difficulty following the meaning, let alone the details, of the original text. If, on the other hand, the translation was intended for readers and listeners with no Latin at all, the problem is worse. On every occasion that the metrical psalter appeared in late Old English manuscripts, it occurs in close connection with the Latin psalter. In B.N. MS lat. 8824 the two texts are written in parallel columns, in the Canterbury Psalter the metrical psalter is used as a gloss above the Latin text, and in *The Benedictine Office* the Latin version of each psalm verse is given on the line above the metrical version. Only in the *Menologium*, where the Latin would have been out of place in the metre and out of place in the context of a vernacular list of church feasts, does the metrical psalm verse appear without its Latin original. If the metrical psalter was a translation of the Book of Psalms intended to stand alone, then at least one of the more significant copies of the text

might have it without the Latin. In the *Benedictine Office*, for instance, only the vernacular translation is given for the other liturgical poems. If the metrical psalter was directed to those lay members of the aristocracy who were literate only in English,[47] the Latin text should not be so prominently displayed in all the extant manuscripts.

The next problem, of course, is considering the extent to which the metrical psalter could stand alone. No scholar has yet been able to look at any part of the text without immediate reference to the source. For nineteenth and twentieth century readers, then, the text fails as a translation, since the first rule of a translation (according to modern theory) is that it should at least present the appearance of textual integrity, that it be a coherent recreation of the original. However, that the metrical psalter today is always used with reference to the Latin does not mean that this was so in the Middle Ages. Nor does it mean that needing the source as well as the translation for comprehension was a fault in an early medieval translation. We do not understand enough about early medieval standards of literacy.[48] Latin, after all, was an imposed language, a means of communication learned for specific purposes by the clergy and the higher aristocracy (though not even inevitably by kings). It is simplifying matters too much to argue that

---

[47] If such a group existed, despite what Alfred claimed.

[48] Our knowledge is improving. See Rosamund McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word.* (Cambridge, 1989), especially pp. 211-70, and the volume of essays she is editing: *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe.* (Cambridge, forthcoming). See also the discussions of oral and written literacy, and the notion of textual communities in Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy. Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries.* (Princeton, 1983).

the metrical psalter must have been intended only for a secular audience or for nuns whose Latin was not as good as the monks'. The number of translations engendered by the Benedictine Reform suggests that all over the late Old English church a need was acknowledged for vernacular versions of major devotional texts and regulatory texts. The *Regularis Concordia*, not a liturgical text but a necessary text for many reasons, was translated for devout men and women in monasteries and nunneries. So could the psalter be provided in verse for the edification of all.

In addition, the question of literacy also involves a distinction between reading and writing. For instance, Alfred clearly was able to read from an early age, but he seems to have learned to write only late in life. Charlemagne, similarly, could read but not write. If literacy meant reading rather than writing for many of those who were counted as literate, then a text from which the psalter could be read and discussed in the vernacular makes more sense as a tool for devotion.[49] This distinction may, in fact, be what is meant when nuns are described as less knowledgeable than monks. Where monks were expected to write, those nuns who did so were unusual. In this context, a version of the psalms, written in verse so that it could have a mnemonic function, is a tool for literacy and for understanding the text. The poet is, this chapter and its predecessor demonstrate, not a bad latinist; he has difficulty with the difficult parts of the text.[50] He

---

[49] Keefer goes somewhat farther on this point: 'I would therefore suggest that the Old English metrical Psalter was probably intended for oral recitation.' (p. 158)

[50] See C. & K. Sisam, facsimile, p. 17.

is not widely read, but seems to have some knowledge of psalter scholarship, using Gallican readings where necessary, and using the commentaries of Augustine and Cassiodorus at times.[51] The translation though, remains very close to the Latin from which it was rendered, and there is little attempt to explain unusual concepts. Although the word order of the Latin is rarely retained, the words carrying lexical import in the source are carefully translated, and the poet keeps the focus on a membrum-by-membrum rendition of his text. Inside the verse he translates each clause separately, and rarely does the translation extend beyond the particular verse being considered. Analysis of the lexicon and consideration of the method of translation reveal both the advantages and disadvantages of this procedure.

[51] See Tinkler, *Vocabulary and Syntax*, pp. 33-48.

Chapter Five - The Psalter Glosses and their relationship to the *Paris Psalter*

The material of the translation itself suggests the most obvious possible connection to vernacular literature—the psalter glosses.[1] Again and again, the main words of the text, those which translate the Latin, tend to correspond with the interlinear glossing of the psalms in the body of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts collectively known as the glossed psalters. Of the thirty-six extant psalters from Anglo-Saxon times, most of which were produced during the late tenth and eleventh centuries,[2] the psalms are wholly or partly glossed in fifteen of the manuscripts, with the *Paris Psalter* having the only parallel translation. The manuscripts are often display productions, whose layout ranges from the elaborate one of the *Canterbury Psalter*, with its tripartite division of texts and space organized for glosses, to the elegant simplicity of the *Blickling* or *Pierpont Morgan Psalter*, which has only sporadic glosses. The glosses fall into two main types, according to the analysis of their textual relations argued in Kenneth and Celia Sisam's edition of *The Salisbury Psalter*

[1] See the list of glossed psalters, their editions, facsimiles, and works concerning individual texts on pp. vi-viii.

[2] See Gneuss, 'Preliminary List', pp. 1-60.

and in the work of Lindelöf, Wildhagen and Berghaus.[3] The first tradition is a practical and liturgically-functional one, called the A-type gloss after its earliest surviving example, the *Vespasian Psalter.* The second type is based on a more scholarly approach, intended more for careful study than for liturgical use, of which the oldest example is the *Regius* or *Royal Psalter*, the prototype of the D-type gloss. Because it is possible that the *Paris Psalter* poet had one or more glossed psalters available for reference while composing his translation (though not necessarily one of those that happens to survive), the relationship of the metrical psalms to the glossed psalters is a potentially rewarding one.

However, determining what connection, if any, existed between the metrical psalter and the glossed psalters is difficult. Many of the words used in all these texts belong to a common stock of prosaic biblical vocabulary. Whether the psalter poet

---

[3] The psalter glosses are a very specialized field of analysis. See U. Lindelöf, *Studien zu altenglischen Psalterglossen.* Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik 13 (Bonn, 1904) and his edition of the Lambeth Psalter (1909-14) for the foundations of analysis. The division of the glosses into two main types, the further subdivision of the D type, and the discussion of individual psalter glosses is carried further in the writings of K. Wildhagen: *Der Psalter des Eadwine von Canterbury* (dissertation; Halle, 1905); 'Zum Eadwine- und Regius-Psalter,' *Englische Studien* 39 (1908), pp. 189-209; the important 'Studien zum Psalterium Romanum in England and zu seinen Glossierungen (in geschichtlicher Entwicklung)' in *Festschrift für Lorenz Morsbach,* eds. F. Holthausen & H. Spies. Studien zur englischen Philologie, 50 (Halle, 1913), pp. 417-72; 'Das Psalterium Gallicanum in England,' *Englische Studien* 54 (1920) pp. 35-45, and his edition of the Cambridge Psalter. Their work is clarified and further advanced in the introduction to the edition of the Salisbury Psalter by Celia Sisam and Kenneth Sisam, pp. 35-75. More recently, see the wide-ranging study, which attempts a detailed stemma of textual transmission, in F. Berghaus, *Die Verwandschaftverbaltnisse der altenglischen Interlinearversionem des Psalters und der Cantica.* (Göttingen, 1979).

had one or more manuscripts of glossed psalters open before him, or whether he depended on his memory, the psalter poet produced a version of the text which is often readily comparable to one or more of the glossed psalter versions. The vernacular equivalents for Latin words are often the same as in the glossed psalters, and the word-by-word translation of the glossed psalters is often surprisingly similar to the phrase-by-phrase translation in the metrical psalms.

In her book, *The Old English Metrical Psalter*, Sarah Larratt Keefer collates a selected group of psalms with representative texts of the two main psalter gloss traditions.[4] She concludes that the uneven style of the poet suggests an intermediary stage between the Latin and the finished paraphrase. This intermediate stage was probably a vernacular psalter gloss. She argues that between two-thirds and three-quarters of the *Paris Psalter* readings in her study accord in some form with the psalter-glosses.[5] She cites in particular the many examples of vocabulary 'ranges' which 'underline the partial dependence of the Old English metrical psalter on the *Vespasian* tradition.'[6] However, there is also much in common with the D-tradition,

---

[4] S.L. Keefer, *The Old English Metrical Psalter: An Annotated Set of Collation Lists with the Psalter Glosses.* (New York: Garland, 1978). For a typescript of the Old English text used for the collation, which included all the *Benedictine Office* fragments, a run from 51.6-70.22, 94.1-11, 133.1-4, and a short run at the end 148.1-150.3, see her Appendix.

[5] Keefer, p. 143.

[6] Keefer, p. 146.

and Keefer postulates that the poet was working with two or three glossed psalters open in from of him. One of these, she suggests, may well have been K, the Salisbury Psalter, which often accords with *PPs* 'where no other psalter shows the slightest agreement.'[7] Such a conclusion, however, is impossible, because the manuscript of K is of a later date than the metrical psalter's date of composition;[8] the antecedent in question could only have been an ancestor of K.

Keefer discounts the influence of what was probably a common stock of biblical vocabulary, and the self-evident fact that in any given language there exists a relatively limited number of appropriate synonyms to render a word from a foreign language.[9] While it is certainly possible that the psalter poet had access to one or more glossed psalters, it is also likely that his knowledge of the text was not dependent on a crib in either the Latin or the Old English. The possibility of memorial reconstruction might even help to explain the way in which the poet slid over difficult passages in the Latin. Finally, given the number of glossed psalters that survive, it is unwise to argue that one manuscript or version is a direct source, unless there were incontrovertible direct evidence to prove the contention, which there is not.

---

[7] Keefer, p. 152.

[8] See Ker, **379**, which dates K to c. 975. The metrical psalter was probably composed in the mid-tenth century.

[9] See, for instance, the review by Joyce Hill, *Archiv* 218 (1981), pp. 420-22, which concludes: 'A more valuable application of psalter collation lists might be further work on semantics and on vocabulary choices within restricted linguistic conditions.' (p. 422)

It is equally difficult to argue that one psalter tradition rather than the other was the more significant influence, given the admixture of forms present in these texts. That the practical, liturgically-functional gloss might appear the more influential is hardly surprising. The metrical psalms may have been influenced by the tradition of psalter glossing, and may have been translated with the use of the glossed psalters, but these arguments cannot in the end be used to prove a close relationship between a specific psalter gloss or gloss type and *PPs*.

To show the potential ambiguities of the relationship between the *Paris Psalter* and the glossed psalters, Psalm 99 is analysed here in accordance with Wildhagen's method, the method Keefer to some extent follows.[10] However, all the psalter glosses are listed below for comparison, rather than just a selection. There is sufficient variation among these texts that they cannot be readily generalized from for this kind of specific analysis.

1. Iubilate deo, omnis terra/ seruite domino in laetitia
A wynsumiað gode all eorðe/ ðiowiað dryhtne in blisse
B wynsumiað ge gode eall eorðe/ ðeowiað dryhtne on blisse
C wynsumiað gode eall eorðe/ þeowiað drihtne on blisse
D drymað gode eall eorðe/ þeowiað - on blisse
E dremeð gode eælle eorðæ/ ðeowiæþ drihtne on blyssæ
F drymað drintne eall eorðe/ ðeowiað drihtne on blisse
G drymað drihtne ealle eorðan/ [ ] drihtne on blisse
H drymað [ ] ealle eorða/ þeowiað [ ] on blisse
I freodremað drihtne eala eorð/ þeowiað drihtne on blisse
J drimaþ drihtne ealle eorðan/ þeowiað drihtne on blisse
K drymað gode ealle eorþan/ þeowiað drihtene on blisse
L no glosses for this psalm
P Nu ge mycle gefean mihtigum drihtne

[10] This is a representative choice. Analysis of other psalms has led to similar conclusions, but is left out here for reasons of space.

eall þeos eorðe elne hyre,
and blisse gode bealde þeowie.

For the first verse of the psalm, all of these texts use forms of *dryhten*[11], *eorðe*, *þeowian*, and *blisse* for **domino, terra, seruite**, and **laetitia** respectively. These are standard equivalents, not useful for suggesting any influence of one text on another. Where some influence might have been discerned is in the renditions of **iubilate**. Here the two traditions differ, with the A-type having *wynsumiað*, and D-type glosses using *drymeð*. However, *PPs* follows neither tradition, instead reversing the sense so that, rather than a commandment to man to rejoice, the psalm opens with a request to God to hear great joy and rejoicing—*mycle gefean...elne hyre*. No specific influence of one tradition or one text can thus be concluded for 99.1.

2. Intrate in conspectu eius in exultatione
A ingað in gesihðe his in wynsumnisse
B ingað on gesihðe his on wynsumnesse
C ingað on gesihðe his on wynsumnysse
D ingað on gesihðe his on bliþnesse + wynsummunga
E Ongængæþ on gesihþe his on hihte
F infarað on gesyhðe hys on bliðnysse
G [ ]gað on gesihðe his on bliðnes[ ]
H ingaþ on gesihþe his on bliþnesse
I insteppað *vel* ingað on gesihðe his on blisse
J infarað on gesihðe his on bliþnesse
K [..]gaþ on gesyhðe his on bliþnesse
P Gangað on ansyne ealle bliðe;

Here the psalter poet rejects all of the glosses in their reading **conspectu**: *gesihðe* in favour of *ansyne*. *gesihð* occurs fourteen times in *PPs* to mean 'face' or

[11] except D, which tends to leave the gloss for **dominus** blank. D is perhaps the most correct here, since the **nomini domini** are sacred, and need no gloss.

'countenance', twelve of which render **conspectu.**[12] Of the twelve occurrences two do not alliterate. Twice, in 87.14 and 68.17, *gesihð* renders **faciem.** *Ansyne* occurs thirty times in *PPs*, rendering **conspectu** four times, **faciem** twenty times, **imagines** once, and being an addition to the text five times. The poet seems to have a definite preference for rendering **conspectu** with *gesihð* and **facie** with *ansyne.* In all but one of the verses where the reverse occurs the purpose seems to be alliterative, as it is in 99.2.[13] If the poet were following the glosses very closely, however, he should have rearranged his line to produce alliteration. A more interesting choice of vocabulary is the verb *gangað* itself, rather than *ingað*, the most common gloss for **Intrate.** Here, rather than being closer to the A or D-glosses, *PPs* agrees more with the unusual E gloss, *Ongængæð.* The psalter tradition underlying E, the Canterbury Psalter, seems in small details (which can be significant) close to the tradition of *PPs*, despite the close derivation of E from D. Finally, rather than using a *-nysse* suffix with either A's *wynsum* or D's *blið* as the root, *PPs* uses *blið* from the D tradition as an adverb, adding *ealle* for the head stave. The E-gloss choice of *hihte* here shows no relationship to any of the other psalter glosses or to *PPs*. Had the poet been aware

---

[12] in 53.3, 55.7, 67.5, 87.2, 88.32, 95.6, 115.5, 118.168, 118.169, 118.170, 137.1, 140.2, 141.2, 142.2.

[13] Except 68.17, where the purpose may be metrical:

68.17 Ne acyr þu æfre fram þinum cnihte þin clæne gesyhð,
forþan me feondas to feohtað geneahhe;
gehyr me hrædlice and me help freme.
Ne auertas faciem tuam a puero tuo quoniam tribulor uelociter exaudi me.

of the I gloss, he might have found *blisse* useful here.[14]

The Latin psalter underlying the metrical translation probably combined verses 2 and 3, since they are included as one verse here.[15]

3. Scitate quod dominus ipse est deus/ ipse fecit nos et non ipsi nos
A weotað ðæt dryhten he is god/ he dyde usic 7 nales we usic
B weotað ðæt dryhten he is god/he geworhte us 7 nales we us
C witað ge þæt drihtyn he ys god/ he worhte us 7 nalys we usic
D witað þæt drihten he is god/he worhte us 7 na selfe we
E witæð ge þet drihten he is god he dyde us 7 ne he us
F witað ge forðon ðe drihten he is god he dyde us 7 na selfe we
G witað forþam þe drihten he is g[ ] he worhte us 7 na we sylfe us
H witað - - he is god he worhte us 7 na selfe we
I witað *vel* wite ge forþan þe drihten se sylfa is god/ he geworhte us 7 na we selfe
J wite ge forðon drihten he is god/ he geworhte us 7 na silfe we
K [...]taþ forþam drihten he is god/ he dyde us 7 na hine we
P (99.2.2-3) witað wislice þæt he is wealdend god;
he us geworhte and we his syndon.

PPs accords with the glosses in rendering **scitote** as *witað*, but replaces *drihten he is god* with *he is wealdend god*, an epithet for alliteration. The second membrum follows BCDGH in using *worhte* (*PPs geworhte*) rather than *dyde* for **fecit**. To this point *PPs* is almost word for word in its translation of the Latin, and therefore accords very closely with the glosses. However, the Latin **et non ipsi nos** presents difficulties as the idiomatic expression does not easily translate. The glossators provide various solutions, some unsuccessful, to render the negative sense, but the psalter poet

---

[14] although *blisse* does occur 18 times in *PPs*, rendering **laetitia** and its cognate verbs, **iubilatio, delectatio, exultatio**, or as an addition.

[15] This is a useful point for determining the underlying Latin text of *PPs*.

reverses and shifts the meaning with *and we his syndon.* The rendition is not completely accurate, is perhaps metrically unusual (the pronoun has exceptional stress for *w*-alliteration), and does not make use of any of the glosses. It does, however, follow the Hebrew psalter version: **& ipsius sumus.** Rather than follow the psalter glosses, the translator looks to another version of the Latin text.

4. Nos autem populus eius et oues pascuae eius/ intrate portas eius in confessione/ atria eius in hymnis confessionem.[16]

A we soðlice folc his 7 scep leswe his/ ingað geatu his in ondetnisse/ ceafurtunes his in ymenum ondetnissa.

B we soðlice folc his 7 scep læswe his ingað geatu his on ondetnesse cafortunes his on ymenum ondetnessa

C we soðlice folc his 7 scep læswe his/ ingað gatu his on andytnysse cafyrtunys his on ymenum andyttnysse

D we soþlice folc his 7 sceap fostornoðes his/ingað on gatu his on ondetnesse on cæfertunas - on ymnum andetnessa

E Us soðlice folc his 7 sceæp leswæ his/ ongæn gæþ gætu his 7detnesse cafortun his on ymenum 7detnesse

F folc his 7 sceap læswe hys/ infarað gatu his on andetnysse on cafertunas his on ymnum andettað him

G folc his 7 sceap fostornoðes his/ ingað gatu his on anddetnesse cafertunas his on ymenum anddettað him.

H folc his 7 sceap fostornoþes his/ ingaþ on gatu his on andetnesse cafertunas - on ymnum - -

I eala his folc 7 sceap læsuwe his ingað gatu his on andetnesse cafertunas his on lofsangum andettaþ him

J folc is 7 sceap fostornoþes his infaraþ on gatum his on andetnesse of cafertunas his on ymenum andettaþ him

K folc his 7 sceap heorde his/ ingað (MS gap)

P 99.3 We his folc syndan and his fæle sceap
ða he on his edisce ealle afedde;
gað nu on his doru, god andettað,
and hine weorðiað on wictunum

---

[16] The Gallican version here is quite different: **Populus eius et oues pascue eius introite portas eius; in confessione atria eius; in hymnis confitemini illi.** It affects especially FGH.

mid lofsangum lustum myclum.

This verse is somewhat more complex, since it really includes three membra. The psalter poet uses the standard equivalents **populus**: *folc* and **oues**: *scep*, but replaces **pascuas** with an extension, *ða he on his edisce ealle afedde* whose root is *edisc*, rather than *læswe*, from ABCEFIJ, or *fostornoðes* from DGH. Rather than *gatu*, the gloss for **portas**, *PPs* has *doru*, which impedes double alliteration in the line and looks like an error. However, the psalter poet uses *doru* to gloss **portas** three times (106.15, 99.3, 147.2) and **ostium** once (140.4). Never does the psalter poet use *geatu*.[17] This appears to have been an idiosyncratic choice of vocabulary, and is certainly a lexical item in which *PPs* differs from all the psalter glosses. All of the texts render **confessione**: *andetnesse*, although *PPs* uses the word in its verb form *andettað*, and changes to *weorðiað* rather than repeat the word in the next line. **cafertun**, generally rendered in the glosses as a borrowing inflected in the vernacular, is translated five times in *PPs*.[18] In 121.2, 133.2 and 134.2 the metrical psalms accord with the glosses, borrowing the Latin word and inflecting **cafertunum** as a dative plural.[19] In the other two occurrences, close together in 95.8 and 99.3, the

---

[17] Here, at least, *gatu* would create metrical difficulties, for *gað nu on his gatu* would be defective, and the rearrangement *gað nu on gatu his* would break Kuhn's Law (which the poet nevertheless does on other occasions; see Chapter Six).

[18] See H. Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglischen.* (Berlin, 1955), p. 85, for a discussion of this loanword in A. He does not discuss *wictun.*

[19] 121.2.2 on þinum cafertunum, þær ure cyðð wæs,
133.2.2 and on cafertunum Cristes huses

psalter poet uses the loan translation *wictun*. Similarly, in this verse the psalter poet uses *lofsangum*, avoiding the glosses' borrowing *ymenum* for **hymnis**. *hymn*, of course, is a widely distributed borrowing in Old English.[20] *PPs* seems here to depart by choice from the common stock of synonyms available in the psalter glosses.

5. Laudate nomen eius quoniam suavis est dominus/ in aeternum misericordia eius/ et usque in saeculum saeculi veritas eius.

A hergað naman his forðon wynsum is drihten/ in ecnisse mildheortnis his 7 oð in weoruld weorulde soðfestnis his.

B hergað noman his forðon wynsum is dryhten on ecnesse mildheortnes his 7 oð weorold weorolde soðfæstnes his

C hergeað naman his forþon wynsum ys drihtyn on ecnysse mildheortnysse his 7 oð on woruld worulde soðfæstnysse his.

D heriað naman - - wynsum is - on ecnesse mildheortnes his 7 oþ aworuld - soþfæstnes his

E hergæþ nomæ his forðæn swete is drihten on ecnesse mildheortnes his 7 oððet on world æworld soþfestnes his.

F heriað naman his forðanðe winsum is drihten on ecnysse mildheortnyssa his 7 oð on cynrine 7 cynrine soðfæstnys his

G heriað naman his forþam þe wynsum [ ] drihten on ecnesse mildheortnesse his [ ] [ ] on cynrene 7 cynrene soðfæstnes his.

H heriað naman his forþon wynsum is - / on ecnesse mildheortnes his 7 oð - - - soþfæstnes his.

I heriað his naman forþan þe is wynsum - on ecnysse mildheortnyss his oþ on mægþe *vel* on cynren 7 cneorisse his soðfæstnys.

J heriaþ naman his forðon winsum is drihten on ecnesse mildheortnes his 7oð on cneorisse 7 cneorisse soþfæstnesse his.

K gap in manuscript

P Heriað naman drihtnes, forþon he is niðum swæs;
is þin milde mod ofer manna bearn.

In the last verse of the psalm the translator shortens the metrical version,

---

134.2.2 and on cafertunum Cristes huses

[20] See H. Gneuss, *Hymnar und Hymnen im Englischen Mittelalter*. (Tubingen, 1968), pp. 3-9.

conflating the formulaic ending **et usque in saeculum saeculi veritas eius** into *ofer manna bearn* and omitting completely the truth or *soðfæstnesse* of God.[21] The phrase *ofer manna bearn* accords with neither gloss tradition, but the *cynrine 7 cynrine* of FG or the *cneorisse 7 cneorisse* of IJ may be somewhat closer to the idea the poet chooses to convey. All these texts render **laudate**: *heriað*, **nomen**: *naman*, **dominus**: *drihten* (except D) and **quoniam**: *forðon* or a variant thereof. For **suavis** the A-tradition and D-tradition give *wynsum*, the E-gloss *swete*, and *PPs* uses *swæs*. Finally, the psalter poet creates double alliteration by using *milde mod* for **misericordia**, rather than *mildheortnes*, the choice of all the psalter glosses.[22]

In Psalm 99, there are many occasions on which the metrical psalter does agree with one or more of the psalter glosses. The most fruitful comparison, for this psalm especially, is with the occasional different readings found in E, a descendant of the D^k tradition, but with a number of idiosyncratic readings. These readings often come closer to the choices of the psalter poet than do the standard glosses of the two traditions. From this analysis, though, it can be seen that when *PPs* agrees with one or more of the psalter glosses, the reason may often be common sense. Many synonyms for the ideas and concerns of the psalms are not available in the vernacular, and great variation in expression when translating the psalter should not be expected.

---

[21] Nor does the translator render the Hebrew reading **fides**.

[22] This is a common choice in P, when rendering **misericordia**; See E.G. Stanley, 'Studies in the Prosaic Vocabulary of Old English Verse' *NM* 72 (1971), pp. 385-418 at 410, and also H. Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen*, p. 67.

Psalm 99 has shown the frequency with which the psalter poet does choose differently, avoiding a difficult phrase or idea, and even shortening the text considerably. The glossed psalters may have been used for consultation by the translator, but a word-for-word glossed psalter does not appear directly to underlie the metrical psalms. Such a preliminary translation would have forced stricter adherence to the Latin and to a prose-based vernacular vocabulary. The psalter poet, in this psalm certainly, does not appear to have been working under such constraints.

However, the metrical psalter does to some extent belong to a tradition of psalter glossing and psalter study which survives in the glossed psalters. The poet's word choice often corresponds to that of one or more of the psalter glosses and gloss traditions, which suggests either an extensive common stock of psalter equivalents or specific knowledge on the part of the translator of at least one, and probably more than one, glossed psalter. What lies behind the metrical psalter may be less a specific exemplar than a vernacular tradition.[23]

This vernacular tradition remains in any case limited in its influence on the metrical psalter. A large proportion of the text draws from a common stock of psalm vocabulary, perhaps drawn from a particular psalter gloss tradition and perhaps not.

---

[23] For another analysis of this tradition, see H. Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen*, which compares the Vespasian Psalter vocabulary to that of other psalters and other Old English texts. See also Hans Schabram, *Superbia. Studien zum ae Wortschatz I* (Munich, 1965), and , by the same author, 'Etymologie und Kontextanalyse in der altenglischen Semantik' *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 84 (1970), pp. 233-53, which applies the same method briefly to *PPs*.

Largely, the words which correspond are the obvious ones, those for which the psalter glosses themselves use the same vocabulary. Equally, the metrical psalter stands alone against all of the psalter glosses in a remarkable number of readings. In *PPs*, the choice of a translation is influenced by expediency for the sake of alliteration and metre just as much as by expediency in terms of which options the psalter tradition provided. Some of the poet's translations are idiosyncratic, to say the least. For some Latin words he uses the same Old English equivalent again and again, for others he changes the translation with every appearance of the lemma in the text, and for others he varies his equivalents, shifting among a group of words without apparent reason. For still others, he stands alone with new translations, such as *edisc* in 99.3 above.

To show some of the variation in the psalter poet's choices of vocabulary, I have collected a representative selection of vocabulary, including mostly nouns and verbs since those are the parts of speech where differences are most suggestive. Rather than providing the full range of equivalents offered by all the glossed psalters, I have chosen two psalters, one a representative of the A-tradition, and the other a representative of the D^k-tradition—the Salisbury and Cambridge Psalters. These are not perhaps the standard psalter glosses to use for such a comparison, but the D gloss, the Regius Psalter, has been much used earlier in this analysis, and the A gloss, the Vespasian Psalter, is the most widely studied of all the psalter glosses. Also, because the Latin of the Vespasian Psalter underlies all the discussion of translation here, variants from the A gloss are often noted. The C gloss stands quite close to A, correcting some of A's errors and adding some glosses to the practical material of the

A-gloss tradition. Using C for this analysis also means frequent reference to the only psalter gloss edition which commonly prints variants from the other psalters. Similarly, K derives primarily from D, and thus represents the other tradition of psalter glossing, but it also contains a collection of other readings, resulting from further analysis of the text. Also, the edition of K is extremely good, with careful consideration of K's place in the psalter gloss tradition. Comparing *PPs* or P (to use the standard sigla for the whole of the metrical psalter in psalter gloss analysis) to C and K means considering the metrical psalms in connection both with the A and D traditions, and with some of the accretions to those traditions.

The semantic fields represented by the words chosen for this analysis are intended to be disparate. They do not include doctrinal words or words belonging to an exclusively religious lexicon (except **oratio** and **deprecatio**, which do not appear to be studied elsewhere, and are included here for a particular purpose—to show how the Latin psalter underlying the glosses and the metrical translation may perhaps be identified by careful analysis of the words used in translation). Otherwise, the lemmata are a selection from a larger group not reproduced here for reasons of space. They show a wide range of possible synonyms for a small semantic group in the Latin, and reveal the differences between nouns and verbs in the range of translations available for the two parts of speech. There is as little overlap as possible with other studies of psalter gloss vocabulary, and indeed with other, more general, studies of Old English vocabulary.

The Latin lemmata are in alphabetical order, except where there is an overlap

in translation from one word of the source to another, in which case cross-references are used to collect all the relevant lemmata in the same place.[24]

abundantia 71.7 77.25 121.6 .7 144.7

71.7	swiðe genihtsum	K genihtsumnes	C genihtsumnysse
77.25	genihte	K genihtsumnesse	C genihtsumnysse
121.6	geniht	K genihtsumnes	C genihtsumnys
121.7	genihtsum	K genihtsumnes	C genihtsumnys
144.7	þa miclan geniht	K genihðsumnes	C genihtsumnysse

genihtsumnesse never appears in P, and poet invariably shortens to *geniht* or *genihtsum*. The root is the same as that of both psalter traditions, but the poet reworks for his purposes on each occasion of the lemmata. The choice shows, again, the rareness of *-nesse* words in verse.[25]

consolatio, consolor *see* protector

decor *see* figmentum

deliciae *see* figmentum

deprecatio *see* oratio

desiderium 77.29 .30 80.13 102.5 111.10 126.5 139.9

77.29	lusta	K gewilnunga	C gewilnung (lust ABE)
77.29	sceattas willan	K gidsunga	C luste
80.12	willum	K wilnu...	C lustum
102.4	willan	K wilnunga	C lust *vel* gewilnunge
111.9	lust	K gewilnung	C lust
126.6	lust	K gewilnunga	C lust

[24] Because the *Paris Psalter* is being compared here to two glossed psalters, its sigla for this analysis will be P.

[25] See Stanley, 'Studies', and M.S. Griffith, *The Method of Composition of Old English Verse Translation.* (D.Phil., Oxford, 1985), pp. 165-72 and Appendix VI.

139.8 lust K of gewilnunga C luste

P does not have *gewilnung* or *wilnung*, the common equivalent for **desiderium**. The poet uses *willa* three times clustered in the middle of the text. This does not appear in any of the glosses except E (102.4 *willan þinæ*), which at times shares unusual readings with P. *lust* occurs 36 times in the text, of which 31 occurrences are alliterative additions as *lustum*.[26] Once, for its first occurrence in 53.6, *lustum* translates **voluntarie** (K *willynlice*) but the word is thereafter added to alliterate with *lof, lufan*, or *gelyfan*. Of the remaining five occurrences of the noun, in 144.21 *lust* is an addition, and the other four render **desiderium** here as a standard equivalent. Generally, P corresponds more with C for this lemmata, using a good equivalent which is less obvious a prose one than K's *wilnunga*.[27]

dissipo 52.6 67.2 .31 118.126 140.7 143.6

52.6 tosceadeð K not in MS C tostenceað
67.1 toworpen K syn todræued C syn tostencte
67.28 Toweorp K tostenc C tostenc
118.126 toweorpan K tostengton C tostencton
140.9 syndon...toworpene K tostenced C tostencyde
143.7 toweorpest K þu dræuæst C þu tostencyst

tostencan does not appear in P; the poet does not use the most common parallel for **dissipo**. Nor does K's *todrefan* appear in P. *toweorpan* occurs 23x in the metrical psalter, rendering a variety of lemmata. *tosceadan* 'to part, scatter, divide' has only three occurrences, here with slightly stretched meaning, in 87.14 and 81.1 translating **diuido**. The poet, then, did not use the expected equivalents *tostencan* and *todrifan* (5x *P*) in favour of one inaccurate choice towards the beginning of translation, 52.6 *tosceadeð*, and the accurate but unexpected *toweorpan*, used for all remaining occurrences of **dissipo**, despite their being few and well scattered through the text. He does not use the psalter gloss equivalents, but another, equally good, translation.

figmentum 102.14

---

[26] 53.6, 54.12, 54.17, 62.1, 62.5, 64.14, 70.2, 70.7, 75.7, 77.24, 77.33, 80.12, 99.3, 102.11, 103.31, 105.11, 106.21, 115.7, 117.25, 118.17, 118.97, 118.159, 118.167, 118.175, 121.6, 127.1, 129.7, 138.8, 144.20, 145.1, and 145.8.

[27] Cf. Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen*, p. 101 and Schabram, 'Etymologie und Kontextanalyse' pp. 239-45.

species 67.13 .14 95.6 103.1 (becomes **decor** in these psalters)[28]
deliciae 138.11

102.13 þearfe? K ..hiw C gehiwunge *vel* brogedetunge
67.2 wlites K hiw C hiw
67.13 scineð beorhtan? K **pallore**: hwiwe C hiwe
95.6 weorðlic wlite K different lemma? C diff. lemma?
138.9 bleom K bleofæstnes C wistum

decor 92.1 103.1 144.12
decoro 143.12
decorus 146.1 (Ga)

92.2 wlite K wliti C wlite
103.2 wliteandette K wlite C wlite
144.12 not in text K not in text C not in text
143.12 frætwum...gegyrede? K **circumornate**: ymbegyrnd? C ornate: gefrætwude?
146.1 wlitegum K — C not in text

wlite appears in the text 6x, *wlitan* once, 65.6, rendering **respiciunt**, and *wliteandette* once (103.2). It translates **decor** twice, **conspectu** once, **species** once, and is an addition to the text in 56.13 and 95.7.[29] *bleo* appears only once, to render the only appearance of **deliciae** in the metrical psalter. For **figmentum**, the common translation, given in both C and K, is *hiw* but *hiw* appears nowhere in *P*, neither in prose nor metrical portions. Cameron notes that translators use some form of **decorum, figmentum**: *hiw* and P readings often differ.[30] In 102.13 poet uses filler phrase *æt þearfe* rather than any translation. On other occasions where *hiw* would be

---

[28] The Anglo-Saxon psalters tend to use **decor** where Continental ones have **species**. See Weber, *Psautier romain*, **passim.**

[29] 56.13.2-3 is ofer ealle eorðan swylce
þines wuldres wlite wide and side.
et super omnem terram gloria tua.
95.7.1-2 Bringað nu drihtne þu ætsomne
wlite and are, wuldor ðridde,
Adferte domino patriae gentium; adferte domino gloriam et honorem;

[30] Angus Cameron, *The Old English Nouns of Colour: A Semantic Study.* (B.Litt., Oxford, 1968), p. 71.

appropriate the poet reworks the text. In 103.1 and 144.12 all three Anglo-Saxon psalters do not have variant Roman readings, and in 146.1 C does not have Gallican reading **decoraque**, K has it but offers no translation, and only P translates with *wlitegum*.[31]

gressus 67.25 72.2 84.14 118.133 139.5
ingressus 67.25

67.23 gangas	K stæppas	C gongas
72.1 gangas	K stæppas	C stæpas
84.12 gangas	K stæppas	C gongas
118.133 on rihtne weg	K stæppas	C gongas
139.5 gang	K ...pas	C gangas
67.23 gangas	K blank	C on gonge

Old English *stæppa* never appears in P, although it occurs once in J, at 24.3 as an addition to the text. P appears to accord with A-type gloss, but *ganga* is most obvious equivalent, especially if *stæppa* is not used. Gallican and Hebrew Psalters agree with Roman except for 67.25, where Ga has **ingressus** twice, and He has **itinera** twice.

inferior 62.10 85.13 87.7 138.15

62.9 **inferiora terrae**: þa eorðscræfu	K þa neoþeran	C þa nyðyrran
85.12 hinderþeostrum	K þære neoþeran	C þære nyðyrran
87.6 hinder	K þam neoðeran	C þan nyðyrran
138.15 niðerdælum	K þære neoþeran	C þam nyðyrrum

The poet has trouble with **inferiori** but does not appear to find successful equivalent until last appearance when uses *niðer* (used throughout in psalter glosses) as part of *hapax legomenon niðerdæl*.[32] He first uses *eorðscræfu*, combining **inferiora terrae**. *eorðscræfu* has only two appearances in text, here and very shortly thereafter in 67.7, an alliterative addition to the text. For next two occurrences poet uses *hinder*, first as compound half-line alliterating with *of helwarena* to translate **ex inferno inferiori**.

---

[31] *wlite*: with *weorðlic* twice, *wuldur* once, *weorðlic* and *wuldur* once; *wliteandette* once with *weorðlice*.

[32] Part of the problem may be confusion with **inferi**, which is glossed in Vespasian *helwearan*. Cf. Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen*, p. 92.

For next occurrence the poet uses *hinder* alone, its only occurrence with this meaning 'the farthest part, i.e. hell' (again a stretched translation). For last occurrence poet finds useful equivalent *niðerdæl*. He does not use the gloss of both C and K until the last occurrence of the lemmata.

ingressus *see* gressus

inproperium *see* obprobrium

lauo 57.9 62.5 72.11 118.48

57.9 ðwehð K he wæxt C he ðwyhð
62.5 þwea K **leuabo**: ic uphebe C **leuabo**: ic uppahebbe
72.11 þwoh K ic wox C ic þwea
118.48 hof K **leuaui**: ic ahof C **leuaui**: ic ahof

þwean occurs only 3x in *P*, always in context of washing hands; it never alliterates but is always in a line with *h*-alliteration. Verb has only two other verse occurrences: *Psalm 50* l. 38 *Aðweah, Christ III* l. 1320.[33] P does not use the equivalent of K, and corresponds to C. All texts *have* variant **leuaui** in 118.48 but *P* either a variant in source of 62.5 or a misreading. Rather than **leuabo**, the text from which P was translated may have read **lauabo**; the poet did not check the reading against the psalter glosses.

lingua 54.10 56.5 63.4 .9 65.17 67.24 70.24 72.9 77.36 80.6 108.3 118.172 119.2 .3 125.2 136.6 138.4 139.4

54.8 geðeode	K tungas	C tungan
56.5 tungan	K tunge	C tunge
63.3 tungan	K tungan	C tungan
63.7 tungan	K tuncge	C tungan
65.15 tungan	K tungan	C tungan
67.23 tungan	K tungan	C tunge
70.22 tunge	K tunge	C tunge
72.7 tungan	K tungan	C tunge
77.35 cuts	K tungan	C tunge
80.6 not in MS	K tungan	C tungan
108.2 on tungan	K of tungan	C tungan
118.172 tunge	K tunge	C tunge
119.2 tungan	K tungan	C tungan

[33] See the Microfiche Concordance, and Stanley, 'Studies', pp. 415-6.

119.3	tungan	K	tungan	C	tungan
125.2	tungan	K	tunge	C	tunge
136.5	tunge	K	tunge	C	tunge
138.2	tungan	K	tungan	C	tungan
139.3	tungan	K	tungan	C	tungan

tunge 15x in *P*, all translating **lingua** after one initial use of *geðeode*. The calque is preferred. Once, the last part of clause is cut and the translation lost (77.35) but otherwise poet uses standard Old English equivalent, corresponding to both psalter glosses.

meditor 62.7 70.24 76.7 .13 89.9 118.15 .16 .47 .70 .78 .99 .117 .148 142.5 (twice)
meditatio 118.24 .77 .92 .97 .99 .143 .174

62.7	gewene	K	ic smæge	C	ic smeage
70.22[34]	mærde	K	smæde	C	bið smeagynde
76.6	ongann hycggean	K	ic gemyndi	C	smeagynde
76.10	metegian ongan	K	ic smæge	C	smeagynde
89.10	?beoð...gnornscendende	K	smædon	C	wæryn smeagynde
118.15	not in text	K	not in text	C	not in text
.16	meteode	K	ic smæge	C	ic smeage
.47	mote/gemetegian	K	ic smæge	C	ic smeage
.70	on modsefan minum healde	K	smægende	C	smeagynde
.78	not in text	K	not in text	C	not in text
.99	not in text	K	not in text	C	not in text
.117	symble þence	K	ic smæge	C	is smeage
.148	spyrian georne	K	ic smæde	C	ic sneage
142.5	metegade on mode	K	smægende	C	smeagynde
142.5	hogode georne	K	ic smæde	C	ic smeage

118.24	ic hi on mode metegie georne	K	sm...	C	smeaung
.77	metegung on modsefan	K	smægung	C	smeaung
.92	on mode minum hæfde	K	smægung	C	smeaung
.97	on mode metegade georne	K	smægung	C	smeaung
.99	hæfde andgyt æghwær gleawast	K	smægyng	C	smeaung
.143	on minum mode hi metegade georne	K	smægung	C	smeaung

---

[34] means 'to celebrate, glorify', here and in 77.7.3 as addition:
77.7.2-3 þæt hi heora bearnum budun and sægdun,
and cinn oðrum cyðden and mærden.
ut notam faceret ea filiis suis; ut cognoscat generatio altera.

.174 elne metige K smæigunc C smeaung

scrutor 63.7 76.7 108.11 118.2 .34 .69 .115 .129 138.23

63.5 smeagað	K hi scrudnodon	C smeagynde hi
76.6 not in text	K not in text	C not in text
108.11 cut	K ascrudnige	C smeage
118.2 smeagan	K scrudniaþ	C smeageað
.34 smeage	K scrudnige	C ic smeage
.69 atredde	K scrudnige	C ic smeage
.115 smeage	K ic scrudnige	C ic smeage
.129 smeað	K scrudnode	C smeagynde
138.20 not in text	K not in text	C not in text

The psalter glosses offer *smeaung*, *smeagung*, *smeagan* for **meditor**, but P avoids throughout, using verb phrases and stretching meanings. None of *gewenan, mæran* and *hycgan* is very successful, and the poet may invent a new meaning for *metegian*, from 'to weigh in mind, consider' extrapolating to 'to meditate, to consider every part of'. The notion of using the mind remains in most of the rest of the equivalents for **metibor**, but they are an odd collection. For **meditatio** the poet again avoids *smeaung* and its cognates, but produces a somewhat more coherent group of replacements. **meditatio** is split into its component parts of 'to consider', 'to have in mind' and different combinations of *mode* and *metegung* appear, with *metegian* the verb even being used in 118.174. The reason, if reason it is, why the poet does not use *smeagan* for **meditor** becomes clear in his choice of equivalents for **scrutor**, where in all occurrences but one *smeagan* appears. *smeagan* occurs 6x in P, the five here and once as *smeagende* in 76.10 in a line extending the translation of **meditor**:

76.10.1-3 þa ic metegian ongan mænigra weorca,
hu ic me on eallum þam eaðust geheolde;
on eallum þinum weorcum ic wæs smeagende.
Et meditatus sum in omnibus operibus tuis;

The D-gloss *scrudnian* does not appear in P. The poet parallels the choice of the A-gloss. 118.69, the one exception to the **scrutor**: *smeagan* rule, is particularly interesting as *atreddan* is a verb unique to *P*, occurring only here and in 138.2 where *atreddest* renders **inuestigasti**. The meaning of the verb, here at least, seems to be 'to examine, investigate; to know'.

obprobrium 56.4 68.8 .10 .11 .20 73.22 77.66 78.4 .12 88.42 .51 108.25 118.22 .39 122.4

56.3	edwit	K hosp	C edwit
68.8	edwit	K hosp	C **inprop.**: edwit
68.9	edwita	K hospas	C edwit
68.10	edwit	K hosp	C edwit
68.19	not in text	K **inprop.**: hosp	C **inprop.**: edwit
73.20	edwita fela	K hosp	C **inprop.**: edwit
77.66	edwit	K hosp	C hosp
78.4	edwitstæf	K on hosp	C edwit
78.13	edwit	K **inprop**: hosp	C **inprop.**: on edwit
88.35	edwit	K hosp	C edwit
88.44	edwitspræce	K hospes	C edwit
108.24	edwitstæfe	K MS lost	C edwit
118.22	facen and edwit	K hosp	C edwit
118.39	edwitt	K hosp	C edwit
122.4	edwite	K hosp	C edwit *vel* hosp

inproperium 68.8 .20 .21 73.22 78.12 106.39

68.21	hearmedwit feala	K on hosp	C on edwit
106.39	not in text	K not in text	C not in text

hosp, the standard reading of K, does not appear in P. **obprobrium** and **inproperium** appear to be interchangeable in source, but both invariably rendered by some form of *edwit* in *P*, a similar choice to that occurring in C. *edwit* 13x (73.9, 88.45, and 11x above), edwitstæf unique to P for three occurrences 78.4, 108.24 and 118.42, *edwitspræc* 2x 88.44 and 101.6, *hearmedwit* only 68.21.

oratio 53.4 54.2 60.2 .6 63.2 64.3 65.19 .20 68.14 79.5 83.9 85.1 .6(twice) 87.3 .14 .15 89.1 101.1 .2 .18 105.44 108.7 114.1 118.169 129.2 (twice) 139.7 140.1 .2 .5 141.1 .3 .7 142.1 144.19

53.2	gebed	K gebed	C gebed
54.1	gebed	K gebed	C gebed
60.1	gebed	K to gebede	C gebede
60.4	gebed	K gebed	C gebed
63.1	gebed	K gebed	C gebed
64.2	gebed	K gebed	C gebed
65.17	bene	K **depre**: bene	C **depre**: bene
65.18	bene	K gebed	C **depre**: bene
68.13	gebed	K bed	C gebed
79.5	gebed	K gebeda	C gebede
83.7	gebed	K bene	C **precem**: bene
85.1	not in source?	K not in text	C not in text
85.5	gebed	K gebed	C gebed

87.2 ingebed K **precem**: gebed C gebed
87.13 gebed K gebed C gebed
87.14 gebed K gebed C gebed
89.1 not in source? K not in text C not in text
101.1 gebed K gebeda C gebed
101.2 benan? K not in text C not in text
101.15 bene K gebedan C gebedu
105.33 bene K gebeda C gebedu
108.6 gebed K gebed C gebed
114.1 gebedes bene K gebeda C gebedys
118.169 gebedum K **deprec**: gebed C gebed
129.1 gebedes bene K not in MS C gebed
129.2 gebedd K not in MS C gebed
139.6 gebed K **deprec**: gebedes C gebedys
140.1 bene K not in text C **orationis**: gebedys
140.2 gebed K gebeda C gebed
140.8 gebed K gebed C gebed
141.1 not in source? or biddende
K **deprecatus sum**: ic halsode C **deprecatus**: biddynde
141.2 bene K gebeda C gebed
141.6 cut K gebedan C gebede
142.1 gebed K gebed C gebed
144.19 bene K **deprec**: gebeda C gebedu

deprecatio 54.2 60.2 65.19 .20 85.6 114.1 118.169 Ga 129.2 Ga 139.7 140.1 141.3 .7 142.1 144.19 Ga

54.1 bene K bed C bene
60.1 bene K gebed C beny
65.17 bene K bene C bene
65.18 bene K **orationem**: gebed C bene
85.5 cut K bene C bene
114.1 gebedes bene K orationis: gebeda C **orationis**: gebedys
118.169 gebedum K **deprec**: gebed C **oratio**: gebed
129.2 gebedes bene K not in text C **orationem**: gebed
139.6 gebed K **deprec**: gebedes C **orat**: gebedys
140.1 bene K not in text C **orat**: gebedys
141.2 bene K **orat**: gebeda C **orat**: gebed
141.6 cut K **deprec**: gebedan C **orat**: gebede
142.1 gebed K **orat**: gebed C **orat**: gebed
144.19 bene K **deprec**: gebeda C **orat**: gebedu

Different copies of the Roman psalter had quite different distributions of **oratio** and **deprecatio**, variations which affected the original translation and glosses underlying

the extant psalter glosses and P. There appears to be an Anglo-Saxon tradition preferring **oratio**: *gebed* and **deprecatio**: *ben* , a convention which the poet follows. *gebed* occurs in P 24 times, on all but one occasion to render **oratio** (87.2 **precem**: gebed). *ben* occurs 14 times, of which 10 probably render **deprecatio**, 2 may render **oratio** (which is dubious), one in 118.70 renders **postulatio**, and one in 105.13 renders **petitionem**. In the text from which the metrical version was translated, **deprecatio** probably appeared in preference to **oratio** in 65.17, 65.18, and 144.19 (supported by either the Latin or the vernacular of at least one of K and C) and possibly in 105.33, 140.1, and 141.2. The circumstances are more difficult to determine in 114.1 and 129.1, where P gives both vernacular equivalents, alliterating them with each other. Since the glosses favour *gebed*, it seems likely that **oratio** was the reading in these verses. In 101.2 there is nothing in either glossed psalter to suggest what the source is, and the Roman Psalter glossary suggests only **oratio**, but it seems possible that *benan* translates **deprecatio** or **prece**. In 101.15 the situation is rather more complex:

101.15 Oft he þearfendra bene ðance gehyrde,
and he ne forhogode heora hold gebed.
Respexit in orationem humilium; et non spreuit precem eorum.

Here, the word order of the source would suggest **orationem**: *ben* and **precem**: *gebed*, the reverse of the apparent convention. However, this may be a case in which the need to produce verse overcame scruples about the translation. *Oft he þearfendra gebed* would make a Type 3B*1b with a long medial drop, and *heora hold bene* would be an acceptable Type 2C1b in the b-verse. Metrically the translation as it stands is perhaps preferable, with an unexceptionable Type 2A1a with anacrusis starting the psalm verse (101.15.1a), and a Type 2B1b closing it (101.15.2b). It seems unlikely that the readings of 101.15 suggest any permanent departure from convention by the poet.

The most interesting reading to emerge from this comparison, however, is *ingebed*, a *hapax legomenon* in 87.2:

87.2 Gange min ingebed on þin gleawe gesihð;
ahyld eare þin and gehyr min gebed.
Intret in conspectu tuo oratio mea; inclina aurem tuam ad precem meam.

Here, the translator renders **oratio** : *ingebed* and **precem**: *gebed*, a repetition which seems unlikely. However, if *min ingebed* is an example of eyeskip in which the *-in* of *min* was repeated by a scribe at the beginning of the following word, then the repetition of *gebed* seems even more obvious, especially when **precem** should, it would seem, be rendered *ben* . The verse is probably defective; this is also the only occasion in the text where a *hapax legomenon* results from the use of *in-*. Because the poet normally reuses his material and this never recurs, it seems unlikely that this is an intended *hapax legomenon*.[36] *ingebed* may perhaps be an attempt to

---

[36] See Tinkler, p. 25, who agrees for other reasons, classifying *ingebed* as a ghost

camouflage *gebed* later in the verse.

parabola 68.12 77.2

68.11 wæfersyn K bispel C bispell
77.2 anlicnessum K bigspellan C bispellum

The poet does not use *bispell*, the reading in both C and K, for **parabola**, mistaking its meaning 'allegory, similitude or parable' to be 'spectacle, show'. He might be suggesting the underlying purpose of a parable, to demonstrate and to reveal meaning, but neither *anlicness* 'resemblance' or *wæfersyn* 'spectacle, sight, show' is a very accurate equivalent.

pellis 103.2

103.3 hyde K fel C fell

P uses different equivalent, perhaps for alliteration, perhaps by preference.

plantare 79.9 .10 .16 91.14 93.9 103.16 106.37
plantatio 143.12

79.8 asettest K plantudest C plantodyst
79.9 settest K — C plantodyst
79.14 sette K plantode C geplantode
91.12 Settað K plantode C geplantode
93.9 worhte K plantode C plantode
103.16 ðu...gesettest K du plantudest C þu geplantodyst
106.35 gesetton K plantodan C plantodon
143.14 settum beamum[37] K plantunga C plantunge

Old English verb *plantian* never appears, possibly because of difficulties with alliteration; on all but one occasion **plantare**: *settan*. P follows neither K nor C.

platea 54.12 143.14

---

word.

[37] *bogum æþelum settum beamum* cf. F J *æðele plantunge*; A *niowe plant steaðelunge.*

54.10 weorþige	K feldan	C wurðigum
143.18 worðum	K stræte	C strætum

stræt does not appear in P; *worð* only once here 143.14; *weorþige* 54.10, 55.9, 137.2. Again, P does not use either of the glosses in K, but does correspond to C for one translation. P misses the obvious translation *stræt*.

princeps 67.26 .28 75.13 81.7 82.12 86.6 104.20 .21 .22 106.40 112.8 117.9 118.23 .161 145.2 148.11

67.24 ealdormen	K ealdras	C ealdoras
67.25 ealdormenn	K ealdras	C ealdormen
75.13 wera?	K ealdra	C aldyrmanna
81.7 ealdormann	K ealdran	C ealdormannum
82.9 ealdormenn	K ealdras	C ealdormenn
86.5 frumsprecend	K ealdra	C ealdormonna
104.16 ealdormen	K alder	C ealdormann
104.17 anweald? he?	K alder	C ealdormann
104.18 ealdormen	K aldras	C ealdormenn
106.39 ealdormen	K ealdras	C ealdormenn
112.7 ealdordom...folces fruman	K ealdran	C ealdormannum
117.9 ealdormen	K ealdermen	C ealdormannum
118.23 ealdormenn	K ealdras	C ealdormenn
118.161 ealdurmanna	K ealderas	C ealdormen
145.2 ealdurmenn	K ealdermen	C ealdormannum
148.11 ealdormen	K ealdras	C ealdor[ ]

See Griffith p. 217, which points out that 10 of 13 verse occurrences of *ealdorman* are in P (He misses *ealdurmann*, and the correct figures are 12 of 15). In all cases *ealdormann* alliterates. However, the poet in other renditions will contract the Old English word to such shorter versions as K's *alder*; he does not do so here. The four occasions where **princeps** is not rendered *ealdormann* are well spread through the text, and they cannot be a clustered change. Two perhaps suggest an allegorical reading of **princeps** as every man (75.13, 86.5), one is probably an expansion based on *ealdormann* (112.7) and the last is a possible misreading of **princeps** as **principio** (104.17). The preference of the poet for the prose word *ealdormann*, when *ealdras* is certainly available, even used three times in K, is inexplicable. A wide range of synonyms is available, especially from the heroic poetry, to render **princeps**, and the poet eschews them all, using here the psalter gloss vocabulary.

protector 58.12 70.3 .6 83.10 113.17 .18 .19 143.2

58.11 wealdend	K frofer	C gescyldynd[38]
70.2 þeccend	K gescylden	C gescyldynd
70.5 mundbyrd...þeccend	K frofer	C gescyldynd
83.8 scyldend	K frofer	C gescyldynd
113.18 fælne fultum	K gescyld	C gescyldynd
113.19 fultum[39]	K —	C gescyldynd
113.20 scyldend	K frofer	C gescyldynd
143.3 mihtig scyldend	K gescyldend	C gescyldynd

refugium 58.17 70.3 89.1 90.2 .9 93.22 103.18 143.2

58.17 helpe æt ðe	K frofer	C gebeorg
70.3 freoða fultumiend	K frofer	C gebeorg
89.1 friðstol	K frofer	C gebeorh
90.2 fæle fultum...freond[40]	K frofer	C gebeorh
90.9 friðstol	K frofer	C gebeorh
93.19 friðstol	K frofre	C gebeorh
103.17 fleoð??rewritten	K help	C gebeorh
143.2 frið and fultum	K frouer	C gebeorh

consolatio 93.19 118.24
consolor 68.21 70.21 76.3 85.17 118.5-0 .52 .76 .82 125.1 134.14

93.17 frofre	K frofra	C frofre
118.24 frofre	K frofer	C frofor
68.20 frefrend	K frefrode	C frefriynde
70.21 not in exemplar?	K not in text	C not in text
76.3 frofre	K beon gefrefrod	C frefrian
85.17 frefredest	K frefrodest	C frefriynd
118.50 frofre	K frefrod	C frefriynde
.52 wurde afrefred	K gefrefrod	C frefnyd
.76 frofre	K gefrefrige	C frefrie
.82 frefrade	K frefrast þu	C frefryst þu
125.1 afrefrede	K frefrede	C frefriynde

---

[38] For *gescildend* see Gneuss, *Lehnbildungen*, pp. 55-6. It is common in the prose section of the *Paris Psalter*.

[39] 113.18 and 113.19, translate **adiutor** and **protector** together.

[40] renders **refugium** and **susceptor**.

134.14 frefriend K **deprecabitur**: he bið gefrefred C bið frefryd

C designates one Old English equivalent for each word: for the Latin **protector**: *gescyldynd*, **refugium**: *gebeorh*, **consolor**: *frofor* and variants. K uses *frofor* for **consolor**, like C, but also uses predominantly *frofor* for **refugium**, with only one instance of *helpe*, and for **protector** uses *frofor* four times, *gescyldend* three times. P follows neither procedure, except that it does use *frofor* throughout for **consolor** and **consolatio**. For **refugium** the poet uses a variety of equivalents, not including either C's *gebeorh* or K's *frofer*. The poet uses *fultum* and variants of *freoð* including the only three occurrences in this text of the heroic noun *friðstol*. The awkward reading of 103.17.4 *erinaces fleoð oft on stanas* may also be illuminated by seeing *fleoð* as a possible corruption of *freoð*, a more common equivalent for **refugium**. However, the line does make sense as it stands. For **protector** the poet has a number of equivalents: *wealdend* to start with, then two successive occurrences of *þeccend*, the only three occurrences of *scyldend* in this text, and *fultum* twice. The poet, then, comes to prefer *scyldend* for **protector**, some variant of *frið* for **refugium**, and uses *frofor* exclusively for **consolor**, with *fultum* and other equivalents available where necessary for the first two lemmata. The poet invariably renders **consolor**: *frofor* but changes the equivalents for other words of very similar meaning.

pupillus 81.3 93.6 108.9 .12 145.9

81.3 steopcildum	K wædlan	C fædyrleasne
93.6 steopcilda	K stepcild	C fædyrlease
108.9 steopcild	K **orfani**: steopcild	C **orfani**: steopcild
108.12 steopcildum	K steopcildan	C fæderlease
145.8 wencelum	K steopcild	C fædyrleasne

The poet never uses the A-type reading *fæderleas* nor the initial gloss of K *wædla*. Again, he translates from a more Roman exemplar without **orfani**, but does use, until the last translation, the later gloss *steopcild*. 145.8 is a unique appearance in the text of *wencel*, for alliterative reasons in the difficult line *weodewan wencelum; he hiom wel onfehð*.

refugium *see* protector

scrutor *see* meditor

semen 68.37 88.5 .30 .37 .45 101.29 104.6 105.27 111.2 125.6

68.36 eþel?	K sæd	C sæd
88.3 cynne and cneowmagum	K sæd	C sæd
88.27 wyrce?	K sæd	C **sedem**: setl
88.32 his agen cynn	K sæd	C sæd

88.45 setl	K **sedem**: setl C **sedem**: setl
101.25 heora sylfra cynn	K sæd C sæd
104.6 cynn	K sæd C sæd
105.21-2 skips clause	K sæd C sæd
111.2 eadig and spedig?	K sæd C sæd
125.5 heora sylfra sæd	K **semina**: sæd C **semina**: sæd

sæd in P in 125.5 meaning 'offspring, posterity' and in 80.15, 106.36, both suggesting 'fruit, sowing': 106.36 **seminauerunt**: *sæde seowan*, 80.15 **saturauit eos**: *oþþæt hi sæde wæron* (means 'sated'?). The poet avoids **semen**: *sæd*, except once at end of translation. He does use *sæd* three times, with a different meaning each time. He also translates from a copy of the Roman psalter apparently more accurate in two places than C and K. There is no fixed equivalent for **semen**. In several of the psalm verses, *cynn*, a translation unique to P, but appearing in both the poetic and prose versions, is a good choice for the context.

species *see* figmentum

tempto 77.18 .41 .56 94.9 105.14

77.20 costadan	K fandodan	C costodon
77.41 costodan	K fandodan	C costodon
77.56 cut	K costnodon	C costodon
94.9 cunnedan	K fandodan	C costodon
105.12 costedan	K fandodan	C costodon

fandian does not appear in P, but *costian* appears 7x, varying in meaning from 'to tempt' to 'to examine, prove' and 'to provoke'. The poet also uses *cunnian* once for **tempto**, a choice of word which appears twice in 94.9 and twice more in the text.[41] The uniformity of the A-type gloss disappears, as does the equivalent *fandian* from the D-type gloss. The poet uses, or cuts, as is convenient.

---

[41] In 70.10 as an addition to the text meaning 'to make a trial of, to search into':

70.10.1-2 Cweþað cuðlice: "Wuton cunnian,
hwænne hine god læte swa swa gymeleasne;
Dicentes deus dereliquit eum;

Also in 79.6, again as addition:

79.6 þu us asettest/on sarcwide
urum neahmannum; nu we cunnion,
hu us mid fraceðum fynd bysmriað.
Posuisti nos in contradictionem uicinis nostris; et inimici nostri deriserunt nos.

tribulatio 53.9 54.4 58.17 59.13 65.11 .14 70.20 76.3 77.42 .49 80.8 85.7 90.15 106.39 107.13 114.3 117.5 118.143 137.7 141.3 142.11

53.7 earfoðum	K geswince	C geswencednysse
54.2 fæcne niðas	K geswencednesse	C geswencydnysse
58.17 costunge cnysedon	K geswinces	C geswinces
59.10 earfoðum	K geswince	C geswencednysse
65.10 bealuwa fela	K geswinc	C gedrefydnysse
65.13 costunge cnyssedan	K geswinc	C geswencydnysse
70.19 earfoðes feala...costung...oncnyssedest	K geswinces	C geswencydnysse
76.2 earfoðdæg	K geswinces	C geswencydnysse
77.42 gewindæg	K gedrefednesse	C swencyndys
77.49 not translated	K gedrefednesse	C geswencydnysse
80.8 not in MS	K geswince	C geswince
85.6 earfoðe/carelice cnyssedon	K geswinces	C geswincys
90.15 earfoþum	K geswince	C geswince
106.38 costunge	K geswince	C geswencydnysse
107.11 earfoðum	K geswice	C geswencydnysse
114.4 costung	K geswinc	C geswencydnyssa
117.5 costunge	K geswince	C geswince
118.143 costunga cnysdan	K geswinc	C geswencydnys
137.7 costunga cnysdan	K geswinces	C geswincys
141.2 earfeþu	K gedreuednes	C geswencydnysse
142.12 costunge	K gedriuednesse	C geswince

There is no appearance of *geswinc* or *geswencednesse* in P; the verb *geswencan* occurs three times 101.2, 101.4, 106.38, and only in the last appearance is there any possible connection to **tribulatio** (except that *costunge* appears to render the Latin lemma). Also, there are no occurrences in P of *gedrefednesse*, although *gedrefan* appears 16x in text. After initial confusion translation settles to either *earfoð* or *costung*, the latter often collocated with *cnyssan*. Note 76.2 *earfoðdæg* precedes 77.42 *gewindæg* (**in die tribulantis**) and may help explain that *hapax legomenon*. Note also 70.19, where the poet collects all the elements of his translation of **tribulatio.**

zelus 68.10 77.58 78.5 118.139

68.39 heard ellenwod	K tyrging	C hatheortnys[ ]
77.58 **ira:** yrre	K **iram:** yrre	C **iram:** yrre
78.5 yrre	K yrre	C hatheortnys
118.139 heard ehtnes?	K æfþanca	C ellyn

hatheortnes never appears in P; *ellen* occurs two times and in two compounds, *æfþanca* appears once, awkwardly in 98.9 to render **studia**, and *tyrging* never. *heard*

in both cases occurs for alliteration with *hus* rendering **domus** (cf. C, not K). Again, all these texts agree in one reading different from RPs. The translation of **zelus** changes throughout the text, varying from the useful compound *ellenwod* to the less strong *yrre*.

These and other clues in the text suggest that the psalter poet uses some words and avoids others. Sometimes the choice seems to have been for dialectal reasons, including the use of *hycgan* throughout the metrical psalter in contexts where Alfred in his prose translation used *hopian*.[42] Although the poet avoids *hopian*, he does mingle *hycgan* with the later verb *hogian*. *hycgan* appears eleven times in the text and the late West Saxon variant *hogian* appears nine times, both usually translating **spero**. The poet, like many other Old English poets, does not seem to have felt any dialectal restriction of the two verbs.

Other preferences follow what seems to have been standard Anglo-Saxon convention, such as **dominus**: *drihten* and **deus**: *god*, or **populus**: *folc* and **gentes**: *þeod* (although neither of these distinctions is invariable in the metrical psalms, and in fact toward the end of the text they are treated almost interchangeably). The poet perforce uses a large number of prose words, but he appears to try to limit them, such that, for instance, the prose preposition *betweoh* occurs only twice.[43] Similarly, *soðfæstnes*, a prosaic word which only occurs 49 times in verse, 45 of which are in

---

[42] See Franz Dietrich, 'Hycgan und Hopian' *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum* 9 (1853), pp. 214-22.

[43] The first time (87.4) *betweoh* is needed for alliteration; in 88.5, shortly thereafter, it does not alliterate but comes immediately before a line with *b*-alliteration. See Griffith, pp. 163-4.

P, translates **iustitia,** (which occurs 59 times in the source), **iustificatio** (32 occurrences), **ueritas,** (47 occurrences), and possibly other lemmata.[44] That the poet uses *soðfæstness* for 45 of these 138 lemmata may suggest that he finds the prose word a useful but not invariable translation. Still other preferences can only be called idiosyncratic. For **libera** the poet has available two useful verbs—*gefreogan* and *alysan*—but *gefreogan* occurs only once in the text, as an infinitive in the difficult verse 93.1; *alysan* appears 51 times, 37 of them rendering **libera.** The verbal prefix *wið-* occurs 18 times in the text, but, strangely, nearly all of these occurrences fall between Psalms 50 and 95, in the first half of the extant translation.[45] These are odd, and apparently individual, vocabulary choices.

The psalter poet's approach to his text is not entirely consistent. For one noun, **lingua,** he makes a single translation with *geðeode,* and then settles into the standard equivalent *tunge* for the next fifteen occurrences in the extant text. At the same time, for an equally simple noun like **semen,** he shifts about in his translation, sometimes using *cynn* (a good translation, depending on the context), sometimes

---

[44] See Griffith, p. 152.

[45] wiðdrifan 93.12, 94.4
wiðferian 54.17, 56.3, 68.18, 72.14, 76.12
wiðgangan 68.3
wiðhycgend 67.21
wiðlædan 55.10, 79.1
wiðsacan 76.3, 77.60, 77.67, 87.14, 88.33
wiðstandan 75.5, 139.10
Only wiðstandan 139.10 falls outside Psalm 95.

avoiding the lemma altogether, and never using the obvious equivalent *sæd*. He appears to preserve the conventional distinction of **oratio**: *gebed* and **deprecatio**: *ben* , throughout the text, despite the clouding caused by changes in textual transmission, only to drop it in 101.15. There are common equivalents missing in the Old English; the poet does not use *geswinc*, a common equivalent for **tribulatio**, and *stæppas*, the standard translation for **gressus** in the D-gloss tradition, never appears in P. These words may not be in his dialect. At the same time the poet demonstrates a preference for *edwit*, even using it as part of the *hapax legomenon edwitstæf*, in order to use the noun as part of his translation of **obprobrium**. He avoids *hosp* altogether, keeping to the use of a single Old English equivalent for both **obprobrium** and **inproperium**. Similarly, in order to save up *frofor* and its cognates as the invariable translation for **consolatio**, the poet uses a collection of equivalents for both **refugium** and **protector**. Why **consolatio**, in preference to the other two nouns, should be translated only by *frofor*, which appears nowhere else in the text despite being a common Old English word, cannot be determined. There appears no logical reason why one noun should be attended to in such a careful way when other nouns of the same semantic field receive quite different treatments. Also, there is no parallel in the psalter glosses for such consistency in this semantic field.[46]

---

[46] Study of the Lambeth Psalter reveals that a move in the direction of more consistent translation was in progress. However, the text of the Lambeth manuscript reveals only the first stage of such an enterprise—that of collecting all the equivalents and producing all the possible versions of the text, a necessary preliminary to choosing one equivalent for each Latin word. For a similar move at Winchester, see now Walter Hofstetter, 'Winchester and the standardization of Old English vocabulary' *ASE* 17 (1988), pp. 139-61.

Similar vocabulary choices occur in the poet's treatment of verbs. For **plantare** the poet does not use *plantian*, and reworks the text to use *settan* or *wyrcan*. The standard equivalent *fandian* never appears for **tempto**, which is translated by *costian*, and once by *cunnian*. *smeagan* is avoided as an equivalent for **meditor**, perhaps so that it can be used for all but one occurrence of **scrutor**. After one rendition of **dissipo**: *tosceadan*, the poet uses *toweorpan*, an accurate translation which does not appear in the psalter glosses. The gloss for **dissipo** is usually *tostencan*, which does not appear in the metrical psalms. Some common equivalents appear in the text; others appear to be ignored.

This analysis of a selection of nouns and verbs leads to a number of tentative conclusions about the psalter poet. Occasionally the poet agrees with the psalter glosses in an error, such as the widespread confusion in the Anglo-Saxon psalters over **adpropinquaverunt** in 106.17.[47] However, for every reading that the metrical psalms has in agreement with one or more psalter glosses, there is one where the translator chooses his own method. His careful discrimination among the verbs for **meditor** and **scrutor** is unparalleled except perhaps in the very scholarly Lambeth Psalter, which tends to offer far more choice in its equivalents than do the other psalters. The poet does seem to agree with C, a gloss of the A-tradition, more often than with K. Rarely does he make any additions to the text which suggest an

---

[47] See pp. 231-2.

allegorical interpretation of the psalter, and rarely does he choose vocabulary for his translation which is not fairly common. His approach to the text more readily approximates to that of the practical, liturgically-functional approach of A and its derivatives, and it is hardly surprising that his word choice more readily corresponds to that of the A-tradition than to that of the more scholarly D tradition. The language of the metrical psalter is at times surprisingly consistent, more so in relation to the lemmata in this selection than might have been expected, and in that sense it develops from the psalter gloss tradition.

One feature of the glosses is their tendency both to add equivalents and to standardise the vocabulary, one perhaps being in aid of the other. The metrical psalter for some words has a clear set of renditions, but is not so consistent for others at the beginning of the text, sometimes finding consistency towards the end of the translation. At other times the poet is less successful. He uses *toweorpan* for **dissipo** when the glosses have both *tostencan* and *todrifan*; he does not use the psalter gloss equivalents, but finds a good translation of his own and uses it throughout the text. At times, the poet almost seems to be looking for the best equivalent. For **inferior**, for example, the poet uses three different translations—*eorðscræfu*, *hinderþeostrum* and *hinder*—before finding *niðerdæl*, for what unfortunately turns out to be the last appearance of the lemmata in the text. Similarly, for **zelus** the poet does not use *hatheortnys* and *tyrging*, but varies the rendition with *heard ellenwod*, *heard ehtnes*, or the weaker *yrre*. He repeats *metegian* for **metibor** throughout the text, as well as the slightly odd translation of **lucerna**: *blacern* (which occurs only twice in the text

in widely-separated contexts). The translation reflects the poet's dialect, and at times his idiolect.[48]

For common words, the *Paris Psalter* tends to agree with one or both psalter gloss traditions. At times, the poet seems to achieve more consistency than the psalter glosses, using the same word for a lemmata throughout the text where the psalter glosses differ. This is hardly surprising. The psalter poet was a single person working in a medieval tradition of psalter study. He almost certainly knew the text from memory, and seems at a number of points in the text to be aware of variant readings from the Gallican and Hebrew Psalters. He displays some knowledge of psalter commentary, again usually where the translation into Old English verse is difficult. The result of his work is a consistent and remarkably coherent text, even toward the end seeming to gain somewhat in coherence, with fewer major errors, more omissions, and fewer word-by-word translations. The very careful word-for-word approach with which the translation began, an approach which almost certainly owed something to the psalter gloss tradition, gives way to a slightly more confident text.

These conclusions, however, can only be tentative, based as they are on complete comparison of only a few psalms and analysis of a selection of lemmata. The glossed psalters and the metrical psalter show a great deal of variety—and some error—in their morphology, often producing verbs whose tense and person are at

---

[48] Such a conclusion does depend on there not having been a glossed psalter, now lost, very closely corresponding to the metrical psalter.

variance with each other and with the Latin, or nouns in unexpected cases. Study of these apparently minor variants might reveal a closer connection between the metrical psalter and one of the surviving glossed psalters than has hitherto been established. Finally, a more complete picture of the Latin from which the metrical psalter was translated is necessary, as was argued in the last chapter. The glossed psalters show nearly every possible kind of variation in their use of the text—Roman psalters with Gallican glosses, Gallican psalters with Roman glosses, as well as Roman with Roman, Gallican with Gallican, and mixed versions, which change partway through the text. Anglo-Saxon psalter study needs to be further advanced before any clearer conclusions about the relationship between the metrical psalter and the glossed psalters can be reached. Always, however, two points are important. The history of psalter study in Anglo-Saxon England is one of a continuous mixing of forms and texts. Secondly, as Celia Sisam and Kenneth Sisam point out,[49] given the proportion of manuscripts surviving from Anglo-Saxon England, it seems likely that there were hundreds of psalters available, one to every parish church, several in every small monastery or nunnery, and many in the great houses. If only a third of those manuscripts were glossed (to use the proportion in surviving manuscripts), there were a great many manuscripts potentially available to the translator of the metrical psalter. Which he used and how much difference it made to the text he produced will have to remain unknown. It seems likely, however, from the number of divergent readings

---

[49] *Salisbury Psalter*, p. 75.

of the metrical psalter with respect to the surviving glossed psalters, that the influence of the psalter-gloss tradition on the vocabulary of the metrical psalter was not as great as might have been expected.

Chapter Six — The Text as Old English Poetry

The *Paris Psalter* clearly develops out of the tradition of studying and interpreting the meaning of the psalms in the vernacular, a tradition exemplified by the Anglo-Saxon glossed psalters. Patently, the metrical psalter owes as much to another vernacular tradition—that of producing poetry. However, careful analysis of the kind of poetic tradition underlying the *Paris Psalter* might reveal more than is now generally assumed. The metrical translation follows those conventions of metre and alliteration which are the most well known feature of Old English poetry. Beyond this apparent compliance with the 'rules' of Anglo-Saxon verse, however, is a collection of small differences. The *Paris Psalter* differs from the norm of classical Old English poetic convention, best exemplified for these purposes by *Beowulf*, such that in details of poetic usage, syntax and word-order, diction, and alliteration and metre the text is distinct from the rest of Old English poetry. These differences have seldom been studied. J.J. Campbell's dismissive remark sums up the modern attitude to the metrical psalter: 'The largest single poetic work in Old English, and by this I refer to mere quantity, is the Paris Psalter.'[1] That 'mere quantity', though, consists

[1] J.J. Campbell, 'Knowledge of Rhetorical Figures in Anglo-Saxon England,' *JEGP* 66 (1967), p. 16.

of 5039 lines of Old English verse, translated from an original for which we may not have the exact manuscript but about which we can determine most of what is necessary for analysing the relationship between source and translation. Accordingly, the places where the metrical psalter is both translation and poetry can perhaps be distinguished from those where it is more one than the other. The *Paris Psalter* may not belong to the poetic tradition of 'strict' Old English verse—although the extant corpus is too small for such a judgment to be made safely—but its use of poetic techniques needs to be examined more closely. Where it belongs in the corpus of Old English poetry remains to be determined.

For instance, some themes and techniques are so common in Old English poetry as to be *topoi*, expected in any work which is part of that corpus. The use of epithets and hendiadys in the metrical psalms has already been discussed. Another rhetorical technique that occasionally appears in the text without warrant from the source is that of parallelism. For example,

68.14 Alys me of lame, þe læs ic weorþe lange fæst,
and me feondum afyrr, frea ælmihtig;
ado me of deope deorces wæteres,
þe læs me besencen sealte flodas.
Eripe me de luto ut non inheream; libera me ex odientibus me et de profundo aquarum.

The addition and repetition of *þe læs* creates a parallel expression which is the poet's own, although its impact is perhaps lessened by its appearance first in a b-verse, and later in an a-verse. A similar set of parallel clauses occurs shortly thereafter in 70.7:

70.7 Sy min muð and min mod mægene gefylled,
þæt ic þin lof mæge lustum singan
and wuldur þin wide mærsian

and þe ealne dæg æghwær herian.
Repleatur os meum laude tua; ut passim cantare gloriam tuam; tota die magnificentiam tuam.

In this verse, the use of parallel constructions in the b-verses of lines 2 to 4 may be influenced by the initial doublet *min muð and min mod.* The parallelism is also rather neatly varied in line 4, which avoids a repetition of structure that might become monotonous.[2] The poet uses parallel constructions quite frequently, but there are few in the *Paris Psalter* which are additions to the text; most are copied from the source.

In other contexts, however, the poet makes additions to his text which seem reminiscent of the themes and images common in Old English poetry. For example, in 60.1.4b-5a the poet describes the tumult of his heart as he calls to God for help in traditional terms: *nu me caru beateð/ heard æt heortan.* The poetic adjective *læne* occurs only twice in the metrical psalter, both times as an addition: in 62.4.2a as part of a well-known collocation *þonne þis læne lif þe we lifiað on* (where its impact is spoiled somewhat by the trite *lif...lifiað* repetition)[3] and in 102.14.4 *swa his lifdagas læne syndan.* The theme of the transitory life is a commonplace of Christian doctrine, but it seems particularly frequent in the Old English elegies.[4]

---

[2] For similar uses of parallelism see, for example, 73.21 and 85.2.

[3] In *Beowulf*, such a repetition might well be argued for as a special addition to the verse.

[4] Cf. *Wand* ll. 106-110, *Seaf* ll. 64-6, *DR* 138, for examples of *lif...læne* collocations, of which there are at least two dozen in Old English poetry. See also the analysis of the gnomic formula by Haruko Momma, 'The "Gnomic Formula" and Some Additions to Bliss's Old English Metrical System,' *N&Q* n.s. 36 (1989) pp.

A more clearly Germanic theme is that of the swearing of oaths, and on two occasions in the text a simple promise or belief becomes a more serious matter; in 62.10 **iurant in eo** turns into line 3 of the psalm verse: *ealle þa ðe on hine aðas sweriað* and in 131.11 the obligation is made even more clear:[5]

> 131.11 þæs deopne að drihten aswor
> and þone mid soðe swylce getrymede,
> þæt he hine for hole ær ne aswore,
> gehet Dauide, swa he him dyde syþþan,
> Iurauit dominus dauid ueritatem et non frustrabitur eam.

The emphasis on the sacredness of the ceremony of oath-swearing and the importance of 'standing fast with truth', not to mention the momentous nature of the decision to take an oath which is implied by the prophet's never previously having sworn, suggest that some overlay of vernacular tradition may have affected the translation at this point.

423-6, in which half-lines such as *Wand* 114b *Wel bið þam þe him are seceð* are classified as the new Type B3. Two of the twelve half-lines in this category in Old English poetry are *PPs* 117.24.1a and 136.9.1a.

[5] Cf. F. Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen.* (Halle, 1903-16). In Edgar 3, the law code promulgated between 946-61, a judge who gives false judgment pays 120 shillings compensation to the king and loses his status as a thegn, unless he can swear an oath that he did not know how to make a more just decision (p. 24). Similarly Edgar 6.1 (962-3) has:

> 7 heora ælc, þonne hine man ærest to wytnesse gecysð, sylle þone að, þæt he næfre, ne for feo ne for lufe ne for ege, ne ætsace nanes þara þinga þe he to gewytnesse wæs, 7 nan oðer þinge on gewytnesse ne cyðe butan þæt an þæt he geseah oððe gehyrde.

Those who are chosen as witnesses must swear an oath that their testimony will include only what they see or hear, and neither money nor favour nor fear will permit a witness to deny what he sees or hears.

Finally, the poet occasionally uses gnomic expressions in b-verses, including 93.7.2b *dyde swa he wolde*, where God's actions are described by way of a modal verb, and 77.43.3b *þæt wæs cuð werum*, an addition at the end of the psalm verse which emphasizes just how widely spread was the knowledge of the tokens and signs of the Lord in the country of the Egyptians.[6]

Aside from these few examples of themes and motifs common to Old English verse, there are a few appearances of word-play in the *Paris Psalter*. Most of these have been amply discussed by Roberta Frank, who notes that *manna/man* puns such as the one in 63.8 are the most common in the metrical psalter:[7]

63.8 Ealle synd gedrefede þe hi on sioð;
sceal him manna gehwylc man ondrædan
and weorc godes wide mærsian
and his weorc ongitan mid wisdome.
Conturbati sunt omnes qui uidebant eos; et timuit omnis homo, et adnuntiauerunt opera dei; et facta eius intellexerunt.

manna here translates **homo**, and *man* is an addition in keeping with **timuit**: *ondrædan*; the pun on every man both being evil and dreading evil is more a result of the need for alliteration than it is word-play. This may explain the purpose of several of these examples of word-play. Thus, *ðonne ge mid mane men ongunnon* in 61.3.1, where again *men* translates **homines** and *mane* is an addition, also has both

---

[6] Paul Cavill uses Psalms 136.9 and 138.15 to argue for a knowledge of wisdom literature in 'Two Sententious Generalisations in the *Metrical Psalms* of the Paris Psalter' *NM* 86 (1985), pp. 453-7.

[7] Roberta Frank, 'Some Uses of Paronomasia in Old English Scriptural Verse' *Speculum* 47 (1972) pp. 207-26 at 221.

elements of the pun occurring in alliterating staves. Perhaps the alliteration is a device to reinforce the pun, but the pun also serves the verse form.

In 65.4.1 the similarity of sounds may only be coincidental, since the word-play is somewhat obscure:

65.4 Cumað nu and geseoð, hu cyme weorc
drihten worhte; synt his domas eac
swiþe egeslice ofer eall ylda bearn.
Uenite et uidete opera domini; quam terribilis in consiliis super filios hominum.

The play between *Cumað* and *cyme* suggests that those who are invited to come and see the works of the Lord must, by coming, acknowledge the beauty and glory of those works. This example, with its very faint pun, raises one of the more difficult questions about the metrical psalter—that of determining the extent to which the text is imbued with what might be called the more poetic features of Old English verse. Most of the rhetorical techniques, tropes, and other expressions in the *Paris Psalter* are direct translations from the source. Those which are not derived from the Latin directly may be influenced to some extent by the Latin traditions of rhetoric available in Anglo-Saxon England.[8] In most of the examples above, however, some influence of an indigenous tradition also seems likely. The extent of that tradition is suggested

[8] See Gneuss, 'The Study of Language in Anglo-Saxon England' *BJRL* 72 (1990), pp. 29-32 for a review of Anglo-Saxon knowledge of rhetoric, and references there. For the general tradition of medieval rhetoric, see James J. Murphy, *Medieval Rhetoric*. Toronto Medieval Bibliographies 3 (Toronto, 1971). For the opposite argument, that Anglo-Saxon literature influenced Latin writing, see for instance Alexandra Hennessy Olsen, 'Old English Poetry and Latin Prose: The Reverse Context' *Classica et Mediaevalia* 34 (1983), pp. 273-82.

by other features of the metrical psalter.

Many of the techniques the psalter poet used for producing his verse are the same as those of more sophisticated poets. Others may reflect a difference in attitude, a change in approach which sets the text apart from the rest of the corpus, or from selected other parts of the corpus. The *topoi* discussed here suggest some knowledge of Old English poetic practice, but sparing use of its manifestations. Other features of the text which may reveal further aspects of this different approach include the syntax, especially the use of filler adverbs and adjectives; the diction, including the *hapax legomena*; and the metre.

(i) Syntax and Word-Order

The syntax, and notably the word-order, of the metrical psalter is often difficult to follow, ambiguous in its treatment of inflection, and uncertain in that it depends so heavily on the Latin source that the translation does not always make sense on its own. For example:

81.3 Demað steopcildum domas soðe
and eadmedum eac þæt sylfe,
wædlum and ðearfum wel soðfæstum.
Iudicate pupillum et egenum humilem et pauperem iustificate.

Here, *wel* in the third line must be an adverb referring back to *Demað*, the first word of the entire psalm verse. There is no sense of suspense, of preparation for the adverb in the course of the verse, and it is clearly an alliterative addition. However, the rest of the last line of the verse consists of adjectives functioning as substantives, and the insertion of *wel*, an adverb which might ordinarily be referring to one or more of the

surrounding adjectives, makes a line which is a syntactic problem. Similarly, in 85.17, the only way in which the psalm verse makes syntactic sense, to the modern speaker, is through the addition of editorial commas around the vocative *drihten*:

> 85.17 Forþon þu me wære fultum fæste, drihten,
> and me frefredest, frea ælmihtig.
> Quoniam to domine adiuuasti me et consolatus es me.

The adverb *fæste* here must refer back to the verb *wære*, although its appearance between two nouns suggests that it might be a form of the adjective *fæst*. However, this is impossible unless there is a mistake in the inflection, for both nouns are masculine nominative singular forms which would take *fæst*. *fæst* would be metrically impossible, whereas *fæste drihten* is a common Type 2Ala. Accordingly, the line must be 'Therefore you were securely (or firmly) a refuge for me, lord', when the adjectival form 'a firm refuge' would make better sense.[9]

Some of the difficulties in the *Paris Psalter* syntax have been noted recently in general studies of syntactic usage in Old English. For instance, Ogura notes that

---

[9] There are many similar half-lines in *PPs*. Compare, for instance the following examples of expressions which are not epithets, but which may appear to be at first glance:

93.17.3	fægere, drihten	domine
96.1.1	rice drihten	dominus
101.16.3	fægere drihten	dominus
101.20.2	hraðe drihtne	domino
102.1.1	bliðe drihten	dominum
102.2.1	bealde dryhten	dominum
102.21.4	bliðe drihten	dominum
103.1.1	bliþe drihten	dominum
103.26.3	fægere gode	addition
103.29.3	bealde drihten	dominus
103.33.4	bliðe drihten	dominum

the use of the reflexive pronoun *self* in the metrical psalter tends to that of prose; *self* in apposition with a noun scarcely occurs in the prose (once only) but is characteristic of the poetry, whereas *self* in apposition with a pronoun is frequently found in the prose. The metrical psalter commonly follows the prose in this respect, for example in 61.9:

61.9.3-4 and eow beswicað sylfe oftast,
þær ge idel gylp on þam ilcan fremmað.
ut decipiant ipsi de uanitate in id ipsum.

The apposition of *eow* and *sylfe* is typical of prosaic Old English, although *sylfe* here also provides *s*-alliteration.[10]

Similarly, in his study of the use of the auxiliary in Old English poetry, Donoghue comments that the psalter poet uses auxiliaries with verbals infrequently and 'when he did he showed no imagination whatsoever.'[11] At the same time, in 118.25, for the only time in all the usages studied by Donoghue, *don* is used as an auxiliary followed by a dependent verbal:

118.25.2 do me æfter þinum wordum wel gecwician.
uiuifica me secundum uerbum tuum.

Accordingly, the psalter text, while not generally showing any 'imagination', (to use the terminology of an outworn literary convention) does have some peculiarities, some

---

[10] Michiko Ogura, *Verbs with the Reflexive Pronoun and Constructions with Self in Old and Early Middle English.* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1989), p. 55. For this verse, Ogura lists the psalter-glosses A, D, and I, showing that A has *in ðæt ilce* where D has *on þæt selfe*, and I emphasizes the reflexive with *hi sylfe...on þæt sylfe.*

[11] Daniel Donoghue, *Style in Old English Poetry: The Test of the Auxiliary.* (New Haven: Yale, 1987), p. 35.

unexpected usages. The use here of *don* as an auxiliary is such a usage, but it does not seem to make any great difference to the sense of the verse. The result is a new construction, an example of the poet's departure from slavish rendition of the Latin. The peculiarities of the psalter poet owe something to Latin syntax, then, but also show some individuality. Throughout, however, the Latin syntax is a pervading influence, sometimes useful in interpreting the Old English, sometimes not.[12]

The dependence of the metrical psalter on Latin syntax is further revealed by Quirk in his study of concessive clauses in Old English poetry.[13] In 131.3 the poet renders a Latin conditional, then temporal, relationship as if it were a concession:

131.3 þeah þe ic on mines huses hyld gegange
oþþe selegesceot þænne swæs wese
oððe on min restbedd ricene gestige,
Si introiero in tabernaculum domus meae; si ascendero in lectum stratus mei.

This would be the only deliberately conditional usage of *þeah*, but Quirk argues that the translator misunderstood the first Latin **Si** as if it were 'even though', suggesting that this nonconcessive use of *þeah* is mainly due to a failure in logical arrangement or confusion or possibly weakness of construction. Elsewhere the psalter poet tends to exaggerate the concessive relationship, making it more explicit. Thus **verumtamen**

---

[12] See, for instance, B. Mitchell, *Old English Syntax* II s. 2669, where he comments, 'Sometimes the context will help' and uses the Latin original to suggest that *siþþan* is an adverb in 103.21 and a conjunction in 70.10. However, he goes on: 'But it [the Latin context] often fails, e.g. in *PPs* 106.39, and is in any case a dangerous guide.' (p. 351).

[13] Randolph Quirk, *The Concessive Relation in Old English Poetry*. (Yale, 1954; rep. 1973).

is reinforced eighteen times in the translation with the use of *hwæðere*. Of the ten times that *and* is used to signal a concession it translates an **et**-concession five times, corresponds to **nunc** twice and **autem** twice, and misreads the concession once. However, three times the poet emphasizes the concession, twice reinforcing with *eft*, and once using an unusual word-order. On the other hand, for dependent concessions without *þeah*, Quirk comments, 'the most remarkable point is the apparent dislike of the English translator for the Latin indefinite constructions; time and again we find the OE version has nothing to correspond to these Latin forms.'[14] For example, in 101.2, the poet twice avoids **quacumque die** in his translation:

101.2 Na þu andwlitan æfre þinne
awend fram me, wuldres ealdor;
gif ic geswenced sy, þu swæs to me
þin eare onhyld and me ofestlice
gehyr, heofenes weard, helpys benan.
Ne auertas faciem tuam a me in quacumque die tribulor; inclina ad me auren tuam in quacumque die inuocauero to; uelociter exaudi me.

Nowhere in the verse does the poet give the slightest impression of the indefinite expression of time which is crucial to the Latin.

However, for another sub-type of dependent concessions without *þeah*, the concessive-equivalent construction, the psalter poet not only follows the Latin closely but also uses such reinforcing adverbs as *ær* to emphasise the concessive relation. Towards the end of the analysis, with respect to the use of *wiht*, Quirk notes that 'The

[14] Quirk, p. 101.

poetic text most faithful to a Latin original at some length is the *Paris Psalter.*'[15] The poet's only variation is to use asseverations of the 'in the slightest' kind. Finally, Quirk concludes that the psalter poet generally tends to express a sense of concession more strongly in Old English, and there is 'not usually any close correspondence of form, position or word order'[16] between the Old English and the Latin. These conclusions appear somewhat contradictory, but they both suggest idiosyncratic syntax. On the one hand, the psalter poet reproduces and even reinforces the sense of concession, choosing particular translations for each Latin expression. On the other hand, the syntax which results in the vernacular does not closely follow the Latin syntax in details of usage. The result is an ambiguous syntax which is not always very clear in its expression of concessive relationships.

This lack of syntactic clarity is a hallmark of the metrical psalter. Lack of space precludes more detailed analysis of syntax here, but the problems which arise may be pointed to by way of analysis of one syntactic feature which is quite common in the text: filler words.

a) Filler Adverbs, Adjectives and Phrases

The most readily recognizable syntactic habit of the psalter poet in his production of verse is his use of filler words. These 'stop-gap' words, almost invariably adjectives and adverbs, can appear anywhere in the line, but most

---

[15] Quirk, p. 131.

[16] Quirk, p. 139.

commonly occur at the beginning of the head stave. They alliterate with the word in the first stave which accomplishes the translation.[17] For each letter of the alphabet the poet appears to have developed a group of eight or ten of these spare-tire words. For letters of the alphabet which are rare in the vernacular, the arrangement of alliteration could be very difficult. For letters, such as *p*, lacking a collection of these words, no alliteration is possible.[18] For letters with such a collection of filler words, verses can be glued together, first at the head stave, and secondly with double alliteration in the a-verse. For *f*, for example, the filler group includes *fæcne, frecne, fægere, fæle, fæste, feala, feor, ful* and *fyrenful*. In Psalm 64.5 three of these words appear, one to provide needed alliteration, one to provide double alliteration in the

---

[17] Sisam and Sisam, facsimile, p. 17.

[18] Words beginning in *p-* are understandably rare in Old English poetry; Bessinger and Smith list only 93, and of these, 50 alliterate. That group includes, however, *Pharaones* four times and *Philipus* once alliterating with *f-*, and *psalterio* four times alliterating with *s-*. A further 27 are proper nouns, including *Pantan, Persea, Pater Noster, Pamphilia, Pentecostenes, Petrus, Pilatus* and so on. Of the remaining 15 alliterating occurrences of words beginning with *p-*, 6 appear in only two lines:

Ald. l. 6 ponus et pondus plena cum sensu
SnS l. 89 prologa prima ðam is P nama

All of these are direct borrowings from Latin. There remain only nine words which alliterate on *p* and are common nouns in Old English poetry: *palmtreow, prasse, plega, gepalmtwigode* (2), *preostas* (3) and *pontisca*. Four times (*Instructions for Christians* l. 125, l. 259; in *Fates of the Apostles* l. 14; and in *Menologium* l. 122) *apostol* alliterates on *p*. Some lines with words beginning with *p* also have no alliteration, including *PPs* 101.5.1 *Ic geworden eom pellicane gelic*. Alliteration on *p*, then, is largely a result of proper nouns and loan-words from the Latin, and occurs more in late poetry, such as *Solomon and Saturn*, and poetry with Latin influences: the metrical psalter, the *Creed*, and *Instructions for Christians*.

a-verse, and one to provide a fourth stress in the line:

64.5 Ealle we ðin hus ecum godum
fægere fyllað; fæste is þin templ
ece and wræclic awa to feore.

Replebimur in bonis domus tue sanctum est templum tuum; mirabile in equitate.

None of these words translates anything from the source.[19]

Breitzer, in his analysis of lines alliterating with *b* in *PPs*, reaches a number of conclusions about these stock words.[20] They are part of the third stage of the poet's translation,[21] in which he creates alliterations where required or desirable for each line. These words Breitzer calls 'non-translating alliterative complements', supplied without authorisation from the Vulgate Psalter, and recognisable by their relative syntactic independence. Breitzer even suggests that, for more important sounds, the poet had 'non-translating alliterative complements with positive, negative,

---

[19] The same technique, that of 'the addition of a word or phrase to the literal translation of a unit for the purpose of meeting the alliterative and metric requirements' is discussed by F.H. Whitman, 'A Major Compositional Technique in Old English Verse' *ELN* 11 (1973), pp. 81-6; the quotation is from p. 81. Whitman discusses this usage in the metrical psalter, the *Metres of Boethius*, *Lord's Prayer II*, and *Riddle* 1. A more extended analysis of the technique with respect to one work is John W. Conlee, 'A Note on Verse Composition in the *Meters of Boethius*' *NM* 71 (1970), pp. 576-85.

[20] Robert S. Breitzer, *A Stylistic Study of the Old English Metrical Psalms.* (Ph.D., Iowa, 1970).

[21] The first two stages in Breitzer's system are syntactical adjustments for alliteration resulting from close translation, and then following the syntax of the source as closely as possible. His argument is clearest in his analysis of the dual version, Psalm 107, which incorporates Psalm 56.9-13 and 59.5-11, pp. 143-67.

and neutral associations, such as *bliðe, biter* and *bealde.*'[22] These three words appear in almost half of the lines alliterating in *b*. The most interesting point here is Breitzer's assignment of neutral status to *bealde*, which occurs 42 times (as *bealde* and *bealdlice*) in the poem and never translates anything from the Latin. In such lines as:

102.2.1 bletsige mine sawle bealde dryhten
118.4.1 þu þine bebodu bealde hete
118.134.2 þæt ic ðine bebodu bealde healde
63.9.2 blissað baldlice bote geweneð
102.19.2 bletsian bealde heora bliðne frean
145.7.5 and blinde eac bealde drihten

bealde appears in different contexts, in different positions in the line, and in lines with substantially different meanings. In none of these cases does *bealde* alter the meaning of the translation. The adverb is so bland that its meaning is almost completely gone. Breitzer notes the ubiquity and usefulness for prosodic reasons of these words, but does not discuss the syntactic and semantic implications of their use.

These stop-gap words tend to appear in groups. Particular sounds and words seem to cluster in a verse and even in a psalm. Often, if the psalter poet uses a filler word starting with *f* in the first line of a verse, he seems more likely to use filler words starting with *f* elsewhere in the verse. In Psalm 66.1 the poet uses alliteration with *m* in the first line and *b* in the second, employs vowel alliteration for the third line, and in the added last line combines stop-gap words from *b* and *m* to finish off

[22] Breitzer, p. 169.

the verse.

66.1 Miltsa us, mihtig drihten, and us on mode eac
gebletsa nu; beorhte leohte
þinne andwlitan, and us on mode weorð
þuruh þine mycelnesse milde and bliðe.
Deus misereatur nobis et benedicat nos; inluminet uultum suum super nos et misereatur nobis.

Similarly, in 93.18-9, alliteration of *f* and *s* predominates, not entirely because the appropriate translations for the important Latin words start with these letters:

93.18 Ne ætfyligeð þe ahwær *facen* ne unriht
ðu gefæstnost *facen* sares
hi soðfæste *sneome* gehæftað
and heora sawle ofslean þenceað
blod soðfæstra *bitere* ageotan
93.19 Forðon me is geworden wealdend drihten
to friðstole *fæst* and gestaðelad;
is me fultum his *fæst* on drihtne.
Numquid adheret tibi sides iniquitatis, qui fingis dolorem in precepto; captabunt in animan iusti, et sanguinem innocentem condemnabunt;
Et factus est mihi dominus in refugium; et deus meus in auxilium spei meae.

After using *facen* in the first line as an expansion of *unriht* for **iniquitatis**, the poet repeats the word in the second line, alliterating with *gefæstnast. fæste* is one of the poet's most popular filler adverbs, and it recurs in the compounds *soðfæste* and *soðfæstra*, to translation **iusti** and **innocentem** respectively. *s*-alliteration is provided in the third line by the filler adverb *sneome*, and the poet carries on with *s*-alliteration in the next line as well. In the last line of the verse *bitere* serves as a filler adverb for alliteration, but also reinforces the meaning. Where the repetition of alliteration is most evident, however, is in the next psalm verse, where in two successive lines *fæst* occurs in the head stave as an alliterative filler influenced perhaps by the use of *gefæstnast* and *soðfæst* in the previous verse. For alliteration the compound *friðstole*

renders **refugium**, and *fultum* translates **auxilium** to finish the verse. In eight lines of verse *f*-alliteration occurs four times, *s*-alliteration twice and alliteration on other letters, *b* and *w*, appears in only two lines. If a particular letter or combination of letters works well, the psalter poet repeats it.

Not only the meaning but also the function of these stock words weakens substantially, especially given the frequency with which the psalter poet uses them. Particularly for filler words occurring in the head stave, grammatical function is uncertain, ambiguously adverbial or adjectival. Two examples may clarify this point.

89.16 We synd gefyllede fægere on mergenne
þinre mildheortnesse; þæs we on mode nu
habbað ealle dagas æþele blisse.
Repleti sumus mane misericordia tua; et exultauimus et delectati sumus in omnibus diebus nostris.

In Psalm 89.16, *fægere* could be either an adjective referring in apposition to the pronoun *We* or an adverb describing the way in which we are *gefyllede on mergenne*. In the third verse of the preceding psalm, *cuðe* occurs as the head stave.

88.3 Ic minum gecorenum cuðe gesette,
hu min gewitnes wolde gangan;
Disposui testamentum electis meis;

The psalter glosses give various forms of *cyþnes* to gloss **testamentum**, and the word may thus be a substantival use of the adjective *cuð*, such that it means knowledge. However, the word occurs in the head stave and could be inflected as an adverb, so that its function is ambiguous. It could well be a unique occurrence of the adverb *cuðe* meaning 'clearly', an extension of function and meaning by the psalter poet for

alliterative purposes.[23] Alternatively, the psalter glosses and their rendition **testamentum**: *cyþnes* may be the determining factor, and *cuð* is a noun, in the dative case, meaning 'testament, knowledge'. That it is an adverb seems a more likely solution.

This overlap of weakening function and loss of semantic value is difficult at times to quantify. However, the frequency with which these words occur tends to rob them of any vestigial impact they might have on the meaning of a verse. In Psalm 118.74, the Old English is metrically confused and resorts to near-rhyme to produce a translation:

118.74 þa ðe on feore forhtigað, þa me on fægere geseoð
and blissiað, bu geðenceað,
þæt ic þinum wordum wel getreowde.
Qui timent te uidebunt me et letabuntur; quia in uerbum tuum speraui.

All of the filler words here, *fægere*, *feore*, *bu* and *wel*, are additions to the Latin. Their semantic value is low, and their utility in the text is almost entirely alliterative.

Gram, the adjective, and *grame* the adverb, appear occasionally in the metrical psalms to suggest enemies or traps who are 'furious', 'fierce', 'angry', 'hostile', or, more feebly perhaps, 'troublesome.' For a number of reasons, analysis of the occurrences of *gram* in *PPs* provides a useful concluding example of filler words and phrases. Five times, in Psalms 56.7, 65.10, 123.6, 123.7, and 140.11, *grame* and *gryne* appear together, so that the collocation of 'anger' with a 'snare' or a 'trap',

[23] *cuðe* as an adverb occurs only here, according to Grein-Köhler.

unique to the metrical psalter, is a common one in this text.[24] Twice more, in Psalms 104.15 and 84.1, *grame* appears near *hæftnyd*, meaning 'custody' or 'bondage,' and once it modifies '*bendum*' or bonds (124.5).'[25] This frequency of collocation might suggest that one sense of *gram* involves constraint and even capture—almost, potentially, the fearful anger of a trapped animal. The psalter poet here, then, makes use of one of his stop-gap words but in such a collocation as to suggest a change in meaning which does not neutralise the sense of the headword, but shifts it substantially. In Psalm 79.1, however, the poet changes his collocations and makes a very difficult Old English verse as a result:

> 79.1 þu þe Israela æðelum cynne
> reccest and rædest, ðu ne recene beheald,
> þu ðe Ioseph swa sceap gramum wiðlæddest.
> Qui regis Israhel intende; qui deducis uelut ouem ioseph.

He adds *gramum* to the text to alliterate with *Ioseph*[26] and translates **deducis** as

---

[24] 56.7.1-2a Fotum heo minum fæcne grime
grame gearwodon,
65.10.1 þu us on grame swylce gryne gelæddest,
123.6.2b-3 swa swa neodspearuwa
of grames huntan gryne losige.
123.7.1 Grin bið on sadan grame torænded,
140.11.1 Geheald me wið þara gryne þe me grame setton.

[25] 84.1.3b þa graman hæftned
104.15.4b-5a þær hine grame æryst/ hæfdon to hæfte,
124.5.1b to gramum bendum

[26] Here, as elsewhere in Old English poetry, the proper noun complicates the situation. R. Woolf comments, in her edition of *Juliana* (London, 1955), p. 16, that 'the fitting of Latin names into Old English metre was extremely difficult, and often resulted in a weak half-line, and Cynewulf therefore avoided them as often as possible'. The poet of the metrical psalter was not so adept, and often produced weak

wiðlæddest, thus producing an image of God angrily leading out his sheep, rescuing his people fiercely.[27] Later verses of the psalm explain the discrepancy, as the psalmist asks (in verse 5) '*hu lange yrsast þu on þines esnes gebed?*' ('How long will you be angry with your servant's prayer?').[28] God, then, in this psalm has turned away his face from his people and is angrily refusing to lead his sheep. *Gramum* can here retain its meaning as 'angry, hostile' with the result that *wiðlæddest*, a favourite word of the psalter gloss tradition, shifts from its meaning of 'to lead away, remove, rescue' to a sense exactly opposite. This is an unsatisfactory solution, requiring a shift in meaning of a well-known psalter verb. Perhaps the better alternative is to conclude that *gramum*, a dative plural, adverbially used, has so lost its semantic value

---

lines when forced to alliterate with a proper name. On two other occasions in *PPs*, *gram* alliterates with a proper name. See A. Pogatscher, *Zur Lautlehre der griechischen, lateinischen, und romanischen Lehnworte im Altenglischen* Q & F 64 (Strassburg, 1888) and F.C. Robinson, 'The Significance of Names in Old English Literature' *Anglia* 86 (1968) pp. 14-58.

[27] Compare the collocation *alys...laþum...wiðferian*, which occurs four times in the text, and may in some way influence this passage:

54.17 A ðu symle sawle mine
lustum alyse, laðum wiðferige,
56.3 He þa of heofenum hider onsende
þe me alysde, laþum wiðferede,
68.18 Beheald mine sawle and hi hrædlice
alys and wiðfere laþum feondum.
72.14.3 þæt hi wæron alysde, laðum wiðferede.

The verb *wiðferian* occurs only five times in the text, four of which are in this collocation.

[28] quousque irasceris in orationem serui tui.

that it should be passed over simply as a word filling a need for alliteration and metre. The invocation of the psalm would then suggest that God, who leads and rescues Joseph and his people like sheep, is being asked to hear and guide His people.

(ii) Diction

As with the syntax, there are peculiarities in the diction of the *Paris Psalter*. In his edition Krapp noted that the poetic noun *metod*, a standard translation in much of the poetry for **deus** or **dominus**, occurs only once.[29] Similarly, *garsecg*, a common translation for **mar** in most of the poetry, occurs only twice, in both cases as part of an added half-line in the b-verse: 96.1.4b *ut on garsæcge*, and 104.35.2a *of garsecge*. Kennings and metaphors not required by the source are similarly rare. The high proportion of prose words in the metrical psalms has been pointed out by E.G. Stanley, with corrections and additions by M.S. Griffith.[30] The extent to which the vocabulary of the text is connected to the psalter glosses has already been discussed here. The diction of the metrical psalter is influenced first by the Latin and second by the gloss tradition which is more prosaic than it is poetic. However, the language of the text must also be, in some way at least, poetic. Thus, Greenfield argues: 'One of the methods by which the Old English poets achieved originality was

---

[29] Krapp, p. xvii.

[30] E.G. Stanley, 'Studies in the Prosaic Vocabulary of Old English Verse' *NM* 72 (1971) pp. 385-418. See also M.S. Griffith, *The Method of Composition*, pp. 149-52.

the coining of compounds, as the *Beowulf* poet's immense wealth of newly minted compound words attests.'[31] Wrenn and Bolton more conservatively refer to the poem's 'rich vocabulary.'[32] One of the markers of poetic diction therefore seems to be the occurrence of *hapax legomena*, which are most commonly compounds.

Given that compounds were usually written as separate words in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, it is, however, difficult to be sure what a deliberate compound might be. Clearly, the extra semantic value which results from classifying two otherwise distinct words as a compound is not usually a factor in the *Paris Psalter*, which makes determining what an acceptable compound is even more difficult in this text. Few of the potential compounds in the metrical psalter fall into the group of those required by inflection, by the absence of endings on the first word. As a result, they belong to the nebulous group of possible compounds, a group whose edges are very unclear. Also, the *hapax legomena* in the *Paris Psalter* include a number of simplices, which must be weighted differently from compounds in terms of their significance. A compound is more likely to be a poetic device, whereas a simplex is normally a word which by accident of preservation does not appear elsewhere. In any case, originality

---

[31] Greenfield, 2nd ed., p. 75. The latest version of the passage is more cautious: 'One of the methods whereby the Old English poets achieved originality was coining compounds, as the *Beowulf* poet's immense wealth of apparently new-minted compound words attests.' S.B. Greenfield and D.G. Calder, *A New History of Old English Literature.* (New York, 1986) p. 126.

[32] C.L. Wrenn, ed., rev. W. Bolton, *Beowulf with the Finnesburg Fragment.* (London, 1973) p. 59.

cannot be proven for an Old English poet in the coining of *hapax legomena.*

Furthermore, the new words or words unique to the metrical psalter almost seem to suggest a different method of producing poetry. They are functional words, produced for practical rather than poetic reasons. If one word was useful for prosodic reasons, then the chances of its reappearance were relatively high. For instance, in Psalms 101.12 and 143.11 the noun *ambihtmæcg* occurs, a word unique to the metrical psalms:

> 101.12 Forþon þæs þancunga þine scealcas
> ambihtmæcgas ealle hæfdan
> forþon þe þu stiðlice stanum and eorðan
> eallum ætgædere ær miltsadest.
> Quia beneplacitos habuerunt serui tui; lapides eius et terre eius miserebuntur.
>
> 143.11 þu healdest and sylest hælu cyningum
> þu alysdest eac leofne David
> þinne agenne ombihtmæcg
> of þam awyrgedan wraðan sweorde.
> Qui das salutem regibus; qui liberasti dauid seruum tuum de gladio maligno.

In each of these verses the poet needs a compound beginning with a vowel to render **seruus.** The tautological *ambihtmæcg* serves admirably as a half-line, but adds nothing more to the meaning that either *ambiht* or *mæcg* could not have provided alone.[33] There is little need in these verses for repetition to intensify the identification of the psalmist as God's servant. *Ambihtmæcg* is only one example of the *hapax legomena* which expediency, not poetic merit, required in the metrical psalms.

---

[33] Repetitious compounds are by no means unusual in Old English poetry. Cf. *Bwf* 2340 *holtwudu*, for example.

A more extended example of the production of *hapax legomena* in *PPs* is the set of compounds with *heah-* as the first element. In the extant text there are 11 of these words occurring a total of 18 times. Of those compounds eight are *hapax legomena*, which account for eleven of the occurrences. The three compounds which occur elsewhere are: *heahcyning* 118.146; *heahsetl* 88.27, 102.18, 131.12, and *heahweorc* 105.29, 102.11, and 101.22 (as *heahgeweorc*). The rest occur once or more than once in this text only: *heahbeorg* 94.4; *heahbliss* 118.111; *heahgaldor* 57.4; *heahgnornung* 101.18; *heahgod* 56.2; *heahmiht* 150.2; *heahsæl* 101.11, 118.108; and *heahþearf* 117.16, 117.20 and 117.27. All of the compounds provide alliteration, nine of them in the a-verse and nine at the head-stave. All of these compounds are adjective + noun (henceforth Adj + N) combinations which serve as a noun in the text. There is some discrepancy, however, in the meaning assigned to *heah* and in the degree to which the compounds render anything from the source. Some are very clearly signalled: 56.2 **deum altissimum**: *heahgod* and 94.4 **altitudines montium**: *heahbeorg*. Others, such as *heahþearf* (which occurs three times in the same psalm) have no authority at all. Two of the three verses containing *heahþearf* are virtually identical both in the source and in the translation:

117.16 Dyde gedefe mægen dryhtnes swyðre,
and me seo swyðre swylce drihtnes
ahof hrædlice æt heahþearfe.
Dextera domini fecit uirtutem; dextera domini exaltauit me.

117.20 Ic þe andette, ece dryhten,
forðon þu me gehyrdest æt heahþearfe
and me þa gewurde wis on hælu.
Confitebor tibi domine quam exaudisti me; et factus es mihi in salutem.

117.27 Ic ðe andette ecne dryhten,
forðon þu me gehyrdest æt heahþearfe,
and þa wurde me wis to hælu.
Confitebor tibi domine quam exaudisti me; et factus es mihi in salutem.

The psalter poet uses the same construction, *æt heahþearfe*, for each occurrence of the coinage, and puts it in the b-verse each time.[34]

In other occurrences *heah-* refers not to height but to greatness or importance, as in 57.4 **incantantium**: *heahgaldor*; 101.18 **gemitum**: *heahgnornung*; 118.111 **exultatio**: *heahbliss*; and possibly 150.2 **potentatibus**: *heahmiht*. In these cases *heah-* serves primarily as an alliterative intensifier meaning 'highly', that is, both 'very', and 'great'. In this context, then, it is unlikely that *heahgaldor* refers to any particular kind of charm or incantation, nor does the first part of the compound even suggest much added significance for the *galdor* which follows. The meaning of *heah-* is almost completely lost, and it functions almost as a stock adjective.

Last of these *hapax legomena* is *heahsæl*, with two occurrences in the last half of the text:

101.11 Aris nu, mihtig god, miltsa Sione;
nu is hire helpe heahsæl cumen.
Tu exsurgens domine misereberis sion; quia uenit tempus miserendi eius.

118.108 Mines muðes me modes willa
on heahsælum hraðe gebringe,

---

[34] The only other use of *heahþearf* is *Instructions for Christians*, ll. 73-4, in a similar syntactic construction, but in the a-verse:
þonne se snotere ðe symle wile
æt his heahþearfe forhelan his wisdom.
See J.L. Rosier, '"Instructions for Christians": A Poem in Old English' *Anglia* 82 (1964), pp. 4-22.

and me þine domas alær drihten, swylce.
Voluntaria oris mei beneplata fac domine; et iudicia tua doce me.

In the second occurrence *on heahsælum* is an addition to the text, not clearly derived from the Latin. However, the last phrase of the previous verse is *þæt ic æfter ðinum wordum weorðe bliðe* and the first line of the following verse is *Is sawl min symble on ðinum.* The context surrounding the psalm-verse is one of bliss and happiness, eternal happiness for the soul. That *heahsæl* in this context means 'great happiness' seems likely. The earlier occurrence of *heahsæl*, however, in 101.11, appears to translate **tempus.** Rather than one *hapax legomenon* with two occurrences, there are two different words here, one built on the root *sæl* meaning 'hall', cognate with OHG *sal*, and the other built on the root *sæl* meaning originally 'happiness, prosperity, good time', cognate with Goth. *selei*, and Icel. *sæla.* The latter gradually developed the meaning 'time' or 'opportunity' in Old English. In both cases, *heah* only intensifies the meaning of *sæl.* It is possible that the word means 'great happiness' in both contexts, although this would leave **tempus** in 101.11 untranslated. More likely, there are two different *hapax legomena* here, which rather strangely occur very close to one another.

At least one more *hapax legomenon* built on *heah-* seems likely in the text. In Psalm 107.7, Tinkler argues,[35] *heahstrengðu* is an *hapax legomenon* produced as an alliterative anomaly, rather than two separate words *heah strengðu* (accepted by all the editors including Krapp):

---

[35] Tinkler, *Vocabulary and Syntax*, p. 52.

107.7 Min is Galaad gearwe Mannases.
is Effrem his agen broður
efne heah strengðu heafdes mines.
Meus est galaad et meus est manases; et effrem fortitudo capitis mei.

In the parallel verse at 59.6, the problem does not arise:

59.6 Min is Galaad gleaw Mannases
and Effrem ys æðele strengþu
heafdes mines her on foldan.

The *hapax legomenon heahstrengðu* would make an appropriate and accurate rendition of **fortitudo**, meaning 'great strength'. No metrical change would result from accepting the compound. The root of the difficulty here is that a *hapax legomenon* which is a compound in the nominative (or other non-inflected form) is not distinguished from an adjective+noun sequence. Any distinction is a modern problem, resulting from modern ideas about word-division.

However, if *heahstrengðu* is accepted as an *hapax legomenon* here, then a series of otherwise unacceptable word combinations in Psalms 88 and 89 also become possible neologisms, merely as a matter of definition. All of these collocations occur in the b-verse, with *heah* + noun. They include the following:

88.6.2 and haligra heah gemetincg (consilio)
88.9.2 heane gehnægean; hafast ðu heah mægen (uirtute)
88.36.1 Handa þu ahofe heah ehtendra (inimicorum)
89.3.1 Ne ahwyrf þu fram mænn heah eadmedu (humilitate)

Not including 107.7, there are 17 occurrences of *heah* as either a nominative singular adjective or an adverb in the metrical psalms. Some of the inflected occurrences of *heah* repeat—but with inflections making a compound impossible—some of the *hapax legomena* discussed earlier: 120.1 *to þam hean beorge*; and 88.22 *heane on mihtum.*

heahmiht and *heahbeorg* seem, then, to be deliberate compounds. The four possible instances here all occur within forty verses of each other. Perhaps, had they been less closely bunched, some of these collocations might have been accepted as *hapax legomena.* However, in 88.36.1 *heah* functions more as an adverb modifying *ahofe* than as an adjective, and there is no reason for considering the phrase as a compound except the frequency of these collocations in the psalm. 88.9.2 seems clearly defective, with four alliterating beats, but *heahmægen* does occur elsewhere in the poetry, and accepting the compound would not change an already corrupt verse for the worse. In 88.6 *heah* could also be adverbial, although *heahgemetincg* to render **consilio** as an 'important meeting' or 'grand council' would be appropriate in the context. Finally, *heaheadmedu* seems somewhat self-contradictory as a translation for **humilitate**, but the meaning of *heah* as the first element in these compounds is so neutral elsewhere that 'great humbling' or 'important humiliation' seems possible. These occurrences represent the only times *heah* + noun occurs in the text where it is not already accepted as a compound; within these two psalms *heah* certainly became a very useful tool for the poet.

Another useful first element in several compounds is the noun *neod-*, which occurs in three unique alliterative compounds late in the text: *neodlof* 148.12; *neodspearuwa* 123.6, and *neodweorðung* 142.ll.

148.12.3 herian naman drihtnes mid neodlofe.
...laudent nomen domini

123.6.2-3 niþa generede swa swa neodspearuwa
of grames huntan gryne losige.
sicut passer erepta est de laqueo uenantium.

142.11.3-5 for naman þines neodweorðunge
drihten usser do me halne
þæt ic on ðinum rihte rædfæst lifige.
propter nomen tuum domine iuiuficabis me in equitate tua.

These are the only compounds with *neod* in the metrical psalms. All alliterate, all are noun + noun combinations, and in all three *neod-* is not signalled by anything in the Latin but the second element does translate or partly translate the source. *Neodlof* makes sense as 'eager praise' and similarly *neodweorðung* is 'eager honouring' or 'eager praise' as well. However, *neod-* functions, like *heah-*, primarily as an alliterative intensifier in both these cases. Hence, unless *neodspearuwa* is to be taken as the coinage of an early naturalist, it simply means a 'sparrow'. The word is more likely to be an alliterative coinage than a lexical one.[36]

The *hapax legomena* of the metrical psalms are thus clustered around useful first elements, as the preceding examples show. They also tend to proliferate in difficult verses. In Psalm 101.3, for example, six words, including two *hapax legomena*, have their sole appearance in the text. These include *gedroren*, past participle of *gedreosan*, which, with the opening *Forðon* and the inverted syntax give an echo of the syntax of elegiac poetry; *smece* to translate *humus*; the two *hapax legomena forspyrcan* and *mearhcofan*, and the words

[36] Cf. H.D. Meritt, *Fact and Lore about Old English Words*. (Stanford, 1954), p. 195, who refutes the Bosworth-Toller definition of 'an active, restless sparrow.' See also Charles H. Whitman, 'The Birds of Old English Literature' *JEGP* 2 (1898) pp. 149-98 at 155, who notes the *hapax legomena* and compares it to A *spearwa*, and to the Lindisfarne Gospels gloss of Matthew 10.29 *staras and hrondsparuas*.

which carry the simile of the psalmist as a cock drying up in a frying-pan, *cocerpannan* and *cocas*:

> 101.3 Forðon dagas mine gedroren syndan
> smece gelice, and forspyrcende synd
> mine mearhcofan, þæs þe me þinceð
> swylce hi on cocerpannan cocas gehyrstan.
> Quia defecerunt sicut fumus dies mei; et ossa mea sicut in frixorium confrixa sunt.

Mearhcofan is most likely a compound used for alliterative purposes—the poet commonly used *bancofa*, but *mearhcofan* here gave him double alliteration in the a-verse; he ran into more difficulty in the b-verse, using an obvious filler clause. Similarly, *forspyrcende* seems to have been chosen for alliteration.[37] The psalter poet does not follow the strict rules of alliteration, as will be further discussed later, and was content to alliterate *s-* with *sp-* and add a prefix to *spyrcan* in order to fill out the metre. Bosworth-Toller defines *forspyrcan* as 'to dry out, to empty', translating the Gallican variant **aruerunt** instead of the Roman **confrixa sunt**, and connects it with *spearcan*, 'to spark'. Tinkler suggests in his analysis of this *hapax legomenon* that *forspyrcan* should be emended to *forswyrcan*, as bones in a frying-pan not only lose their marrow but also grow dark. This is an unconvincing emendation, spoiling the bones' opportunity to dry up before bursting.[38]

---

[37] Cf. Tinkler, *Vocabulary and Syntax*, p. 23.

[38] The physical presentation of the fire's ravages of the body is a commonplace; cf. *Beowulf* 1116 *ban-fatu bærnan*; and *Phoenix* 219-20 *þonne fyr þigeð/lænne lic-homan.*

In a similar passage of *Christ and Satan*, R.E. Finnegan, following Ettmuller's suggestion, emends the manuscript reading *sweartade* to *spearcade*, citing the articles of Hill and Keenan on Satan's speech in sparks and arguing for influence of the *Visio Pauli* on the text:[39]

> He spearcade þonne he spreocan ongan
> fyre and atre;
>
> (ll. 78-79a)

Possibly, the psalter poet, trying to make use of a poetic motif, drew on the common formulae of poetic lament to open the verse, then conflated the images of Satan speaking in sparks and the dry bones speaking, and ended the verse with a rather homely simile intended as a grand finale.[40] *Cocerpanne* appears only in the glossaries,[41] this text, and one psalter gloss. The gloss to the *Regius Psalter* reads:

> forðon geteorodon swa swa smic dagas mine 7 ban mina swa swa on

---

[39] Robert Emmett Finnegan, ed. *Christ and Satan.* (Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1977), p. 95. See also T.D. Hill, 'Satan's Fiery Speech: 'Christ and Satan' 78-79' *N&Q* 217 (1972) pp. 2-4, and H.T. Keenan, 'Satan Speaks in Sparks' *N&Q* 219 (1974) pp. 183-4. The history of translation of the whole verse, but without reference to this instance, appears in Valerie Edden, '"And my boonus han dried yp as critouns": the History of the Translation of Psalm 101.4' *N&Q* 28 (1981) pp. 389-92. For the *Visio Pauli* tradition in Anglo-Saxon England see Antonette diPaolo Healey, ed. *The Old English Vision of St. Paul.* Speculum Anniversary Monographs 2 (Cambridge, Mass., 1978) and the references there.

[40] For this theme see J.E. Cross, 'The Dry Bones Speak—A Theme in Some OE Homilies' *JEGP* 56 (1957) pp. 25-44; repr. in J.E. Cross, *Latin Themes in Old English Literature.* (Lund, 1962). The theme comes originally from Ezekiel 37.

[41] The DOE entry includes 10 occurrences in glosses and glossaries, six of which are in Aldhelm. Of the remaining entries, two are those discussed here.

cocerpannan gecocsoda synd.

The poet either made use of a gloss very closely related to the *Regius Psalter* itself (the reading does not appear in the copies), or both the poet and the glossator drew on a tradition now lost. Psalm 101.3 then, is one of the poet's more notable efforts, as he loses both alliteration and meaning in his attempt to render this passage.

Like the filler words, the *hapax legomena* of *PPs* provide little poetic nuance to the text, and tend to fill necessary holes in the verse rather than add new material. Where the technique is most useful is in the rendition of difficult verses, verses where the Latin is obscure or the translation is complicated by proper nouns or a lack of adequate equivalents in the vernacular. In these cases the poet developed his diction in various ways. What the psalter poet rarely, if ever, did was produce poetic diction or develop a poetic idea to express in a *hapax legomenon.*

a) *hapax legomena* in *PPs* and in selected other Old English poems

The *hapax legomena* in Old English poetic texts are an interesting marker of style and, to some extent, an index of originality. If more poetry, and perhaps more prose, survived from the period no doubt there would be substantially fewer *hapax legomena.* Many of the words which we consider to be unique would be shown to be common, or at least more frequent than we suppose. The *hapax legomena* which would remain, however, might well exist in the same or similar proportions in a given poem. The impression of the *hapax legomena* and use of vocabulary in *Exodus*, for example, suggest that even were a much larger corpus of Old English poetry to be

extant, there would remain a particular use of language and some coinages in the poem. It seems unlikely, then, that a greater corpus of Old English literature would include all the words hitherto called *hapax legomena* in *Exodus*, but none of those in *Beowulf*. The proportions of neologisms in individual poems, if the poems are of sufficient length for the numbers to be statistically significant, would probably remain the same. While the exact numbers of *hapax legomena* in each Old English poem are thus unreliable, their rate of occurrence is a more useful index of one of the stylistic phenomena of Old English poetry. Also, the kind of *hapax legomena* occurring, that is to say their morphological structure, may be a stylistic feature.[42]

Frequent occurrence of *hapax legomena* is commonly taken as a marker of stylistic excellence. For instance, in their edition of *The Wanderer*, Dunning and Bliss remark that:

> The vocabulary of *The Wanderer* shows few special characteristics. There are twenty-two hapax legomena, about the same proportion as in *Beowulf*: these are *bihreosan*,...and *wintercearig*. Of these all but two (*hrið*, *hryðig*) are compounds or derivatives of common stems;[43]

The occurrence of *hapax legomena* ranks here as a special characteristic. The *hapax legomena* are very frequent in the two texts mentioned by Dunning and Bliss: one

---

[42] The notion of grammatical analysis of compounds here is an extension from the analysis of noun compounds in David A. Reibel, *A Grammatical Index to the Compound Nouns of Old English Verse*. (Ph.D. diss. Indiana, 1963). Reibel bases his work on the entries in Grein-Köhler. See also N.O. Waldorf, *The Hapax Legomena in the Old English Vocabulary*. (Ph.D., Stanford, 1953).

[43] T.P. Dunning & A.J. Bliss, ed. *The Wanderer*. (Methuen, 1969), p. 36.

every five lines in *The Wanderer* (22 in 115 lines) and just over one every five lines in *Beowulf* (677 in 3182 lines). The occurrence of *hapax legomena* in the metrical psalms is of quite a different order of frequency—roughly one every twenty-eight lines (180 in 5039 lines). The frequency of coinage of *hapax legomena* in *PPs* is thus five times lower than it appears to be in *The Wanderer* and *Beowulf*. In the ordinary course of his work, the psalter poet did not depend heavily on the coinage of new words; in fact, despite the disproportionate amount of attention that has been paid to the *hapax legomena* in *PPs*, the translator used the technique of the invention of new words far less frequently than would appear to be typical of Old English poetry.[44]

Whether the *hapax legomena* are so embedded in the verse that they invariably alliterate is one significant feature of their appearance in Old English poetry. Table Three gives the correlation between these words and alliteration.

Table Three - *Hapax Legomena* and Alliteration in Some Old English Poems

	no. of *hapax legomena*	total lines	% h.l.	no. with allit.	percentage allit.
The Wanderer	22	115	19%	20	91%
Finnsburh Fragment	13	48	27%	13	100%

---

[44] The *Paris Psalter* is the only manuscript whose *hapax legomena*, prose as well as verse, form the greater part of the subject of a monograph, although Tinkler does point out that the manuscript is not a 'great wordhoard of Old English otherwise unrecorded' *Vocabulary and Syntax*, p. 13.

Battle of Maldon	23	325	7%	23	100%
Guthlac A & B	103	1379	8%	99	96%[45]
Solomon & Saturn	58	505	11%	55	95%
Andreas	155	1722	9%	145	94%
Exodus	165	590	28%	153	93%
Paris Psalter	215	5039	4%	188	87%[46]

The implications of this table are discussed below with respect to each poem.

Furthermore, the kinds of *hapax legomena* occurring in *PPs* are revealing when compared to other texts. *The Wanderer* is far too small a sample to be significant, but may suggest some methods of analysis. Dunning and Bliss count 22 *hapax legomena* in the text, of which 20 alliterate. Of these only two are simplices, both with the same root: *hrið* (102) and *hryðig* (77). Seven of the compounds are N+N, four Aj+N, and five N+Aj. The remaining four *hapax legomena* are Prep+Vb compounds. In all of the noun-compounds alliteration falls on the first word of the compound; in the preposition-verb compounds the alliteration, if present, falls on the

[45] Both the Guthlac poems and the Solomon and Saturn material would normally be separated into their constituent texts. However, the result would be poems too short for this kind of analysis, and the general percentages would, in any case, remain the same.

[46] There are 180 words unique to the metrical psalter, but some occur more than once in the text.

verb—*bihreosan* (77) and *biwawan* (76).[47] The two non-alliterating compounds both fall in this category: *forþolian* (38) and *geondþencan* (60, 89). In all three occurrences the verb appears both at the end of the line, and at the end of a syntactic unit.

Except for the simplices and the verb-compounds, the *hapax legomena* of *The Wanderer* all parallel similar compounds elsewhere in the poetry, and also evoke each other through repetition of elements. Thus there are two *hapax legomena* with *-cearig* as the second element (*modcearig* (2), and *wintercearig* (24)), *dreorig* occurs as the first element in *dreorighleor* (83), and as the second in *seledreorig* (25), and *sele* occurs again in *selesecg* (34), and perhaps in *winsæl* (78). Most of the *hapax legomena* in the poem thus appear to be planned; that is, the poet created them for their context, modelling the words on the standard poetic compounds of Old English. The majority of the *hapax legomena* are nominal compounds, including such well-constructed metaphors as *eardstapa* (6) and *gliwstæf* (52).

The frequency of *hapax legomena* is even higher in the *Finnsburh Fragment*, where thirteen words, including 7 N+N compounds, occur in 48 lines. One *hapax legomenon* occurs every four lines in the text.[48] They include such examples of heroic vocabulary as the possibly metaphoric *banhelm* l. 30, *sweordleoma* l. 35,

---

[47] l. 76 winde biwaune, weallas stondaþ
l. 77 hrime bi*h*rorene, hryðge þa ederas.

[48] Calculations are from the edition of Donald K. Fry, ed. *Finnsburh Fragment and Episode.* (Methuen, 1974).

sealobrun l. 35, *guðwudu* l. 6, and *drihtgesið* l. 42. There are two simplices, both probably adjectives—the obscure *celæs* l. 29 and *waðol* l. 8. The other four compounds include one each of Aj+N and Aj+Aj and two N+Aj formations. All of the *hapax legomena* in the *Finnsburh Fragment* thus belong to the classical style of vernacular poetry.

By contrast, the *hapax legomena* of the *Battle of Maldon* reveal a number of other methods of formation of compounds, and a marked shift in the concentration of these words. Scragg refers to what he calls 'the occurrence of many *hapax legomena* in the poem' and goes on to note that 'there is little originality in the vocabulary since much of it is inherited poetic diction.'[49] Scragg is quite right in the second comment but, comparatively speaking, the frequency of *hapax legomena* in *BM* is substantially lower than that of the earlier heroic poems. *BM* has only 22 *hapax legomena* in 325 lines with one repeated, providing 23 total occurrences, and the frequency is therefore approximately one every fourteen lines. Of the *hapax legomena* only 8 are N+N formations, and there are two each of N+Aj and Aj+N compounds. There are 3 simplices and one Prep+Vb compound. Lastly, there is one each of the following formations: Prefix+Aj, Av+Aj, and Prep+Aj. The *hapax legomena* do not quite fit in the tradition of poetic compounding, although they do all alliterate in the text. They further prove Scragg's statement, made concerning the metre, that 'It is in such infringements of the 'rules' governing Old English verse, minor in themselves but

---

[49] D.G. Scragg, ed. *The Battle of Maldon.* (Manchester, 1981), p. 32.

cumulatively significant, that we find the most noticeable departures from earlier practice.'[50] There are few N + N compounds, and many *hapax legomena* which are morphologically distinct from each other. All of the *hapax legomena* alliterate, including the verbs, whereas in other poems there is a tendency for verbs not to alliterate. This co-alliteration of verbs in *BM* is a striking feature, and must be in some way significant. The frequency of *hapax legomena* is much lower in *BM* than that in the other poems analysed here. Like the metre, the diction shows small but significant differences from earlier poetry.

Where more suggestive figures than these—for comparison with *PPs*—may be found is in the longer poems, particularly those with a Latin source or some evidence of influence from the Latin. In the *Guthlac* poems,[51] for instance, there are 103 *hapax legomena* in 1379 lines, a frequency of about one every thirteen lines. The formation of these coinages is:

N+N	61
N+Aj	12
Aj+N	11
Prep+Vb	3
Prep+N	8
Prep+Aj	1
simplex	7
	103

Nominal compounds are overwhelming, and the unusual formations found in *BM* are

---

[50] Scragg, pp. 29-30.

[51] Calculations are from the edition of J. Roberts, *The Guthlac Poems of the Exeter Book.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).

not evident in *Guthlac A* or *B*. All but four of the *hapax legomena* alliterate.

In *Solomon and Saturn* there are relatively more *hapax legomena* than in *Guthlac* but the higher proportion is not the result of better poetic diction, but the reverse.[52] There are 58 *hapax legomena* in 505 lines of text (including both dialogues and both manuscripts), for an average of one every nine lines. Three do not alliterate. The kinds of formations, though, are quite different. Fewer than half of the *hapax legomena* are nominal compounds, and there are nine each of simplices and of Prep+Vb combinations. The complete figures are:

N+N	23
N+Aj	5
Aj+N	4
simplex	9
Prep+Vb	9
Pref+Vb	2
Pref+N	2
Pref+N+N	1
N+Suff	1
Pref+N+Aj	1
Prep+N	1
	58

Some of these *hapax legomena* are not, in fact, as strange as they appear in tabular form. For instance, the N+Suff is *ferigend* (l. 80 MS A, *feriend* l. 80 MS B), which occurs in the a-verse to rhyme with *nerigend* in the b-verse: *flodes ferigend folces nerigend.* Similar rhyme occurs in the preceding line: *scyldigra scyld Scyppendes seld*, and in l. 83 *on westenne weard weorðmynd geard.* The *hapax legomenon*

---

[52] Calculations are from the edition of R.J. Menner, *The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn.* (New York, 1941).

ferigend is heavily influenced by the riddling and rhyming context here. Similarly, the Pref+N+Aj occurs in l. 12 (MS B) and the same line recurs in l. 39 (both MSS): *se gepalmtwigoda Pater Noster* (l. 12). The central image of the poem and the prose dialogue is the armed and glorious Pater Noster which is addressed here in terms approximating it to Christ himself. Aside from providing *p*-alliteration, *gepalmtwigod* shows a 'very definite and intentional' association between the palm tree and the Lord's Prayer.[53] The palm is a symbol of victory over the Devil and of life, and the 'palm-twigged' Pater Noster would be invincible in battle. This *hapax legomenon* is also conditioned by its purpose and context, and the unusual formation is put to good purpose in the text. The *hapax legomena* of *Solomon and Saturn* reflect the Latin background of the text and reveal that the poetic matter treated here did not fit so readily into the conventional poetic diction.

Far less difficulty with accommodating the material to the context is evident in *Andreas*, which has 155 *hapax legomena* in 1722 lines, an average of one every eleven lines.[54] 100 are N+N compounds, 22 N+Aj, 8 Aj+N, 9 simplices (nearly all nouns), 5 Prep+Vb compounds, and eleven assorted formations, none as unusual as those in *S&S*. The overwhelming majority of *hapax legomena* in *Andreas* are the more typical nominal compounds. Furthermore, the alliteration of the *hapax*

---

[53] Menner, p. 43.

[54] Calculations are from the edition of Kenneth R. Brooks, *Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961).

legomena clearly reveals what was a tendency in the other poems. Ten of the *hapax legomena* do not alliterate, including all five of the Prep+Vb compounds, two of the three simplex verbs, and the Pref+Vb compound.[55] The remaining two non-alliterating *hapax legomena* are two adjectives. However, the Prep+Vb compounds, which alliterate (usually on the verb) in some other texts, are placed in the fourth stave throughout *Andreas*. This is partly due to the tendency to put the verb at the end of the clause, which often corresponds to the end of the line, but also suggests that Prep+Vb combinations, while occasionally necessary, did not, in some poems at least, belong in the alliterating parts of the line.

Exodus, the last poem for which calculations of *hapax legomena* can be made here because of considerations of space, has 165 of these words in 590 lines, which means an extremely high frequency of one every 3.6 lines.[56] This is higher than *Beowulf* and the other heroic poems looked at here, and suggests interesting usage of poetic diction by the *Exodus* poet. The formation of *hapax legomena* is as follows:

N+N	108
N+Aj	7
Aj+N	12
Prep+Vb	9
simplex	13

[55] Cf. Marie Borroff, *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight: A Stylistic and Metrical Study*. (Yale, 1962), who discusses the way in which non-alliterating words are often the more interesting *hapax legomena*.

[56] Calculations are from the edition of Peter Lucas, *Exodus*. (London: Methuen, 1977).

Prep+N	7
Prep+Aj	3
Aj+Aj	2
Av+N	2
Pref+Vb	2
	165

There is an even more overwhelming proportion of nominal compounds in *Exodus*, although a surprising number of simplices occurs. Again, there are few verbal *hapax legomena*, and most of those do not alliterate. Of the twelve *hapax legomena* not alliterating, six are Prep+Vb, and two are Pref+Vb. Elements of the compounds are frequently repeated elsewhere, so that the vocabulary of the poem is interlocking. For example, *heah* occurs in *heahlond* l. 385, *heahtreow* l. 388 and *heahþegnung* l. 96, and *gebeorh* occurs as the second element in both *feorhgebeorh* l. 369 and *randgebeorh* l. 296. Most of the first elements of compounds occur at least twice, many appear three times, but only *sæ* and *wæl* occur four times. The diction is carefully chosen in *Exodus*, and the arrangement and frequency of the *hapax legomena* reveal the dexterity of the poet.

In the *Paris Psalter*, however, the use of *hapax legomena* is somewhat different from that of *Beowulf* and the other poems examined here. Appendix Four gives a list of these words in the metrical psalter, and includes their structure. In summary, it shows the following frequency and totals of types of *hapax legomena* in the text:

N+N	89
N+Aj	3
Aj+N	20
Aj+Aj	1

Aj+N+Sfx	3
Prep+N	6
Pref+N	8
N+Sfx	3
Prep+N+Sfx	1
N+N+Sfx	4
Pref+N+N	2
N+Pref+N	4
Prep+Pref+N	1
Aj+Sfx	1
Adv+N	1
N+Adv	1
Adv+Aj	2
Adv+Prep	1
Prep+Vb	13
Simplex	16
	180

Over half of the *hapax legomena* in the metrical psalter are N+N compounds, but the array of other structures is the greatest in the poems studied here. Also, there is a higher proportion of verbal *hapax legomena*, and of simplices. Further, the percentage of alliteration is much lower than that in the other poems discussed. The *hapax legomena*, like other features of the verse translation, reveal small but significant differences in comparison to the rest of the Old English poetic corpus.

(iii) Metre

In his review of the facsimile edition of the *Paris Psalter*, Campbell comments that Kenneth and Celia Sisam 'are kind to the poet in describing his metre as decadent....The metrical Psalms are not so much decadent as pedestrian.'[57]

---

[57] A. Campbell, rvw. EEMF 8 in *MAE* 28 (1959) pp. 107-8 at 107.

Pedestrian is certainly the better word for a description of the metre of the metrical psalter, particularly because decadent implies a decay, whether conscious or not, from the classical standards of Old English metre as exemplified by *Beowulf*. Whether the differences between the *Paris Psalter* and *Beowulf* are the result of decay it is difficult to say. No difference in date can be proven between the two texts, although they most likely do represent different eras in Anglo-Saxon poetry, and the *Paris Psalter* is likely to be later. More important, perhaps, is the difference in mode between the texts: *Beowulf* is a long and coherent poem involving heroic themes and chronicling the birth and death of nations, while the *Paris Psalter* is a translation, usually quite close, of a series of poems, often quite short ones, which are not indigenous to Anglo-Saxon culture. Differences in metre are likely to be linked to these differences. The *Paris Psalter* can perhaps be more profitably compared to those texts in Old English which belong to the same genre, the short poems which are translations of liturgical material for use in vernacular versions of the Office or the Mass and *Judgment Day II*.[58] These texts provide a body of almost 700 lines, albeit one that consists of quite short works which may vary metrically among themselves.

Here the metre of the *Paris Psalter* will be compared to that of *Beowulf*, such that the departures from accepted convention can be identified and discussed.[59]

---

[58] These texts include a group which has already been loosely associated with the metrical psalter—the five poems in the latter part of CCCC MS 201. To these poems can be added the metrical paraphrases in the *Benedictine Office*.

[59] Some parameters for this kind of stylistic comparison and analysis are laid out in Klaus R. Grinda, 'Pigeonholing Old English Poetry: Some Criteria of Metrical

More briefly, its similarities with the group of translations including *Judgment Day II, Lord's Prayer II, An Exhortation to Christian Living, Gloria I, Lord's Prayer III,* and the *Creed* will be considered.[60] The sample of the metrical psalter used for analysis here comes from towards the end of the text, Psalms 118 to 122 (620 lines). The length of Psalm 118 makes it perhaps an unduly coherent choice, but the metre of the *Paris Psalter* is remarkably uniform throughout.[61] The metrical analysis of the sample appears in Appendix Five. For comparison with *Beowulf*, I have used Bliss's analysis, and I have followed Bliss throughout in the analysis of metrical types.[62]

Style' *Anglia* 102 (1984) pp. 305-22.

[60] The edition from which these texts were examined is Elliot Van Kirk Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, ASPR 6 (New York: Columbia, 1942).

[61] See, for instance, B. Tschischwitz, *Die Metrik der angelsächsischen Psalmen-übersetzung*. (Breslau, 1908) for a detailed description of the metre. R.E. Diamond, *The Diction of the Anglo-Saxon Metrical Psalms*. Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 10 (The Hague, 1963) comments on the 'surprisingly regular verses' (p. 9). M.S. Griffith considers the metre in connection with that of other translation poems in *Method of Composition*, pp. 62-114.

[62] A.J. Bliss, *The Metre of* Beowulf. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1958, rev. ed. 1962). Bliss's conventions for analysis are retained here in order to keep the comparison with *Beowulf* as accurate as possible. The only difference lies in not making Bliss's distinction between remainders and defective verses; all such verses are simply listed here as remainders. I have even followed Bliss in his analysis of initial finite verbs as unstressed parts of the verse, despite the cogent arguments of M.S. Griffith, *Method of Composition*, pp. 65-71. See also E.G. Stanley, 'Verbal Stress in Old English Verse' *Anglia* 93 (1975) pp. 307-34 at 307-21. For a completely different approach to metrical analysis see J.C. Pope, *The Rhythm of Beowulf: An Interpretation of the Normal and Hypermetric Verse-Forms in Old English Poetry*. 2nd ed. (Yale, 1966).

The metrical analysis of this passage does, however, reveal two psalm-verses where the division into lines and half-lines is awkward. In 118.49.2 the line as it is arranged makes little syntactic sense:

118.49 Gemun nu, dryhten, þines wordes,
on þam þu me þinum þeowe hyht gesealdest.

There is no alliteration in the first line of this verse, and the only way to produce alliteration in the second line is to place the noun *þeowe* in the head-stave. Syntactically *þeowe* belongs in the a-verse, and shifting it there would produce half-lines typical of the metrical psalter—a1f and 1A1a—but no alliteration. The entire psalm-verse may well be corrupt in some way, but moving *þeowe* makes better syntactic and metrical stress. Secondly, in 118.125, rearrangement produces one metrically odd verse but makes greater syntactic and semantic sense. Krapp reads:

118.125 Ic eom esne þin; syle andgit, þæt ic
þine gewitnesse wel leornige.[63]

Here, shifting *þæt ic* to the beginning of the second line produces an unexceptionable d1e verse *þæt ic þine gewitnesse*, but makes a new type of light verse in the b-verse

---

For variations in these approaches see Thomas Cable, *The Meter and Melody of* Beowulf. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 64 (Urbana, 1974), and Geoffrey Russom, *Old English Meter and Linguistic Theory*. (Cambridge, 1987). The works upon which all metrical analysis of Old English poetry base themselves are E. Sievers, 'Zur Rhythmik des germanischen Alliterationsverses' *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 10 (1885), pp. 209-314 and 451-545; and, by the same author, *Altgermanische Metrik*. (Halle, 1893).

[63] Grein and Grein-Wülker have the same arrangement, except that they omit the comma between *andgit* and *þæt*.

of the previous line: *syle andgit*, a1b. However, that verse as it reads in Krapp's edition is similarly awkward, requiring stress on *ic* to produce Type 3B*1b. Rearranging the verse seems preferable.

A few other points should be made about the *Paris Psalter* before a comparison to *Beowulf*. They include: the average number of syllables in a verse, the use of secondary stress, the occurrence of isolated half-lines, the placement of metrical stress, the alliteration, and the use of anacrusis.

First, Pope argues that the average number of syllables in a normal verse in Old English is, for most poems, between five and six.[64] This seems a slightly high figure, but in any case the *Paris Psalter* average verse is certainly closer to six syllables than to five. As a result, the verse of the *Paris Psalter* appears wordy and cluttered, only rarely consisting of one or two words. The a-verse in particular generally includes at least three words, and six syllables, while the b-verse seems to have fewer of each. However, the verse of the *Paris Psalter* looks unbalanced, overfull of words and of syllables. Whether this impression is borne out by analysis will shortly be seen.

Secondary stress, and the verse-types which include it, is unduly rare in the metrical psalter. This diminishing proportion of D and E types was first analyzed by Tschischwitz, who noted the close correlation between metrical looseness and direct

---

[64] J.C. Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*. 2nd ed. (New York: Norton, 1981), p. 108.

translation.[65] One of the results of direct translation appears to be problems with the creation of complex verses. The subtle variations in stress which verses using secondary stress provide is perhaps out of place in a poem concerned solely with the production of literal meaning. The third group of verses with secondary stress, the A2, A3 and A4 verses, are even worse represented than D and E types. This is particularly the case for A2 verses, which account for a total of 85 a-verses with double alliteration in *Beowulf*. In the *Paris Psalter* examples of A2 verses are very rare; in the passage analyzed by Griffith (Psalms 51-63, the first 480 lines of the text), there are no examples of 1A2, and 2 examples of 2A2, one of which is quite remarkably in the b-verse.[66] Similarly, the prevalence of A3 in *Beowulf*—a total of 194 verses, including 120 with double alliteration in the a-verse—contrasts to the paucity of the type in the metrical psalter, which has 4 examples of A3 in the first 480 lines. Finally, *Beowulf* has five examples of A4; the sample from the metrical psalter has none. The very few occasions on which secondary stress occurs in Type A verses in the metrical psalter seem almost accidental. This lack of verses with secondary stress in *PPs* means automatically a paucity of single-word verses, of compounds, and of complex verses, because those are the verse forms which most frequently make use of secondary stress.

One feature of the *Paris Psalter* which is, on the face of it, somewhat unusual,

---

[65] Tschischwitz, p. 93.

[66] Griffith, *Method of Composition*, p. 291.

is the rarity of the isolated half-line. There are only eight half-lines in the text, of which four are cut off in the manuscript.[67] The remaining four half-lines are:

52.5.6a æniges ne þurfon.
77.56.4a fæste healdan.
117.26.2a ecne andette;
149.2.3a swiðust ealra.

In all of these half-lines except 117.26.2, the translation of the entire psalm verse is complete, and the half-line appears at the end of the psalm-verse. These three half-lines seem original to the poet. The fourth half-line is possibly a result of scribal error:

117.26 þu eart min dryhten god, and ic dædum þe
ecne andette;
þu eart min hælend god, and ic herige ðe.
Deus meus es tu et confitebor tibi; deus meus es tu et exaltabo te.

That a half-line including another epithet for God, such as *ælmihtig god* or *eallmihtig fæder*, might have been part of the original translation seems likely, especially given the weight and length of the verses surrounding it. This would produce a verse with several epithets in close succession, but such a technique is not unusual in the metrical psalms. Whatever is concluded about the verse, there remain at most four single half-lines in the extant text.[68] The psalter poet may have written few metrically

---

[67] 67.28.1, 79.18.1 (which should probably be emended to a full line by comparison with this verse in the *Benedictine Office*), 97.8.1, and 109.6.1.

[68] See A.J. Bliss, 'Single Half-lines in Old English Poetry' *N&Q* 216 (1971) pp. 442-9 for an examination of all the short lines in the Junius manuscript. He concludes that those with double alliteration or alliteration continued from the previous line should be printed as they stand.

intricate lines, but he wrote equally few isolated half-lines.

The standard view of Old English metrics divides the parts of speech into stress-words, particles and proclitics. Metrical stress falls as a rule on 'fully meaningful words which naturally carry a strong stress: nouns, verbal nouns (infinitives and participles), adjectives, and many adverbs.'[69] In *PPs*, however, stress falls on such normally unstressed parts of speech as auxiliary verbs, personal pronouns, finite verbs (even when not displaced from their normal position), and even occasionally on proclitics including possessive pronouns, prepositions, and demonstratives. For example,

118.29.1 Afyr fram me unryhte wegas,

This line either has no alliteration or vowel alliteration on *Afyr* and *unryhte*, which produces very odd metrical stress but verses which do scan as 3E1 and 2A1a. Placing stress on not one but two prefixes is unusual, when the metrical stress would normally fall on the root verb and noun. Other examples of unusual metrical stress include:

118.39.1 þu me scealt edwitt min of awyrpan.
118.44.2 and to worulde on *ðære* wunian mote.
118.66.1 þu me þeodscipe *þinne* tilne
118.66.3 forðon ic *þin* bebod þriste gelyfde
118.70.2 swa meoluc *wese* mægene gerunnen;
118.85.2 sægdon soðlice; na ic hit *swa* oncneow
118.87.3 ic *þin* gebed *þa* ne wolde
118.110.3 *fram* þinum bebodum feor geswician
118.131.3 þær *ic* ðin bebod efnede mid willan
121.3.3 þær *syndon* dælas on sylfre hire.

---

[69] A.J. Bliss, *An Introduction to Old English Metre.* (Oxford, 1962) p. 7.

Metrical and alliterative stress, if any is recognised,[70] falls here on such unlikely words as the particle *þa*, the preposition *fram*, the possessive pronoun *þin* even when it precedes the governing noun, the auxiliary verb *wesan* and the connective *swa*.

Alliteration in the metrical psalter is similarly lax. Griffith has pointed out the much higher percentage of vowel alliteration in translation poetry, especially in *PPs*.[71] The frequency with which prefixed verbs alliterate either on the verb or on the prefix is also high, in that consistency of alliteration for each word is lacking. For example, the verb *oncneowan* appears several times in the selection, and alliteration shifts back and forth from the prefix to the root:

118.85.2 sægdon soðlice; na ic hit swa oncneow,
118.100.1 Ic þæt ofer yldran oncneow and þæt a geheold,
118.104.1 On bebodum ðinum ic me betst oncneow,

The alliteration is on the root in the first and third examples, but must be on the prefix in 118.100.1 in order to avoid a breach of Kuhn's Law, and to provide double alliteration in the a-verse.

The alliterative distinctions between *s*, *sc*, *sp* and *st* are usually present, but as Amos points out palatal and velar *g* do not alliterate.[72] These sounds no longer

---

[70] In some of these cases, it would be possible to argue for accidental alliteration.

[71] Griffith, pp. 24-40.

[72] Ashley Crandell Amos, *Linguistic Means of Determining the Dates of Old English Literary Texts*. Medieval Academy Books 90 (Cambridge, Mass., 1980), p. 101.

alliterate with each other, and the poet's usage reflected that change.[73] There is also a lower percentage of double alliteration in the a-verse, even for verse-types which in *Beowulf* would have double alliteration there in well over 95% of occurrences. Alliteration in the metrical psalter follows the conventions of Old English verse, but stretches those conventions to fit the requirements of a different kind of verse, and a different purpose.

Finally, the frequency of anacrusis is much higher in *PPs*. Bethel notes that half of the E-types in the first half of the line have anacrusis, a feature which shows an 'exceptional enthusiasm' for that usage.[74] Generally, there is a lavish use in the text of extended anacrusis. Light verses in particular can be very long, with collections of unaccented words occurring in the anacrusis.

(a) The *Paris Psalter* and *Beowulf*

Three major points of comparison to *Beowulf* will be considered here: the use of new verse types, the new proportions of known verse types, and the placement of verse types in the line. Appendix V(b) gives a summary of the results of the scansion of Psalms 118-122.

---

[73] This idea first appears in E.V. Gordon, ed. *Battle of Maldon*, (London, 1937), p. 44n, and may be originally Tolkien's.

[74] Patricia Bethel, 'On Anacrusis in the Psalms of the Paris Psalter' *NM* 89 (1988), pp. 33-43; see also her 'Notes on types of anacrusis in *Genesis B* and relations with other anacrusis in Old English and Old Saxon' *Parergon* 2 (1984) pp. 1-24.

The proportion of light verses in the a-verse here is slightly higher than that of *Beowulf*, but very few occur in the b-verse. (The figures of Bliss for *Beowulf* are unreliable unless the co-alliteration of verbs is accepted as not giving double alliteration.) Of those that do appear in the b-verse, 13 are in verse-types that also occur in the b-verse in *Beowulf*, and only 3 verses (2 of a1b, 1 of a1c) do not appear in the b-verse in *Beowulf*. However, the metrical psalter does expand the metrically acceptable limits for light verses, as the following verse-types unattested in *Beowulf* occur: a1g, a2b, d1e, d1f, d2-, and e1f. In all cases except a2b, the new types provide for more unaccented syllables. Otherwise they are unremarkable. See, for example:

d1e	118.14.2a	þær ic ðine gewitnesse
d1f	118.22.3a	forðan ic þine gewitnesse
a1g	118.39.3a	forþon ic eom on þinum domum

In all of these verses, extra words and additional information require the use of longer metrical types than those which occur in *Beowulf*.

On the other hand, there are only two hypermetric verses in the selection:

118.124.2a mycel milde mod,
118.140.2a sylf swiþe hat,[75]

These verses are not as complex as the hypermetric verses in *Beowulf* nor quite as frequent, but they are not otherwise different. The proportions of normal verses also differ from those in *Beowulf*. Almost half (307) of the b-verses are 2A1a, and an

[75] These are not listed in Bliss's Index of Hypermetric Verses, in *Metre*, pp. 162-8.

additional 115 are 1A*1a.[76] The result is a monotonous sameness in b-verses. Many verse types are sparsely represented, and double alliteration is rare. The following verse-types which occur in *Beowulf* do not appear in the selection from *PPs*: 1*D*1, 3*E*1, 1A2b, 1A*2b, 1A*3, 1A*4, 1D2, 1D3, 1D4, 1D*1, 1D*4, 1D*6, 2A1b, 2A3b, 2A4, 2B1-, 2B1d, 2B2-, 2B2b, 2B2c, 2B2d, 2C2-, 2C2a, 2C2c, 2C2d, 2C2e, 2E1a, 2E1b, 2E2a, 2E2b, 3B2c, 3E3 and 3E*3. Some of these verse-types are rare in *Beowulf*, but they collectively account for 8% of the text. The non-appearance of those types in the *PPs* selection suggests a lack of variety in the verse. This diminution of verse-types is hardly offset by the single occurrence of a new verse-type (3B*1f in 118.173.3a *forðon ic þine bebodu geceas*) or by the use of several variants of f-type verses.[77] These include the following in this selection:

f1a	118.109.1a	Is sawl min
f1b	118.167.1a	Hafað sawl min
	119.5.4b	nis min cyð þær,
	121.2.2b	þær ure cyðð wæs,
f1c	118.93.2a	nymðe ic soð word
	118.94.1a	Ic eom þin hold scealc
	118.126.1b	þæt man eac wel do, (w-alliteration)
	118.141.3a	þæt ic þin soð weorc
f1d	118.94.2a	forðon ic þin soð weorc
	118.129.2a	forðon heo min sawl smeað

These verse-types do not appear in *Beowulf*, but they do occur sporadically in other Old English poems, notably in the liturgical verse and *Judgment Day II*:

---

[76] Cf. Griffith, *Method of Composition*, p. 95.

[77] Cf. E. Neuner, *Uber ein- und dreihebige Halbverse in der altenglischen alliterierenden Poesie.* (Weimar, 1920).

f1b JDII 43a ðis is an hæl (vowel alliteration)
f1b Crd 45a ac is an god, (vowel alliteration)[78]

The paucity of D and E-types in *PPs* has already been noted. The selection contains a total of 26 verses of both types. Many of them are typical examples of these types. 118.2.4a, for instance, is a Type 1D*2: *heortan hordcofan.* Similarly, there are very few Type A verses with secondary stress. When they do appear, they also follow standard usage; for example, Type 2A3a appears in 118.136.2a *wid gang wætera.* However, there remain only 12 Type A verses with secondary stress in the metrical psalter sample, when in *Beowulf* there are 306. The number in the metrical psalter is statistically negligible; that in *Beowulf* represents 0.5% of all the verses in the poem. Finally, the heavy Type B and C verses are spread through both the a and b-verses, with and without double alliteration. There are occasional collections in particular categories (such as Type 2C1b with 16 in the a-verse, single alliteration; and 12 in the b-verse) but many of these concentrations result from simple repetition. The collocations of *milde mod* and *soðfæst word* (or *soðfæst weorc*) lend themselves readily to the production of Type B verses, while *æ þine* invariably produces Type C. This kind of repetition does not, of course, occur in *Beowulf*, and the verse types there can fulfil more accurately the conventions of alliterative verse.

There are three verses in the selection which do not alliterate:

118.21.3 and þine bebodu efnan noldan.

---

[78] See Matti Rissanen, *The Uses of One in Old and Early Middle English* Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 36 (Helsinki, 1967), p. 297 for the stressed use of *an* in Old English poetry.

118.46.4 and on þam ne beon æfre gescynded.
118.165.1 þam bið sib mycel þe him þenceð,

Once, it would be possible to argue for transverse alliteration:

118.38.1 Sete ðinum esne oðer swylce,

However, since I have followed Bliss in not counting imperatives as accented syllables (except on the very few occasions when the alliteration requires it) and since there is no other evidence of the poet attempting metrical subtleties, it seems best to consider the transverse alliteration here accidental.

Nowhere in *Beowulf* do more than two consecutive lines have identical metrical types.[79] In this selection from *PPs*, however, this happens on several occasions, notably including 121.1.1-3:

121.1 Ic on ðyssum eom eallum bliðe,
þæt me cuðlice to acweden syndon,
and on godes hus gange syððan.

Here all three a-verses are 3B1b, and all three b-verses are 2A1a, the only difference among the latter being the monosyllabic anacrusis in *acweden syndon*. There is little stylistic variation of the metrical types in the metrical psalter.

The arrangement of types in the line also differs from that in *Beowulf*. For instance, Type 1A1a has double alliteration in the a-verse 150 times, single alliteration

---

[79] The seventeen examples of consecutive lines with the same metrical types in *Beowulf* are: 184-5 3B1a 1A*1a; 198-9 1A*1a d3b; 273-4 d1b 2A1a; 427-8 1D1 2A1a; 465-6 3B1b 2A1a; 821-2 3B1b 1A*1a; 1725-6 3B1a 2A1a; 1765-6 2C1b 3B1b; 1828-9 d1b 2A1a; 2023-4 2A1a 3B1b; 2242-3 1A*1a 3E2; 2245-6 2A1a 3E2; 2374-5 d1b 2A1a; 2404-5 2A3a 3B1b; 2700-1 1A1a 2B1b; 2776-7 2A1a 2E2a; and 3181-2 2A1a d2a.

11 times, and occurs in the b-verse 151 times in *Beowulf*. The corresponding figures in this passage are 0, 3 and 65. Type 1A1a, which 50% of the time has double alliteration in *Beowulf*, never does so in this section of *PPs*. The figures are similar for 1A*1a, except that it occurs even more frequently in the b-verse in *PPs*. Also, it can have anacrusis in *PPs*, which it only has in *Beowulf* if it has double alliteration. Thus, 118.19.2b *þine þa deoran bebodu,* and 118.98.1a *þu me snoterne gedydest.* The second example also violates Kuhn's Law, the principles of which seem not to be considered important in this text. It is commonly broken, and unaccented syllables occur where necessary in the verse. This makes the scansion of the verse difficult at times, when the location of the caesura can be obscured. Other examples of the loss of Kuhn's Law are:

118.18.1a Onwreoh þu mine eagan,
118.63.2a and þine halige bebodu
118.80.3a þæt ic on ealdre ne wese
118.172.3a wærun eall þin bebodu

These are not just minor violations of the rules governing *Satzpartikeln*. In every case emending to put all of the unaccented syllables into the same dip would be almost impossible and would also change the meaning of the verse. The widespread departures from Kuhn's Law must be authorial, and most likely reflect a relaxation of the verse form for this text.

Also, Bliss gives the distribution of monosyllabic and disyllabic anacrusis in *Beowulf*, ordering this metrical feature by the types in which it occurs. In *PPs*, the anacrusis can be as much as pentasyllabic, and it consists of much more than the anacrusis of *ge-* and other prefixes, which is the most frequent use of anacrusis in

Beowulf:

118.15.1a Swa ic on þine soðfæstnysse
118.47.3a forþan ic hi on lufan minre
121.9.1a And ic for mines godes huse.

These examples show the extremes of anacrusis in the metrical psalter, but single, double and triple anacrusis are fairly common in the text. Anacrusis occurs not just in a-verses with double alliteration, but also in a-verses with single alliteration (as in the examples above) and in b-verses, such as 118.72.1b *þæt ic bebodu healde*. Also found in the b-verse are types reserved in *Beowulf* for the a-verse:

a1b	118.125.1b	syle andgit
a1c	118.69.2b	ic nu mid ealre
1D5	120.4.2b	se þe sceal healdan nu
1D*2	118.75.3b	samed eadmedne
1D*3	121.4.3b	wæran Israelas[80]
1D*5	118.90.1b	wunað ece forð
2A2	118.150.1b	ungemete neah aa
2A2	118.150.2b	syndon ealle hi
2A2	118.172.3b	æghwær rihtwis

The three occurrences of 2A2 in the b-verse are rather clustered, which may suggest that with metre, as with other features of the metrical psalter, changes or innovations tended to be repeated fairly soon thereafter. The appearance of heavy types with secondary stress in what is usually the lighter verse, with less complex types, suggests that in this matter, as in may others, the translator did not follow the *Gesetze* closely.

Last is the occurrence in the a-verse of verse types used in *Beowulf* only in the b-verse. There are fewer of these, but heavy verse types are particularly prone to this

[80] The example of lD*3 depends upon the stress of *Israelas*, which is scanned here as /\x.

shift:

3B*1d 118.84.2a þe þu mine ehtend for me
3B*1e 118.67.3a hwæðere ic þine spræce geheold
3B2b 118.83.4a þine soðfæste weorc

The need to include as much information as possible in the a-verse meant a shift in conventional verse organization. Compared to *Beowulf*, then, the metrical psalter has more verse types, a looser approach to the conventions surrounding anacrusis and double alliteration, a shift of verse types to other places in the line, fewer heavy verses and verses with secondary stress, more light verses and Type A verses, and less attention to Kuhn's Law and other conventions of metre.

(b) The *Paris Psalter, Judgment Day II* and the liturgical poetry

The occurrence of f-type verses in the liturgical poems has already been discussed. Other similarities are readily apparent. Scansion, for instance, of the first nine lines of *Judgment Day II* reveals a comparable preponderance of heavy verses in the a-verse, a lack of double alliteration, and a high frequency of Type A verses in the b-verse:

Hwæt, ic ana sæt 3B1b innan bearwe, 2A1a
mid helme beþeht, 3B*1b holte tomiddes, 1A*1a
þær þa wæterburnan ~~2A1 swegdon and urnon 1a*1a
on middan gehæge ~1A*1a eal swa ic secge. 1A1b
Eac þær wynwyrta 1D*2 weoxon and bleowon 1A*1a
innan þam gemonge 1A*1b on ænlicum wonge, ~2A1a
and þa wudubeamas ~~2A1 wogedon and swegdon 1A*1a
þurh winda gryre; ~2A1a wolcn wæs gehrered, 1A1b
and min earme mod 3B1b eal wæs gedrefed. 1A1b

Here, only line 5 has double alliteration, and every b-verse is a Type A. Only Types

A, B, and D are represented in the passage, which compares well to *PPs*; however, there are no light verses, which there probably would be in the metrical psalter.

Kuhn's Law is similarly ignored in the liturgical poetry, for example in *Gloria I 23b and on þone seofoðan þu gerestest* (Type lA*lb with quadruple anacrusis). The anacrusis here is somewhat excessive, but triple anacrusis does occur not infrequently, including in *JD II 180a and þe mid stiðum astyrest* (1A*la), and 266a *ne bið þær wædl ne lyre* (lAla), and in *Exh 41b wið þære wambe fylle* (2Ala). Double and single anacrusis are relatively common in these texts, although there are differences among them. The repetition of the same verse types is not as marked in these texts, and there is more use of secondary stress, but the vocabulary used and the need for alliteration tend to strain the verse form somewhat. For example, *Lord's Prayer II* begins:

> þu eart ure fæder 2A1a ealles wealdend, 2A1a
> cyninc on wuldre. 1A*1a Forðam we clypiað to þe, 3B*1c
> are biddað, 2A1a nu þu yþast miht 3B1b
> sawle alysan. 1A*1a þu hig sændest ær 3B1b
> þurh þine æþelan hand 3B1c in to þam flæsce; 1A1b
> ac hwar cymð heo nu, 3B1b

The epithet *ealles wealdend* is actually a calque rendering **omni potens**, and alliteration requires stress on *ure* in the a-verse, in order to provide vowel alliteration. Similarly, in line 5 the vowel alliteration means that the preposition *in* has to alliterate. The adverb *ær* is awkwardly added at the end of line 4, purely to eke out a fourth stress. The verses are all Type A or B, with extra syllables and anacrusis in order to fit the material into the verse form. *æþelan* and *yþost* are added primarily for alliteration, and three nouns translate **pater**: *fæder, wealdend* and *cyninc*. These

additions and changes to the verse closely resemble those in the metrical psalter.

Further examination of these liturgical poems might prove the existence of a different mode of verse production, a mode in which the conventions of the Old English metrical system were substantially relaxed and to some extent rewritten. This mode of verse production allowed for a much higher frequency of light verses, more use of anacrusis, a higher tolerance for unaccented syllables in the line, greater fluidity in the line such that verse types normally confined to one location could move, and generally a more permissive approach to the line.

The notion that each half-line should be a syntactically separate segment may have been the first feature of the Old English verse to be changed in this mode of production. Thus, for example, in *PPs 118.99.1 Ofer ealle þa þe me ær lærdon*, editors divide the line between *þa* and *þe* to produce 3B1b in the a-verse and 2C1b in the b-verse. Syntactically, however, *þa þe* acts together as a relative pronoun and the separation of the two particles is awkward at best. The line could be divided after *ealle*, which would result in a very short a-verse a1b, and a very long b-verse 2C1c, which seems perhaps even less acceptable. The root of the difficulty is the need to produce a particular kind of verse, a verse in which considerations well beyond the poetic intervene.

Greenfield describes the metrical psalter as verses 'not very distinguished as poetry: meter and alliteration, however regular, are mechanical and uninspired, common adjectives and adverbs as well as unusual words are overworked as verse

fillers, and the traditional poetic vocabulary finds little place therein.'[81] These statements are not entirely clear: the metre is to some extent regular, but it strains the conventions of Old English verse and generally ignores Kuhn's Law; the use of adjectives and adverbs as filler words to provide alliteration is not restricted to the *Paris Psalter* although it is certainly more frequent there than in most other Old English poems; what 'unusual words' means is obscure; and 'the traditional poetic vocabulary' needs closer definition. There are certainly poetic words in the text, but there are fewer compounds, fewer hapax legomena and fewer poetic locutions, in that the syntax tends towards prose word-order. R.E. Diamond argues that the psalter poet's 'choice of diction here is not exactly the result of the creative process we often think of in connection with poetry, but a rather mechanical matter.'[82] Again, what the Old English poet intended in his production of a metrical version of the psalter is impossible for the modern critic to recover, and Diamond's assumption of a 'creative process' is a tenuous one at best. What both Greenfield and Diamond are pointing toward are features in the metrical psalter which set it apart from the highly-wrought verse typical of such works as Beowulf and Exodus.

These features, however, are subject to a number of explanations. The infrequency of poetic locutions and hapax legomena, the oddities of syntax, and the

---

[81] Greenfield, *New Critical History*, p. 232, chapter by Greenfield, reviewed by D. Calder prior to publication but not substantially changed.

[82] Diamond, *Diction*, p. 7.

relaxation of metrical conventions combine to produce a different sort of poetry. Some have argued that the *Paris Psalter* is simply late and decadent verse, produced in a period when recollection of the conventions of poetry was being lost. To some extent this may well be true, but the *Battle of Maldon*, the latest datable long poem in Old English, errs in the direction of too-scrupulous attention to details of versification, rather than manifesting a falling-off in these techniques.[83] Similarly, that almost all of the criteria used for dating Old English poems are inconsistent and impossible to use has been proven by Amos. For instance, the test of contraction after the loss of intervocalic *h* is shown not to provide 'reliable evidence.'[84] Concluding a date from stylistic, or even phonological, evidence is very risky, especially when the span of time in which the greater part of Old English poetry was composed might be as small as a few decades or as extended as several centuries.[85] The differences in technique in the metrical psalter may be in part a result of date, but other considerations are at work as well.

In a more sophisticated variant of this argument, Shippey posits that the decline of Old English poetry might have been linked in some way to the

---

[83] On the other hand, see Thomas Cable, 'Metrical Style as Evidence for the Date of *Beowulf*' in *The Dating of Beowulf*. ed. C. Chase. (Toronto, 1981), pp. 77-82 for the changes to poetic form in the late Old English period.

[84] A.C. Amos, *Linguistic Means*, p. 49.

[85] Cf. E.G. Stanley, 'Some Doubts and No Conclusions' in *The Dating of Beowulf*, pp. 197-211.

development of prose.[86] He examines Alfred's translation of the *Metres of Boethius* and concludes that '[h]is verse here is prosaic in more senses than one—in rhythm, in vocabulary, ultimately even in the structure of sentences.'[87] This argument is certainly an interesting one, especially given the rise of prose styles which make 'significant rhythmical distinctions'[88] in the second half of the tenth century. The similarities between Ælfric's rhythmical line and the plain, unadorned verse of a work such as the metrical psalter are clear. Prose and poetry are, however, two distinct entities, and arguing that the linkage between the two is so strong that one could so heavily influence the other, as Shippey suggests (admittedly in the form of a question), is debatable.

Linked to this argument is the view that the stylistic changes in such poems as the *Paris Psalter*, *Metres of Boethius*, and *Judgment Day II* are a result of their being translation poetry. Griffith has argued the point most recently, and most clearly, suggesting that many of the metrical changes and alliterative anomalies, the limited number of syntactic constructions and the use of prose words and repetitive language are simply features of translation poetry, the result of close translation from a Latin

---

[86] T.A. Shippey, *Old English Verse*. (London, 1972), p. 181-9.

[87] Shippey, p. 181.

[88] A. McIntosh, *Wulfstan's Prose, PBA* 35 (1949) pp. 109-42.

original.[89]

Finally, the *Paris Psalter* may belong to a different genre, that of liturgical poetry. That genre, or mode of verse since the category in Old English verse is not really large enough to merit the term genre, is concerned not only with translation but also with the production of a particular kind of verse. The metrical differences in the metrical psalter are very similar to those in the shorter liturgical poems, and the close syntactic connection to the Latin source is also typical of those poems. The lower proportion in this material of hapax legomena, and the higher proportion of filler words and repetitious locutions may simply reflect a different kind of communication. The primary purpose of the metrical psalter is, after all, the translation of the psalms into the vernacular, and translating such a sacred text requires the most prestigious form available in the vernacular—poetry. In order to accommodate this material, changes in the vernacular form were necessary, and changes were made. However, while the result may have been 'decadent' and 'bad' verse in this case, that is not the inevitable result of changes to a verse form. This is a tired poet, not a decadent system.

---

[89] M.S. Griffith, *The Method of Composition*, summarized on pp. 249-55.

Conclusion: Some Problems and Parallels

In 1835, a reviewer of Thorpe's edition of the *Paris Psalter* described the text as a 'version of the Psalms, in pure and elegant Saxon.'[1] Such a high evaluation of the metrical psalter did not last long when the text was better understood, and Bartlett's description of 1894 castigating 'the negligence and clumsiness of the translation and the poverty and artificiality of the verse'[2] is typical of modern views. On the other hand, Pearsall almost seems to praise the text as one in a number of 'routine productions' of the late Old English period which 'show that the skills of classical Old English verse were not forgotten.'[3] Wrenn more typically notes that the versification does not show 'any poetic merit beyond what is occasionally carried over from the Latin'[4] and Donoghue, most recently, calls the psalter poet 'unimaginative and scarcely competent.'[5] The last description may be unduly harsh, but the metrical psalter is certainly neither inspired verse nor a creative and imaginative translation of the psalter. It is,

---

[1] *Fraser's Magazine* 12 (1835), pp. 76-8.

[2] Helen Bartlett, *The Metrical Division of the Paris Psalter.* (Baltimore, 1896), p. 49.

[3] Derek Pearsall, *Old English and Middle English Poetry.* (London, 1977), p. 63.

[4] C.L. Wrenn, *A Study of Old English Literature.* (London, 1967), p. 193.

[5] Daniel Donoghue, *Style in Old English Poetry,* (New Haven, 1987), p. 35.

however, not a text so negligible that it should be ignored by scholars, using its manifest defects as a reason for dismissing it from consideration. In the early eleventh century this translation of the psalms was, after all, copied into two de luxe psalter manuscripts, used for a few lines in another poem, and used to explain the contents of the Benedictine daily hours in the vernacular. More attention to the metrical psalter's place in the history of letters in Anglo-Saxon England seems necessary.

The metrical psalter may be a bywater for students of Old English literature, but it is part of the mainstream of medieval thought. Of the 947 extant manuscripts produced or present in England before the Conquest, thirty-six are psalters, a further thirty are concerned with psalter study, and a proportionately large part of a further thirty liturgical manuscripts—sacramentaries, missals and breviaries—consists of individual psalms and groups of psalms.[6] Nearly a tenth of the surviving manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon England, then, are directly concerned with the psalter. Some of the parallels and links between the metrical psalter in B.N. MS lat. 8824 and other Anglo-Saxon manuscripts have been identified and discussed, but others remain.

The manuscript in which the greater part of the *Paris Psalter* survives is, in the words of Krapp, a 'scissors and paste book.'[7] A group of disparate texts,

---

[6] Figures derived from H. Gneuss, 'A preliminary list of manuscripts written or owned in England up to 1100' *ASE* 9 (1981), pp. 1-60. These numbers are only approximations, for the complete list is still being developed, and there will always be discrepancies and differences of opinion even after it is produced.

[7] G.P. Krapp, ed. *The Paris Psalter and the Meters of Boethius*. (New York, 1932), p.

probably readily available to the compiler, was collected and organised into an elegant and expensive codex. Also, the other manuscripts in which parts of the metrical psalter occur suggest its wide currency in Anglo-Saxon England. Thirdly, the larger context of the text includes the glossed psalters, with their word-by-word rendition of the Latin psalter. All of these manuscripts form part of the context of the *Paris Psalter*, and each casts a different kind of light over the text.

In his review of Tinkler's book on the unusual vocabulary of the *Paris Psalter*, Rosier argues that what is really needed for the metrical psalter is a list of the characteristics of this type of poetry.[8] Notably, this list would include a discussion of the effect of translation on this text and on other Anglo-Saxon poetic translations. Providing a way of defining the genre of the metrical psalter, these characteristics might suggest that while date and the need to produce a translation are important influences on the *Paris Psalter*, also important is its place in a group of poems which might be called liturgical poetry in the vernacular. In this poetry the technique of variation, which remains the most noticeable rhetorical technique of the native tradition,[9] provides not a changed view of the material or a different facet of meaning, but simple repetition with, at most, a slight shift of emphasis or

---

xviii.

[8] J. Rosier rvw. of J.D. Tinkler, *Vocabulary and Syntax of the Old English Version in the* Paris Psalter. (The Hague, 1971) in *MAE* 42 (1973), pp. 260-1.

[9] Cf. Fred C. Robinson, Beowulf *and the Appositive Style*. (Knoxville, 1985), where in the Preface he refers to the 'controlled equivocations' of variation and the appositive style as being central to the expressive devices of the poem (p. vii).

intent. The result is a poetry reminiscent of the monastic habit of rumination in reading, and the constant repetition which is characteristic of the psalter is further exaggerated in the vernacular.

Similarly, the place of this material on the continuum between word-for-word translation, direct translation, paraphrase, free interpretation, and imaginative recreation and extension of the original could be more closely defined. If *Exodus* represents the extreme of imaginative recreation, and *Genesis A* is paraphrase, does the metrical psalter qualify as direct translation, or does its omission and addition of material argue for its being somewhat closer to paraphrase? *Judgment Day II* and the liturgical poems in Bodleian MS Junius 121 and in Corpus Christi College MS 201 show remarkable similarities to the *Paris Psalter* in their diction, syntax and metre, but these poems need to be studied more closely to determine if the similarities result only from a shared purpose and content or from other connections between the texts.

The psalter is the book of the Old Testament which to modern Christians is 'the easiest one to approach in a direct and personal way.'[10] For the medieval reader or listener, it provided a series of rules and modes of address for God, a set of methods for living the appropriate Christian life. It was not a personal document, capable of infinite interpretation, but the word of God, expressing the spirituality of the Middle Ages, and repeated at frequent intervals in the Offices.

---

[10] Artur Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary*. tr. H. Hartwell. (London: SCM Press, 1962), p. 19.

Nevertheless, the psalter did speak to the individual. Techniques of translation used to make a vernacular poetic version of the psalms might well recur in other translations of similar material, whether for pedagogic purposes or for personal enjoyment. A great concern with individual piety and with individual knowledge of the scriptures and doctrines of the church is present in the Anglo-Saxon church, and the psalter is the primary text for individual worship. It contains all that is necessary for a petitioner to address God, providing a set of ideas and images which remain 'ingrained habits of mind'.[11] The Psalms express a personal, direct relationship with the deity, elucidating in clear poetic language the spiritual experience of mankind. Bede in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* identifies reciting the psalter with piety: Oswald, Egbert, Chad, Aidan, the nuns of Barking, and Boniface are all so described. The psalms also have power as charms; in the early twelfth century Christina of Markyate's cell is invaded by toads, (which were thought to be both evil and poisonous):

> Ap[pare]bant subito teterrima. terribili[bus] ac spaciosis orbibus oculorum. se[debant] hinc et hinc: spalterio [*sic*] vendicantes medium locum in gremio virgi[nis] quod propemodum omnibus horis iacebat expansum in usum sponse Christi.[12]

When she refuses to give up singing the psalms, the toads disappear.[13] From the

---

[11] Rivkah Zim, *English Metrical Psalms: Poetry as Praise and Prayer, 1535-1601.* (Cambridge, 1987), p. ix.

[12] C.H. Talbot, ed. *The Life of Christina of Markyate.* (Oxford, 1959), p. 98.

[13] Christina is also closely associated with the making of the St. Albans Psalter, which has texts in both Latin and Old French, with numerous glosses in Old English. See C.J. Holdsworth, 'Christina of Markyate' in *Medieval Women*, ed. Derek Baker, pp. 185-204, and for the psalter *The St. Alban's Psalter*, ed. O. Pacht, C.R. Dodwell, and F. Wormald (London,

early years of Christianity in England through the Middle Ages and into the modern era, the psalter was studied, memorized, sung, meditated upon and translated.

The tradition of psalter translation as an exercise separate from simply glossing and comprehending the text (a tradition begun perhaps with the *Paris Psalter*) continued with the early Middle English prose psalter of the thirteenth century, with the Psalms in the Wycliffe Bible, and with the translation and commentary on the Psalms by Richard Rolle of Hampole in the late fourteenth century.[14] The psalter became a favourite text for translation and reinterpretation in the Renaissance, including versions by Sir Philip Sidney and his sister the Countess of Pembroke, and Queen Elizabeth I, who followed the learned tradition of translating the psalter as an exercise in piety. However, the translations of the psalms which in many ways resemble the piece-by-piece, repetitious, syntactically awkward and metrically stretched readings of the *Paris Psalter* are the early metrical translations of the sixteenth century.[15] Thus, Thomas Sternhold's version

---

1960).

[14] K.D. Bülbring, ed. *The Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter.* E.E.T.S. o.s. 97 (Oxford, 1891); J. Forshall and F. Madden, ed. *The Holy Bible...Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and His Followers.* (Oxford, 1850). See also Margaret Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible.* (Cambridge, 1920), and Anne Hudson, *Lollards and their Books.* (London: Hambledon, 1985); Bramley, H.R., ed. *The Psalter or Psalms of David and Certain Canticles.* (Oxford, 1884), and for selections see Allen, Hope Emily, ed. *English Writings of Richard Rolle, Hermit of Hampole.* (Oxford, 1931). See also Dorothy Everett, 'The Middle English Prose Psalter of Richard Rolle of Hampole' *MLR* 17 (1922), pp. 217-27, 337-50.

[15] See D.R. Fletcher, *English Psalmody and Isaac Watts.* (Ph.D., Princeton, 1951), H.G. Glass, *The Story of the Psalters.* (London, 1888), and Millar Patrick, *Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody.* (Oxford, 1949). The most recent analysis of this material is Roland

of Psalm 96 verses 1 and 2:

> Sing ye with praise unto the Lord
> New songs with joy and mirth;
> Sing unto Him with one accord,
> All people on the earth.
>
> Yea, sing unto the Lord alway,
> Praise ye His holy Name;
> Declare and show from day to day
> Salvation by the same.

> Cantate domino canticum nouum; cantate domino omnis terra.
> Cantate domino et benedicite nomini eius bene nuntiate de die in diem salutare eius.

In Sternhold's version, one psalm-verse becomes one stanza, and when the translation is complete but the stanza is not, filler words and phrases are added—words and phrases which are remarkably similar, given the differences in the language, to those which appear in the same psalm in the Anglo-Saxon version. The rhythm of the line is similarly excruciating, and the need to provide rhyme is nearly as great a stumbling-block as the need for alliteration in Psalm 95.1-2 of the *Paris Psalter*:

> Singað nu drihtne sangas neowe;
> singe þeos eorðe eall eceum drihtne.
> Singað nu drihtne, and his soðne naman
> bealde bletsiað; beornas sægeað
> fram dæge to dæge drihtnes hælu.

In the end, both translations serve the same purpose—they provide a poetic but close translation of an important text of the Christian church. The last word on the

---

Greene, 'Sir Philip Sidney's *Psalms*, the Sixteenth-Century Psalter, and the Nature of Lyric' *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 30 (1990), pp. 19-40.

question should perhaps belong to a better poet than either the Old English translator or Sternhold: John Donne, commenting on the translation of Sidney and the Countess of Pembroke:[16]

> They shew us Ilanders our joy, our King,
> They tell us *why*, and teach us *how* to sing;
> ...The songs are these, which heavens high holy Muse
> Whisper'd to *David*, *David* to the Jewes:
> And *Davids* Successors, in holy zeale,
> In formes of Joy and art doe re-reveale
> To us so sweetly and sincerely too,

[16] John Donne, 'Upon the translation of the Psalmes by Sir Philip Sydney, and the Countesse of Pembroke his Sister' in *The Divine Poems*, ed. H. Gardner. 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1978), pp. 33-5, ll. 21-2, 31-5.

Bibliography

A. Reference Works

Bessinger, Jess B. and Philip H. Smith. *A Concordance to the Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records.* (Ithaca, 1978).

Bosworth, Joseph and T. Northcote Toller. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.* (Oxford, 1882-98). *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Supplement* by T. Northcote Toller (Oxford 1908-21). *Enlarged Addenda and Corrigenda* by A. Campbell (Oxford, 1972).

Cameron, Angus, Allison Kingsmill and Ashley Crandell Amos. *Old English Word Studies: A Preliminary Author and Word Index.* (Toronto, 1983).

Clark Hall, J.R. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.* Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching. 4th ed. (Toronto, 1984).

Greenfield, Stanley B. and Fred C. Robinson. *A Bibliography of Publications on Old English Literature to the End of 1972.* (Toronto, 1980).

Grein, Christian W.M., *Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter.* rev. J.J. Köhler. (Heidelberg, 1912).

Holthausen, Ferdinand. *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* (Heidelberg, 1934).

Ker, Neil R. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon.* (Oxford, 1957). 'Supplement' *ASE* 5 (1976) pp. 121-48.

Venezky, Richard L. and Antonette di Paolo Healey. *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English.* (Toronto, 1980).

B. Primary Works, especially editions

Baker, Peter S. 'A Little-Known Variant Text of the Old English Metrical Psalms' *Speculum* 59 (1984) pp. 263-81.

Bright, James Wilson and Robert Lee Ramsay, ed. *Liber Psalmorum, The West-Saxon Psalms.* (Boston: Heath, 1907).

Bülbring, Karl D., ed. *The Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter.* Part I. E.E.T.S.

o.s. 97 (London, 1891).

Colgrave, Bertram ed. *The Paris Psalter.* Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 8. (Copenhagen, 1958).

Dobbie, E.V.K. *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems.* Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 6 (New York, 1942).

Dunning, T.P. & A.J. Bliss, ed. *The Wanderer.* (London, 1969).

Farrell, R.T., ed. *Daniel and Azarias.* (London, 1974).

Feiler, Emil, ed. *Das Benediktiner-Offizium, ein altenglisches Brevier aus dem 11. Jährhundert. Ein Beitrag zur Wulfstanfrage.* Anglistische Forschungen 6 (Heidelberg, 1901).

Finnegan, R.E., ed. *Christ and Satan: A Critical Edition.* (Waterloo, Canada, 1977).

Fry, Donald K. *Finnsburh: Fragment and Episode.* (London, 1974).

Grein, Christian W.M., ed. *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie.* Zweiter Band. Text II. (Göttingen: Wigand, 1858).

Grein, C.W.M. and R.P. Wülker, ed. *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie.* III Band. Text II. ed. Bruno Assmann. (Leipzig: Wigand, 1898).

Harsley, F., ed. *Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter* E.E.T.S. o.s. 92. (Oxford, 1889).

James, M.R., ed. *The Canterbury Psalter.* (Friends of Canterbury Cathedral, 1935).

Klaeber, F., ed. *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg.* (Lexington, Mass., 1950).

Krapp, George P. ed. *The Paris Psalter and the Meters of Boethius.* Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 5 (New York, 1932).

Kuypers, A.B., ed. *Book of Cerne.* (Cambridge, 1902).

Littlehales, Henry, ed. *The Prymer* or *Lay Folks' Prayer Book.* E.E.T.S. Part I o.s. 105; Part II o.s. 109 (London, 1897).

Logeman, H., ed. *The Rule of S. Benet* E.E.T.S. o.s. 90 (London, 1888).

Mitchell, B. and F.C. Robinson. *A Guide to Old English: Revised with Prose and Verse Texts and Glossary.* 4th ed. (Oxford, 1986).

Plummer, Charles & John Earle, ed. *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel.* (Volume I: Text, Appendices, Glossary; Oxford, 1892; Volume II: Introduction, Notes & Index; Oxford, 1899; repr. 1952).

Roberts, Jane, ed. *The Guthlac Poems of the Exeter Book.* (Oxford, 1979).

Schröer, A., ed. Die angelsächsischen Prosarbeitungen der Benediktinerregel. Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 2. rev. ed. H. Gneuss. (Kassel, 1885-8; rep. Darmstadt, 1964).

Schröer, A., ed. *Die Winteney-Version der Regula Sancti Benedicti.* rev. ed. M. Gretsch. (Halle, 1888; rep. Tubingen, 1978).

Scragg, D.G., ed. *The Battle of Maldon.* (Manchester, 1981).

Symons, Thomas, ed. *The Monastic Agreement of the Monks and Nuns of the English Nation.* (London: Nelson, 1953).

Thorpe, B. *Libri Psalmorum Versio Antiqua Latina; cum Paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica.* (Oxford, 1835).

Ure, James M., ed. *The Benedictine Office.* (Edinburgh, 1957).

Vleeskruyer, R., ed. *The Life of St. Chad: An Old English Homily.* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing, 1953).

Weber, Robert, ed. *Le psautier romain et les autres psautiers latins.* (Rome, 1953).

Woolf, Rosemary, ed. *Cynewulf's 'Juliana'.* (London, 1955; rep. Exeter, 1977).

C. Secondary Sources

Aarts, F.G.A.M., 'The Pater Noster in Medieval English Literature' *PLL* 5 (1969) pp. 3-16.

Adams, Arthur. *The syntax of the temporal clause in Old English prose.* Yale Studies in English. (New York, 1907).

Alexander, J.J.G. & M.T. Gibson, ed. *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays presented to Richard William Hunt.* (Oxford, 1976).

Amos, Ashley Crandell. *Linguistic Means of Determining the Dates of Old English Literary Texts.* Medieval Academy Books 90 (Cambridge, Mass., 1980).

Arrowsmith, William and Roger Shattuck. *The Craft and Context of Translation.* (New York: Anchor Books, 1964).

Atwood, E. Bagby and Archibald A. Hill, ed. *Studies in the Language, Literature and Culture of the Middle Ages and Later.* (Austin, 1969).

Auerbach, Erich. *Literary Language and Its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages.* tr. R. Manheim. (New York, 1965).

Bammesberger, Alfred, ed. *Problems of Old English Lexicography: Studies in Memory of Angus Cameron.* ((Regensburg, 1985).

Bartlett, Adeline C. *The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in Anglo-Saxon Poetry.* (New York, 1935).

Bartlett, Helen. *The Metrical Division of the 'Paris Psalter'.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1896).

Bassnett-McGuire, S. *Translation Studies.* (London, 1980).

Bately, J. 'Lexical evidence for the authorship of the prose psalms in the Paris Psalter' *ASE* 10 (1981) pp. 69-95.

Bateson, M. 'Rules for Monks and Secular Canons after the Revival under King Edgar' *EHR* 9 (1894) pp. 690-708.

Bateson, M. 'A Worcester Cathedral Book of Ecclesiastical Collections' *EHR* 10 (1895) pp. 712-31.

Belloc, Hilaire. *On Translation.* Taylorian Lecture 1931. (Oxford, 1931).

Benson, G. and D. Tselos. 'New Light on the Origin of the Utrecht Psalter' *The Art Bulletin* 13 (1931) pp. 13-79.

Berghaus, F-G. *Die Verwandschaftverhaltnisse der altenglischen Interlinearversionem des Psalters und der Cantica.* (Gottingen, 1979).

Bessinger, Jess. B. Jr. and Stanley J. Kahrl. *Essential Articles for the Study of Old English Poetry.* (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1968).

Bestul, Thomas H. 'The Old English *Resignation* and the Benedictine Reform' *NM*

78 (1977) pp. 18-23.

Bestul, Thomas H. 'St. Anselm, the Monastic Community at Canterbury, and Devotional Writing in Late Anglo-Saxon England' *Anselm Studies* 1 (1983) pp. 185-98.

Bethel, Patricia. 'Anacrusis in the Psalms of the Paris Psalter' *NM* 89 (1988) pp. 33-43.

Bethel, Patricia. 'On the Meter and Syntax of the *Psalms* of the *Paris Psalter*'. Abstract for Kalamazoo 1984. *OEN* 17 (1984), pp. A. 47-8.

Bethurum, Dorothy. 'Archbishop Wulfstan's Commonplace Book' *PMLA* 58 (1942) pp. 916-29.

Bishop, Edmund. *Liturgica Historica.* (Oxford, 1918).

Bishop, T.A.M. *English Caroline Minuscule.* (Oxford, 1971).

Blair, Peter Hunter. *The World of Bede.* (London, 1970).

Blake, N.F., 'Varieties of Middle English Religious Prose' in *Chaucer and Middle English Studies.* ed. B. Rowland (London, 1974).

Bliss, A.J. 'The Appreciation of Old English Metre' in *English and Medieval Studies.* ed. N. Davis and C.L. Wrenn. (London, 1962) pp. 27-40.

Bliss, A.J. *An Introduction to Old English Metre.* (Oxford, 1962).

Bliss, A.J. *The Metre of* Beowulf. rev. ed. (Oxford, 1962).

Bliss, A.J. 'The Origin and Structure of the Old English Hypermetric Line' *N&Q* 217 (1972) pp. 242-8.

Bliss, A.J. 'Single Half-lines in Old English Poetry' *N&Q* 216 (1971) pp. 442-9.

Borg, Alan and Andrew Martindale, ed. *The Vanishing Past. Studies of Medieval Art, Liturgy and Metrology presented to Christopher Hohler.* BAR International Series 111 (Oxford, 1981).

Bostock, J. Knight. *A Handbook on Old High German Literature.* (Oxford, 1955).

Bouterwek, Karl W. *Caedmon̆s des Angelsachsen biblische Dichtungen.* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1854).

Brayer, E. and A. Bouly de Lesdain. 'Les prières usuelles annexées aux anciennes traductions françaises du psautier' *Bulletin d'information, Institut de Recherche* 15 (1969) pp. 69-120.

Bright, James W. 'An Idiom of the Comparative in Anglo-Saxon' *MLN* 27 (1912) pp. 181-3.

Bright, J.W. and R.L. Ramsay, 'Notes and Studies: Notes on the "Introductions" of the West-Saxon Psalms' *Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1912) pp. 519-28.

Bright, J.W. and R.L. Ramsay, 'Notes on the West-Saxon Psalms' *MLN* 23 (1918) pp. 471-4.

Bright, J.W. 'On the Text of the Prose Portion of the *Paris Psalter*' *MLN* 24 (1909) pp. 77-8.

Broderick, Herbert Reginald. *The Iconographic and compositional sources of the drawings in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11.* (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1978).

Bromwich, J. I'a. 'Who was the translator of the Prose Portion of the *Paris Psalter*?' in *The Early Cultures of Northwest Europe: H.M. Chadwick Memorial Studies.* ed. Sir Cyril Fox and Bruce Dickins. (Cambridge, 1950) pp. 289-304.

Brook, G.L. 'The Relation between the Textual and the Linguistic Study of Old English' in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in some Aspects of their History and Culture presented to Bruce Dickins.* ed. Peter Clemoes (London, 1959) pp. 280-91.

Brooks, Nicholas. *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury. Christ Church from 597 to 1066.* (Leicester, 1984).

Brooks, Nicholas, ed. *Latin and the Vernacular Languages in Early Medieval Britain.* (Leicester, 1982).

Brown, P.R., G.R. Crampton & F.C. Robinson, ed. *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature: Essays in Honour of Stanley B. Greenfield.* (Toronto, 1986).

Brownrigg, Linda L. 'Manuscripts containing English decoration 871-1066, catalogued and illustrated: a review' *ASE* 7 (1978) pp. 239-66.

Bruce, J. Douglas. *The Anglo-Saxon Version of the Book of Psalms commonly known as the 'Paris Psalter'* (Baltimore, 1894).

Bruce, J. Douglas. 'Immediate and Ultimate Sources of the Rubrics and Introductions

to the Psalms in the Paris Psalter' *MLN* 8 (1893) pp. 72-82.

Buhler, Curt F. 'A Lollard Tract: on Translating the Bible into English' *MAE* 7 (1938) pp. 167-83.

Bullough, D.A. 'The Educational Tradition in England from Alfred to Ælfric: Teaching **Utriusque Linguae**' *Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo* 19 (1972) pp. 466-78.

Butler, Cuthbert, ed. *Sancti Benedicti Regular Monasteriorum.* (Stanbrook, 1930).

Bzdyl, Donald Gregory. *Prayer in Old English Narratives.* (Ph.D. diss., Illinois, 1977).

Cabrol, Fernand. *The Books of the Latin Liturgy.* Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge 21. (London, 1932).

Caie, Graham D. 'The Source Manuscript for the Old English *Judgment Day II*' in *Essays presented to Knud Schibsbye.* ed. M. Chesnutt et al. (Copenhagen, 1979).

Calder, Daniel G. *Old English Poetry: Essays on Style.* (Berkeley, 1978).

Calkins, Robert G. *Illuminated Books of the Middle Ages.* (London, 1983).

Cameron, Angus, R. Frank, and J. Leyerle, ed. *Computers and Old English Concordances.* Centre for Medieval Studies. (Toronto, 1970).

Cameron, Angus. 'Middle English in Old English Manuscripts' in *Chaucer and Middle English Studies.* ed. B. Rowland. (London, 1974).

Cameron, Angus. *The Old English Nouns of Colour, A Semantic Study.* (B.Litt., Oxford, 1968).

Campbell, A. *Old English Grammar.* (Oxford, 1959).

Campbell, Jackson J. 'Knowledge of Rhetorical Figures in Anglo-Saxon England' *JEGP* 66 (1967) pp. 1-20.

Campbell, Jackson J. 'Learned Rhetoric in Old English Poetry' *MP* 63 (1966) pp. 189-201.

Campbell, Jackson J. 'Prayers from MS Arundel 155' *Anglia* 81 (1963) pp. 82-117.

Catford, J.C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation.* (London, 1965).

Clemoes, P. 'The Old English Benedictine Office' *Anglia* 78 (1960) pp. 265-83.

Clemoes, P. *Rhythm and Cosmic Order in Old English Literature.* Inaugural Lecture as Elrington and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon. (Cambridge, 1970).

Collins, Rowland L. 'A Reexamination of the Old English Glosses in the *Blickling Psalter*' *Anglia* 81 (1963) pp. 124-8.

Conlee, J.W. 'A Note on Verse Composition in the *Metres of Boethius*' *NM* 71 (1970) pp. 576-85.

Cook, Albert S. *Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers.* [First Series] (London: Macmillan, 1898).

Cross, J.E. *Latin Themes in Old English Literature.* (Lund, 1962).

Cross, J.E. 'The Literate Anglo-Saxon: On Sources and Disseminations' *PBA* (1972) pp. 67-100.

Cross, F.N.L. and E. A. Livingstone. *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church.* 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1974).

Culley, R.C. *Oral Formulaic Language in the Biblical Psalms.* (Toronto, 1967).

Curtius, E. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages.* tr. Willard R. Trask. (New York, 1953).

Daiches, David and A.K. Thorlby. *Literature and Western Civilization: The Medieval World.* (London, 1973).

Deanesly, Margaret. *The Pre-Conquest Church in England.* (London, 1961).

Deanesly, Margaret. *Sidelights on the Anglo-Saxon Church.* (London, 1962).

Delisle, L. 'Notes sur la Bibliothèque de la Sainte-Chapelle de Bourges' *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 4è série, II (1956) pp. 142-59.

Derolez, Rene. 'A New Psalter Fragment with Old English Glosses' *ES* 53 (1972) pp. 401-8.

Diamond, Robert E. *The Diction of the Anglo-Saxon Metrical Psalms.* Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 10 (The Hague: Mouton, 1963).

Dick, Ernst S. and Kurt R. Jankowsky. *Festschrift für Karl Schneider.* (Amsterdam

and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1982).

Dietrich, Franz. 'Hycgan und Hopian' *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 9 (1853) pp. 214-22.

Dietz, Klaus. 'Die ae. Psalterglossen der Hs. Cambridge, Pembroke College 312' *Anglia* 86 (1968) pp. 273-9.

Dodson, Sarah. 'The Glosses in "The Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter"' *University of Texas Studies in English* 12 (1932) pp. 5-26.

Douet d'Arcq, L. 'Notes sur la bibliothèque de Jean, duc de Berri en 1416' *Revue archéologique* 7 (1850) Part I pp. 144-68, Part II pp. 224-33.

Edden, Valerie. 'And my boonus han dried yp as critouns': The History of the Translation of Psalm 101.4,' *N&Q* n.s. 28 (1981) pp. 389-92.

Emerson, Oliver F. 'Originality in Old English Poetry' *RES* 11 (1926) pp. 18-31.

Engelbregt, J.H.A. *Het Utrechts psalterium; een eeuw wetenschappelijke bestudering (1860-1960).* (Utrecht, 1965).

Everett, Dorothy. 'The Middle English Prose Psalter of Richard Rolle of Hampole' *MLR* 17 (1922) pp. 217-27, 337-50.

Fakundiny, L. 'The Art of Old English Verse Composition' *RES* 21 (1970) pp. 129-42, 257-66.

Fakundiny, L. *Some Features of Verse Technique in Old English and Old Saxon.* (B.Litt., Oxford, 1967).

Farmer, D.H. *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints.* new ed. (Oxford, 1987).

Fehr, B. 'Das Benedictiner-Offizium und die beziehungen zwischen Aelfric und Wulfstan.' *Englische Studien* 38 (1913) pp. 337-46.

Flasdieck, H.M. 'The Phonetic Aspect of Old Germanic Alliteration' *Anglia* 69 (1950) pp. 266-87.

Floyer, J.K. and S.G. Hamilton. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Preserved in the Chapter Library of Worcester Cathedral.* (Worcestershire Historical Society, 1906).

Förster, Leonard. 'Translation: An Introduction' in *Studies in Communication 2. Aspects of Translation.* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1958) pp. 1-28.

Forster, Max. 'Die altenglischen Texte der Pariser Nationalbibliothek' *Englische Studien* 62 (1926-8) pp. 113-31.

Fowler, David C. *The Bible in Early English Literature.* (London, 1977).

Frank, Roberta. 'Some Uses of Paronomasia in Old English Scriptural Verse' *Speculum* 47 (1972) pp. 207-26.

Frank, Roberta and Angus Cameron. *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English.* (Toronto, 1973).

Gatch, M. McC. *Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England: Aelfric and Wulfstan.* (Toronto, 1977).

Gevirtz, Stanley. *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel.* Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 32 (Chicago, 1963).

Gneuss, Helmut. 'Latin Hymns in Medieval England: Future Research' in *Chaucer and Middle English Studies.* ed. B. Rowland. (London, 1974).

Gneuss, Helmut. *Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglischen.* (Berlin, 1955).

Gneuss, Helmut. 'The origin of Standard Old English and Æthelwold's school of Winchester' *ASE* 1 (1972) pp. 63-83.

Gneuss, Helmut. 'Some Problems and Principles of the Lexicography of Old English' in *Festschrift für Karl Schneider.* ed. Ernst S. Dick & Kurt R. Jankowsky. (Amsterdam, 1982).

Godden, M.R. 'Ælfric's Changing Vocabulary' *ES* 61 (1980) pp. 206-33.

Godman, Peter. *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance.* (London: Duckworth, 1985).

Grattan, J.H.G. 'On the Text of the Prose Portion of the "Paris Psalter"' *MLR* 4 (1908-9) pp. 185-9.

Greenfield, S.B. *The Interpretation of Old English Poems.* (London and Boston, 1972).

Greenfield, S.B. and D.G. Calder. *A New Critical History of Old English Literature.* (New York, 1986).

Gretsch, Mechtild. 'Æthelwold's Translation of the Regula Sancti Benedicti and its

Latin Exemplar' *ASE* 3 (1974) pp. 125-51.

Griffith, Mark S. *The Method of Composition of Old English Verse Translation with particular reference to the Metres of Boethius, the Paris Psalter and Judgment Day II.* (D.Phil. Oxford, 1984).

Griffith, M.S. 'Poetic Language and the Paris Psalter: the decay of the Old English tradition' *ASE* (forthcoming).

Grinda, K.R. 'Pigeon-holing Old English poetry: Some Criteria of Metrical Style' *Anglia* 102 (1984) pp. 305-22.

Halvorson, N.O. *Doctrinal Terms in Aelfric's Homilies. University of Iowa Humanistic Studies* 5 (1932-8), pp. 1-98.

Hargreaves, Henry. 'From Bede to Wyclif: Medieval English Bible Translations' *BJRL* 48 (1965) pp. 118-140.

Hargreaves, Henry & Cecily Clark. 'An Unpublished Old English Psalter-gloss Fragment' *N&Q* (1965) pp. 443-6.

Hargreaves, Henry. 'The Vocabulary of the *Surtees Psalter*' *MLQ* 17 (1956) pp. 326-9.

Harris, Robert M. 'An Illustration in an Anglo-Saxon Psalter in Paris' *JWCI* 26 (1963) pp. 255-63.

Heimann, Adelheid. 'The last copy of the Utrecht Psalter' in *The Year 1200: A Symposium.* New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art. Introd. J. Hoffeld (New York, 1975) pp. 313-38.

Heimann, Adelheid. 'Three illustrations from the Bury St. Edmunds Psalter and their prototypes' *JWCI* 29 (1966) pp. 39-59.

Heusler, Andreas. *Deutsche Versgeschichte mit Einschluss des altenglischen und altnordischen Stabreimverses.* (Berlin & Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, Part I 1925, II 1927, III 1929).

Hiver de Beauvoir, M. *La Librairie de Jean duc de Berry.* (Paris, 1860).

Höhler, C.E. 'Some Service-Books of the Later Saxon Church' in *Tenth Century Studies.* ed. D. Parsons (London, 1975) pp. 60-83 and 217-27.

Holthausen, F. 'Altenglische Interlinearversionem Lateinischer Gebete und Beichten'

Anglia 65 (1941) pp. 230-54.

Holthausen, F. 'Zu altenglischen Dichtungen' *Beiblatt zur Anglia* 35 (1924) pp. 276-7.

Holthausen, F. 'Zur ae Literatur. IV' *Beiblatt zur Anglia* 18 (1907) pp. 201-8.

Holthausen, F. 'Zu alt- und mittelenglischen Texten' *Beiblatt zur Anglia* 31 (1920) pp. 191-8.

Holthausen, F. 'Zur ae metrischen Psalmenubersetzung II' *Beiblatt zur Anglia* 43 (1932) pp. 102-13.

Howard-Hill, T.H. *Literary Concordances. A Guide to the Preparation of Manual and Computer Concordances.* (Oxford: Pergamom, 1979).

Hughes, Andrew. *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office; A Guide to their organization and terminology.* (Toronto, 1982).

Hughes, Kathleen. 'Some Aspects of Irish Influence on Early English Private Prayer' *Studia celtica* 5 (1970) pp. 48-61.

Jacobsen, Eric. 'The art and craft of translation. Some historical and literary aspects' in *Essays Presented to Knud Schibsbye.* Ed. Michael Chesnutt et al. Publications of the Department of English, University of Copenhagen 8 (Copenhagen, 1978).

Jacobsen, Eric. *Translation: a Traditional Craft.* Classica et Mediaevalia. Dissertationes, 6. (Copenhagen, 1958).

James, M.R. 'Four Leaves of an English Psalter, Twelfth Century' *The Walpole Society* 25 (1936-7) pp. 1-23.

John, Eric. *Orbis Britanniae and Other Studies.* (Leicester, 1966).

Johnson, Aubrey R. *The Cultic Prophet and Israel's Psalmody.* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1979).

Jost, Karl. *Wulfstanstudien.* Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten 23. (Bern, 1950).

Keefer, Sarah Larratt. *The Old English Metrical Psalter. An Annotated Set of Collation Lists with the Psalter Glosses.* (New York: Garland, 1979).

Klauser, Theodor. *A Short History of the Western Liturgy.* (Oxford, 1969).

Kock, Ernst A. 'Interpretations and Emendations of early English Texts VIII' *Anglia* 45 (1921) pp. 105-31.

Kock, Ernst A. 'Interpretations and Emendations of Early English Texts XI' *Anglia* 47 (1923) pp. 264-73.

Kökeritz, Helge. 'The Anglo-Saxon Unicorn' in *Early English and Norse Studies.* A.H. Smith Festschrift. (London, 1963).

Korhammer, Michael. *Die monastischen Cantica im Mittelalter und ihre altenglischen Interlinearversionen.* Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie 6. (Munich, 1976).

Korhammer, M. 'The Origin of the *Bosworth Psalter*' *ASE* 2 (1973) pp. 173-87.

Koskenniemi, I. *Repetitive Word Pairs in Old and Early Middle English Prose.* (Turku, 1968).

Krogmann, Willy. 'Altenglisches' *Anglia* 61 (1937) pp. 351-60.

Kuhn, S.M. 'Was Ælfric a Poet?' *PQ* 52 (1973) pp. 643-62.

de Langhe, Robert. *Le Psautier, ses origines, ses problèmes littéraires, son influence.* (Leuven, 1962).

Lawrence, C.H. *Medieval Monasticism.* 2nd ed. (London, 1989).

Lawton, David, ed. *Middle English Alliterative Poetry and its Literary Background: Seven Essays.* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1982).

Leclercq, Jean. *Études sur le vocabulaire monastique du moyen age.* Studia Anselmiana 48. (Rome, 1961).

Leclercq, Jean. *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: a Study of Monastic Culture.* tr. C. Misrahi. (New York, 1962).

Leclercq, J., F. Vandenbroucke, & L. Bouyer. *La Spiritualité du Moyen Age.* (Paris, 1961).

Le Hir, Y. 'Sur les traductions en prose française du psautier' *Revue de linguistique romane* 25 (1961) pp. 324-8.

Le Page, R.B. 'Alliterative Patterns as a Test of Style in Old English Poetry' *JEGP* 58 (1959) pp. 434-41.

Leroquais, V. *Les psautiers manuscrits latins des bibliothèques publiques de France.* (Macon, 1940-1).

Levin, Samuel R. *Linguistic Structures in Poetry.* Janua Linguarum 23 (The Hague: Mouton, 1962).

Levison, Wilhelm. *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century.* (Oxford, 1946).

Lewis, C. Day 'On Translating Poetry,' Second Jackson Knight Memorial Lecture, Exeter, 1969 (Abingdon, 1970).

Lewis, Richard A. 'Plurilinear Alliteration in Old English Poetry' *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 16 (1975) pp. 589-602.

Lindelöf, U. *Studien zu altenglischen Psalterglossen.* Bonner Beitrage zur Anglistik 13. (Bonn, 1904).

MacGillivray, H. *The Influence of Christianity on the Vocabulary of Old English.* Studien zur englischen Philologie 8 (Halle, 1902).

Malone, Kemp. 'When did Middle English Begin?' *Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies.* (Baltimore, 1930).

Martène, Edmund. *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux benedictins de la congrégation de S. Maur.* (Paris, 1717).

Mayr-Harting, Henry. *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England.* (London: Batsford, 1972).

Mearns, James. *The Canticles of the Christian Church, Eastern and Western, in early and medieval times.* (Cambridge, 1914).

Meritt, Herbert D. *Fact and Lore about Old English Words.* (Stanford, 1954).

Meritt, Herbert D. *Some of the Hardest Glosses in Old English.* (Stanford, 1968).

Meritt, Herbert D. 'Twenty Hard Old English Words' *JEGP* 49 (1950) pp. 231-41.

Metcalf, A.A. *Poetic Diction in the Old English "Meters of Boethius".* (The Hague: Mouton, 1973).

Minnis, A.J. *Medieval Theory of Authorship.* (Aldershot, 1984).

Mitchell, B. 'The Dangers of Disguise: Old English Texts in Modern Punctuation' *RES* 31 (1980) pp. 385-413.

Mitchell, B. 'Five Notes on Old English Syntax' *NM* 70 (1968) pp. 70-84.

Mitchell, B. 'Pronouns in Old English Poetry; Some Syntactical Notes' *RES* 15 (1964) pp. 129-41.

Mitchell, B., C. Ball & A. Cameron. 'Short Titles of Old English Texts' *ASE* 4 (1975) pp. 207-21; 'Addenda and Corrigenda' *ASE* 8 (1979) pp. 331-3.

Morrell, Minnie Cate. *A Manual of Old English Biblical Materials.* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1965).

Morrish, Jennifer J. *An Examination of Literacy and Learning in England in the Ninth Century.* (D.Phil., Oxford, 1982).

Muir, Laurence. 'Some Observations on the Early English Psalters and the English Vocabulary' *MLQ* 9 (1948) pp. 273-6.

Neale, J.M. & R.F. Littledale. *A Commentary on the Psalms: from Primitive and Mediaeval Writers, and from the Various Office-books and Hymns of the Roman, Mozarabic, Ambrosian, Gallican, Greek, Coptic, Armenian, and Syriac Rites.* 4 vols. (London: Masters & Co., 1860-74).

Newmark, Peter. *Approaches to Translation.* (Oxford, 1981).

Niles, John D. *Old English Literature in Context: Ten Essays.* (Cambridge & Totowa, New Jersey; 1980).

Niver, Charles. 'The Psalter in the British Museum, Harley 2904' in *Medieval Studies in Memory of A. Kingsley Porter.* Volume II ed. W.R.W. Koehler (Cambridge, 1939) pp. 667-87.

Ogilvy, J.D.A. *Books known to Anglo-Latin writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin (670-804).* Medieval Academy of America. (Cambridge, Mass., 1936).

Ogilvy, J.D.A. *Books Known to the English, 597-1066.* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967).

Ogura, Michiko. *Old English 'Impersonal' Verbs and Expressions.* Anglistica 24 (Copenhagen, 1986).

Ogura, Michiko. 'OE Temporal Conjunctions denoting "when" or "while" with special regard to the Gospels and the Psalter' *NM* 85 (1984) pp. 273-90.

Ogura, Michiko. *Verbs with the Reflexive Pronoun and Constructions with Self in Old and Early Middle English.* (Cambridge, 1989).

Owen, Ga le R. 'Wynflæd's wardrobe' *ASE* 8 (1979) pp. 195-222.

Parsons, David, ed. *Tenth Century Studies.* Essays in Commemoration of the Millenium of the Council of Winchester and *Regularis Concordia.* (London: Phillimore, 1975).

Pearsall, Derek. *Old English and Middle English Poetry.* (London, 1977).

Potter, Simeon. *On the Relation of the OE Bede to Werferth's Gregory and to Alfred's Translations.* (Prague, 1931).

Quirk, Randolph. *The Concessive Relation in Old English Poetry.* Yale Studies in English 124 (New Haven, 1954).

Quirk, Randolph. *Essays on the English Language: Medieval and Modern.* (London: Longmans, 1968).

Raffel, Burton. *The Forked Tongue: A Study of the Translation Process.* (The Hague, 1971).

Ramsay, Robert L. 'The Latin Text of the Paris Psalter: a Collation and some Conclusions' *American Journal of Philology* 41 (1920) pp. 147-76.

Ramsay, Robert. 'Theodore of Mopsuestia and St. Columban on the Psalms' *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 8 (1910-12) pp. 421-97.

Raw, Barbara C. *The Art and Background of Old English Poetry.* (London: Arnold, 1978).

Riedinger, Anita. 'The Old English Formula in Context' *Speculum* 60 (1985) pp. 294-317.

Rigg, A.G. *Editing Medieval Texts: English, French, and Latin Written in England.* Papers given at the twelfth annual Conference on Editorial Problems, University of Toronto, November 1976. (New York: Garland, 1977).

Robinson, Fred C. 'Lexicography & Literary Criticism: a Caveat' *Philological Essays: Studies in Old & Middle English Language and Literature in Honour of Herbert Dean Meritt.* ed. J.L. Rosier. (The Hague, 1970).

Robinson, F.C. 'The Significance of Names in Old English Literature' *Anglia* 86

(1968) pp. 14-58.

Robinson, F.C. 'Two Aspects of Variation' in *Old English Poetry: Essays on Style.* ed. Daniel G. Calder. (Berkeley, 1979) pp. 127-45.

Robinson, J. Armitage. *The Times of Saint Dunstan.* (Oxford, 1923).

Rogerson, J.W. & J.W. McKay. *Psalms 51-100.* The Cambridge Bible Commentary. (Cambridge, 1977)

Rogerson, J.W. & J.W. McKay. *Psalms 101-150.* The Cambridge Bible Commentary. (Cambridge, 1977).

Rosier, James L. 'The Stowe Canticles' *Anglia* 82 (1964) pp. 397-432.

Russom, G. *Old English Meter and Linguistic Theory.* (Cambridge, 1987).

Salmon, P. *Les 'Tituli Psalmorum' des manuscrits latins.* (Paris, 1959).

Schabram, Hans. 'Etymologie und Kontextanalyse in der altenglischen Semantik' *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 84 (1970) pp. 233-53.

Schabram, Hans. *Superbia. Studien zum altenglischen Wortschatz I.* (Munich, 1965).

Schwarz, W. *Principles & Problems of Biblical translation.* (Cambridge, 1955).

Schwarz, W. 'The Meaning of **Fidus Interpres** in Medieval Translation' *JTS* 45 (1944) pp. 73-8.

Scragg, D.G. 'Initial *h* in Old English' *Anglia* 88 (1970) pp. 165-96.

Selver, Paul. P. *The Art of Translating Poetry.* (London, 1966).

Semple, W.H. 'St Jerome as a Biblical Translator' *BJRL* 48 (1965) pp. 227-43.

Shippey, T.A. *Old English Verse.* (London, 1972).

Shippey, T.A. *Poems of Wisdom and Learning in Old English.* (Cambridge, 1976).

Sisam, K. 'Notes on the West-Saxon Psalms' *MLN* 33 (1918) pp. 474-6.

Sisam, K. *Studies in the History of Old English Literature.* (Oxford, 1953).

Skemp, Arthur R. 'The Transformation of Scriptural Story, Motive, and Conception

in Anglo-Saxon Poetry' *MP* 4 (1907) pp. 423-70.

Slay, D. 'The Composition of Old English Verse' *TPS* (1952) pp. 1-14.

Sneddon, Dorothy A. *Studies in the language of the Anglo-Norman translations of the Psalms with particular reference to the Oxford Psalter.* (B.Litt., Oxford, 1972).

Southern, R.W. *The Making of the Middle Ages.* (London, 1933).

Stanley, E.G. 'Studies in the Prosaic Vocabulary of Old English Verse' *NM* 72 (1971) pp. 385-418.

Stanley, E.G. 'Spellings of the Waldend Group' in *Studies*, ed. Atwood, E.B. & A.A. Hill. (Texas, 1969) pp. 38-69.

Stanley, E.G. 'Verbal Stress in Old English Verse' *Anglia* 93 (1975) pp. 307-34.

Stevenson, J., ed. *Latin Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church, with an Interlinear Anglo-Saxon Gloss.* Surtees Society. (Durham, 1851).

Stock, Brian. *The Implications of Literacy.* (Princeton, 1983).

Stracke, J. Richard. 'Eight Lambeth Psalter-Glosses' *PQ* 53 (1974) pp. 121-8.

Symons, Thomas. 'The English Monastic Reform of the Tenth Century' *Downside Review* 60 (1942) pp. 1-22, 196-222, 268-79.

Szarmach, Paul. 'Anglo-Saxon Letters in the Eleventh Century' *Acta* 1 (1974) pp. 1-14.

Szarmach, P. & Bernard F. Huppé ed. *The Old English Homily and its Background.* (Albany, 1978).

Tanger, Gustav. 'Collation des Pariser altenglischen Psalters mit Thorpe's Ausgabe' *Anglia* 6 (1883) pp. 125-41.

Temple, Elzbieta. *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts 900-1066.* (London, 1976).

Thomson, E. *Godcunde Lar 7 Þeowdom: Select Monuments of the Doctrine and Worship of the Catholic Church in England before the Norman Conquest.* (London, 1849).

Tinkler, John D. *Vocabulary and Syntax of the Old English Version in the Paris Psalter.* Janua Linguarum, series practica 67 (The Hague: Mouton, 1971).

Tschischwitz, B. *Die Metrik der altenglische Psalmenübersetzung.* (Breslau, 1908).

Tselos, D. 'Defensive addenda to the problem of the Utrecht psalter' *Art Bulletin* 49 (1967) pp. 334-49.

Tselos, D. 'English Manuscript Illustration and the Utrecht Psalter' *Art Bulletin* 41 (1959) pp. 137-49.

Tselos, D. *The Sources of the Utrecht Psalter Miniatures.* (Minneapolis, 1955; 2nd ed. 1960).

Tsevat, M. *A Study of the Language of the Biblical Psalms* (Philadelphia, 1955).

Tupper, F. 'History and Texts of the Benedictine Reform of the Tenth Century' *MLN* 8 (1893) pp. 172-84.

Weiser, Artur. *The Psalms: A Commentary.* tr. H. Hartwell. (London: SCM, 1962).

Wetzel, Claus-Dieter. *Die Worttrennung am Zeilenende in altenglischen Handschriften.* (Frankfurt: Lang, 1981).

Whallon, W. *Formula, Character and Context: Studies in Homeric, Old English and Old Testament Poetry.* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969).

Whitbread, L. 'Notes on the Old English *Exhortation to Christian Living*' *SN* 23 (1951) pp. 96-102.

Whitbread, L. 'The Old English Poem *Judgment Day II* and its Latin Source' *PQ* 45 (1966) pp. 635-56.

Whitbread, L. 'The Old English poems of the Benedictine Office and Some Related Questions' *Anglia* 80 (1962) pp. 37-49.

Whitbread, L. 'The Sources and Literary Qualities of Bede's Doomsday Verses' *AfdA* 95 (1966) pp. 258-66.

Whitelock, D. 'The Old English Bede' *PBA* (1962) pp. 57-90.

Whitelock, Dorothy. 'The Prose of Alfred's Reign', in *Continuations and Beginnings: Studies in Old English Literature.* ed. E.G. Stanley. (London, 1966) pp. 67-103.

Whitman, Charles H. 'The Birds of Old English Literature' *JEGP* 2 (1898) pp. 149-98.

Whitman, F.H. 'A Major Compositional Technique in Old English Verse' *ELN* 11 (1973) pp. 81-6.

Whitman, F.H. 'The Meaning of "Formulaic" in Old English Verse Composition' *NM* 76 (1975) pp. 529-37.

Wichmann, J. 'König Alfreds angelsachsische Übertragung der Psalmen I-LI exclu.' *Anglia* 11 (1889) pp. 39-96.

Wildhagen, K. *Der Psalter des Eadwine von Canterbury. Die Sprache der altenglische Glosse.* (Halle, 1905).

Wildhagen, K. 'Das Psalterium Gallicanum in England' *Englische Studien* 54 (1920) pp. 35-45.

Wildhagen, K. 'Studien zum Psalterium Romanum in England und zu seinen Glossierungen' in *Festschrift für Lorenz Morsbach. Studien zur englischen Philologie* 50. (Halle, 1913) pp. 417-72.

Wilson, R.M. *The Lost Literature of Medieval England.* (London: Methuen, 1952; 2nd ed. 1970).

Wittig, Joseph S. 'King Alfred's *Boethius* and its Latin sources: a reconsideration' *ASE* 11 (1983) pp. 157-98.

Wordsworth, Christopher & Henry Littlehales. *The Old Service Books of the English Church.* (London, 1904).

Wormald, F. 'The English Saints in the Litany in Arundel MS. 60' *Analecta Bollandiana* 64 (1946) pp. 72-86.

Wormald, F. 'Decorated Initials in English MSS from a.d. 900 to 1100' *Archaeologia* 91 (1945) pp. 107-35.

Wormald, F. *English Drawings of the tenth and eleventh centuries.* (London, 1952).

Wormald, Patrick. 'Bede, Beowulf and the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxon Aristocracy' in *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England.* ed. R. Farrell. British Archaeological Review 46 (1978) pp. 32-93.

Wrenn, C.L. *A Study of Old English Literature.* (London, 1967).

Young, Patrick. *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Wigorniensis.* Ed. Ivor Atkins & Neil R. Ker. (Cambridge, 1944).

Appendix One

Nine Latin Prayers from B.N. MS lat. 8824

1. Oratio

Aufer a nobis domine iniquitates nostres & ut s*anctum* s*anct*orum puris mereamus mentibus introire.

2. Oratio

Scelera mea quibus iram merui; dimitte que s[e]mp*iternus* & misericors deus tui iusti arbitrio iudicii que iniusta ego cogitando, loquando, faciendo, & intercedentibus omnium s*anct*orum tuorum meritis? mentis mee fortitudinem fidei altitudinem spei sinceritatem tue simul & fraterne delectationnis p*ro*pitius inspirare dignare qui uiuis & regnas deus *pater* om*n*ia se*cu*la seculorum.

3. Oratio

Per horum omnium s*anct*orum d*omi*ne angelorum & archangelor*um* ap*osto*lorum martyrum confessorum uirginum merita & orationes & intercessiones & passiones & suffragia trinitas clementissima infunde cordibus n*ost*ris per gr*ati*am s*ancti* spiritus conpunctionem fontem que lacrimarum; ut possimus reatum conscientie *nost*re p*er*fecte cognoscere; & ualeamus coram te omniu*m* facinorum nostrorum fideliter accussare commissa; Te domine tribuente qui [ui]uis.

4. Item Alia Oratio

Exaudi me d*omi*ne s*ancte* pater om*nipoten*s aeterne deus; ut deprecatio mea ad te digna sit ut quando animam meam exire de corpore iubeas. In me non habeat partem inimicus ullam iniquitatis, sed infunde d*omi*ne misericordiam tuam ut angelus tuus s*anct*us michahel dignanter me perducere faciat ante conspectum tuum & tu qui pius es & misericors delicta mea clementer dimittere iubeas & in tua gloria dignanter me suscipias, p*er*

5. Alia Oratio

Deus qui uiuor*um* es saluator omnium qui non uis mortem peccatoris nec ita ris? in p*er*ditione morientium; deus misericordie te suppliciter deprecor intercedentibus s*anct*is tuis concede michi ueniam delictorum meorum ut ad missa defleam & post modum non admittam ut cum michi extrema dies finis que uite aduenerit; emundatis delictis omnibus me angelus s*anct*itatis suscipiat, p*er*

6. Oratio

Pietatem tuam d*omi*ne peto ut orationem meam & uotum meum dignanter suscipias supplicationem serui tui; placatus adtende & aduersis languoribus me eripe atque tibi que p*ro* meis delictis offero digneris suscipere; & aeterne uite heredem me constitue desideriu*m* meum in bonis op*er*ibus amplifica uotum ane cumula?; & ab insidiis inimicorum me libera, p*er*

7. Alia

Adsit nobis d*omi*ne q*ui*s oratio s*anct*oru*m* atque archangelor*um* patriarcharum & p*ro*phetaru*m* tuorum & te deprecor d*omi*ne miserere michi famule tue; *uel* & famulis & famulabus tuis p*er* intercessionem omnium s*anct*orum apostolor*um* martirum uirginu*m* & confessorum tuor*um* d*omi*ne cum comitibus eor*um* & nos p*ro*tege & uiam n*ost*ram in salutis tuae p*ro*speritate dispone ut inter om*ni*s uie & ui[t]e huius uarietates tuo se*m*p*er* p*ro*tegamur auxilio. & famuli & famule tue qui nob*is* bona fecerunt & in orationibus nost*ris* recommendauerunt, ut qui nobis confessi fuerunt; uel quor*um* nomina sup*er* s*anct*oru*m* altare[m] tuum d*omi*ne ad scripta esse uidentur; & om*ni*s homines qui in d[e]o credunt & baptisma recipiunt peregrini & captiui & orphani & uidue & nauigantes in bonis? & iter agentes & penitentie & anime fidelium defunctorum ut d*e*us om*ni*p*ote*ns liber & ea foras? de inferno & de malis tormentis & de penis pessimis & de manibus inimicos meorum & deprecor te d*omi*ne michi famule tue & famulis & famulabi tuis porrige dexteram caelestis auxilii ut te toto corde perquirant & que digne postulant[es] adsequantur; & animabus omnium fidelium catholicor*um* orthodoxorum quorum nomina sup*er* s*anct*um altare[m] tuu*m* d*omi*ne adscripta esse uidentur quorum numerum & nomina tu solus d*omi*ne cognoscis & quibus donasti sacramentum baptismi in regione s*anct*orum iubeas dare consortium & plenitudinem gaudiorum. p*er*

8. Alia Oratio

S*anct*e marie semp*er* uirginis s*anct*orum que omnium archangelorum angelorum patriarcharum prophetarum apostolorum martirum confessorum monachorum uirginum & omnium simul sanctor*um* tuorum domine suffragia imploramus ut eorum intercessionibus a cuntis domine liberemur offensis peccati atque maculis p*er* te fili dei qui uiuis

9. Da quaesumus domine deus indulgentiam meorum michi peccatorum; quatinus quic quid carnali delectatione uel animi mei cogitatione uel uana huius seculi ambitione contra tuorum rectitudinem preceptorum p*er*feci; in hac presenti uita ueniam accip*er*e merear; p*er*

Appendix Two

Collation of Manuscript Differences between the psalm fragments in the *Benedictine Office* Bodleian MS Junius 121 and the psalter in B.N. MS lat. 8824.

Psalm	MS Junius 121	MS lat. 8824
53.1	halgan	haligan
58.1	luge	lungre
58.1	gife	geofe
60.6.12-4	þæt min	þæt ic min
64.6	hiht	hyht
64.6	ðisse	ðysse
69.1 (f. 51a)	beheald me drihten	beheald drihten me
70.7	mægne	mægene
70.7	wuldor	wuldur
79.18	mægna	mægena
		(remaining 3 1/2 lines missing from *Paris Psalter*)
87.13	to	þo
87.13	mægne	mægene
87.13	clypode	clypade
89.15	hwæthwygu	hwæ hwi ga
89.15	eaðbene	eaðbede
89.18	Geseoh	Beseoh
89.18	þine	on þine
89.18	bliðum	bliðe
89.19	beorhtnys	beorhtnes
101.1	heofonas	heofenes
102.1	þone	þæne
102.1	ecan	ecean
102.2	drihten	dryhten
102.2	wilt	wylt
102.2	ofergeotul	ofergeottul
102.4	Se	He
102.5	mildse	miltse
102.5	edniwe	edneowe
102.5	gelicost	gelicast
102.5	geoguðe	geogoðe
102.5	gleaw	gleawe
118.175	sawul	sawl
118.176	sceap	scep
118.176	þæt ðe	þætte

118.176	forwurðan			forweorðan
121.7	Sy			Si
121.7	mægne			mægene
139.1.1-2	men			menn
140.2	full			ful
140.2	ricene			recene
140.2	recels			ricels
in the whole text	þ	4 times	when	ð
	ð	19 times	when	þ

Appendix Three

Epithets for God in the *Paris Psalter*

Note: This list does not include examples of the possessive pronoun with a noun, whether the pronoun occurs pre- or post-positionally. Thus, *dema usser*, *min wuldor*, and *ure drihten* and the like are all excluded.

52.3.1	halig drihten	dominus
52.6.1	mihtig drihten	deus
52.7.4	halig drihten	dominus
53.4.2	ece drihten	dominus
53.7.1	lifes ealdor	addition
54.1.1	halig drihten	deus
54.15.3	hælend drihten	dominus
55.3.2	wuldres drihten	domine
55.4.1	wealdend god	deo
55.4.5	god drihten	deo
55.7.1	leofum gode	deo
55.9.3	ecne drihten	domino
55.10.1	mihtig god	deus
56.4.1	mihtig god	deus
56.6.1	halig drihten	deus
56.13.1	halig drihten	deus
58.1.1	halig god	deus meus
58.4.4	mægena god	domine
58.4.4	mihtig drihten	deus
58.4.5	Israela god	deus Israhel
58.9.2	geara andfencgea	susceptor meus
58.10.1	Min se goda god,	deus meus...bona
58.11.2	wealdend min drihten	protector meus domine
58.18.1	geara andfengea	susceptor meus
58.18.2	mihtig drihten	deus meus
59.5.2	halig god	deus
59.9.2	mihtig drihten	deus
59.11.1	mihtig drihten	deo
60.1.1	halig god	deus
60.4.1	halig drihten	deus
61.2.1	gearu hælend	salutaris meus
61.6.2	gleaw hælend	salutaris meus
61.7.1	min gearu hælu	salutari meo

63.1.1	halig drihten	deus
63.6.2	hælend drihten	deus
64.2.1	halig drihten	addition
64.3.3	mihta wealdend	addition
64.4.1	ece god	addition
64.5.1	ecum godum	addition
64.6.1	hælend god	deus salutaris noster
64.10.4	god lifigende	addition
65.1.1	ecne drihten	deo
65.3.1	wuldres ealdor	addition
65.3.2	ecne drihten	addition
65.3.5	hæleþa cynnes	addition
65.7.2	ecne drihten	deum
65.16.2	wealdend drihten	deus
65.17.1	hælend drihten	deus
66.1.1	mihtig drihten	deus
66.3.1	fæle god	deus
66.5.1	fælne drihten	deus
67.3.1	ecean drihtnes	dei
67.6.1	dema halig	deus
67.9.1	ecean drihtnes	dei
67.9.3	Israela godes	dei Israhel
67.12.2	mihtig kynincg	rex uirtutum
67.12.3	wlites wealdend	addition
67.14.1	se heofonlica kynincg	caelestis regis
67.19.3	se goda god	addition
67.20.2	ure hælend god	deus salutaris noster
67.21.1	wealdend god	deus
67.23.4	soðes kynincges	regis
67.24.5	Crist drihten god	dominum deum
67.26.1	mihtig god	deus
68.6.1	wuldres god	deus
68.7.4	mægena god	deus uirtutum
68.7.6	Israela god	deus Israhel
68.13.1	mihtig drihten	domine
68.14.2	frea ælmihtig	addition
68.29.2	ecean drihtnes	deus
68.31.1	leofan gode	deo
68.35.1	Sione god	deus...Sion
69.1.1	drihten god	deus
69.1.1	deore fultum	addition
69.6.2	frea ælmihtig	addition
70.1.1	god drihten	deus
70.2.3	god drihten	deum

70.3.1	geara trymmend	firmamentum
70.3.2	freoða fultumiend	refugium meum
70.6.2	fultum strang	adiutor fortis
70.8.1	wuldres ealdor	addition
70.8.4	lifiende god	addition
70.11.1	god ælmihtig	deus
70.11.2	soð god	deus
70.16.6	lifigende god	deus
70.18.3	wuldres cyning	addition
70.18.4	ece drihten	deus
70.20.4	ece drihten	addition
70.20.6	Israela god	addition
70.21.2	sigora wealdend	addition
71.1.1	drihten kyninge	deus...regi
71.19.1	ece drihten	dominus
71.19.2	hiora sylfra god	deus
72.1.1	ece god	deus
72.23.1	mihtigum drihtne	deo
72.23.2	god drihten	domino deo
73.1.1	ece god	deus
73.2.1	mihtig god	addition
73.4.1	wealdend drihten	addition
73.11.1	Usser god kynincg	deus autem rex
73.11.2	wise hælu	salutem
73.16.3	fæcne drihtne	domino
78.17.3	ece drihten	addition
73.20.1	drihten god	deus
74.1.1	ecne drihten	deus
74.6.4	dema drihten sylfa	deus iudex est
74.8.6	Iacobes god	deo Iacob
75.5.2	Iacobes god	deus Iacob
75.8.2	þam godan gode	domino deo
76.2.1	ecne drihten	deum
76.7.2	ece god	deus
76.9.3	haligan drihtnes	domini
76.11.1	weruda god	deus
76.11.2	mihtig god	deus magnus
76.11.2	ure se mæra god	deus noster
76.11.3	ana god	deus
76.13.1	wuldres god	deus
77.5.1	leofum drihtne	domini
77.12.1	halgan drihtnes	dei sui
77.20.5	witig god	deus
77.23.1	halig drihten	dominus

77.34.2	fæle fultum	adiutor eorum
77.34.3	hea god	deus excelsus
77.41.2	Israhela god	deum et sanctum Israhel
77.56.2	heanne god	deum excelsum
77.59.1	halig drihten	dominus
77.65.1	wealdend drihten	dominus
78.1.1	ece drihten	deus
78.5.1	wuldres god	domine
78.8.1	mihta wealdend	addition
78.9.1	frea ælmihtig	deus salutaris noster
78.9.2	lifigende god	domine
78.10.2	eower halig god	deus eorum
79.4.1	mægena god	domine deus uirtutum
79.5.1	mægena god	domine deus uirtutum
79.5.1	mære drihten	addition
79.7.1	mægena god	domine deus uirtutum
79.14.1	mægena god	domine deus uirtutum
79.14.7	tires wealdend	addition
79.16.4	weoruda drihten	addition
79.17.1	wealdend mihtig	addition
80.15.2	halig god	addition
81.1.1	God mihtig	deus
82.1.1	ece drihten	deus
82.14.2	ece drihten	addition
83.1.2	mægena drihten	domine uirtutum
83.2.2	lifigendan leofan drihten	deum uiuum
83.3.1	weoruda drihten	domine uirtutum
83.3.2	deore cynincg	rex meus
83.4.2	halig drihten	domine
83.5.2	fælne god	domine
83.6.4	soðes drihtnes	deus
83.7.1	halig drihten	domine
83.7.2	mære god	deus uirtutum
83.7.3	Iacobes god se mæra	deus Iacob
83.12.3	his ecean godes	domine deus uirtutum
84.4.1	hælend drihten	deus salutaris noster
84.5.3	Crist ælmihtig	deus
84.6.1	mihtig drihten	domine
84.7.1	halig god	dominus deus
84.11.1	fremsum god	dominus
85.1.1	halig drihten	domine
85.4.1	wealdend drihten	domine
85.5.1	ece drihten	domine
85.7.2	ece drihten	domine

85.8.2	wuldres ealdor	addition
85.9.1	mihtiga drihten	addition
85.11.3	halig god	domine deus meus
85.13.1	God min se leofa	deus
85.14.1	min drihten god	domine deus meus
85.15.2	mihtig drihten	addition
85.17.2	frea ælmihtig	addition
87.1.1	drihten god	domine deus
87.1.1	dyre hælend	salutaris meae
87.9.2	wuldres gode	domine
87.13.1	ece drihten	domine
87.14.2	soð god, wiðsacan	domine
88.1.1	mihtig drihten	domine
88.4.1	halig drihten	domine
88.5.1	weoruda drihten	domino
88.7.1	mægena god	domine deus uirtutum
88.7.1	mihtig drihten	potens es domine
88.15.1	mærost wuldor	gloria...tu es
88.16.1	ece drihten	domini
88.16.2	Israhela cyning eac se halga	sancti Israhel regis nostri
88.24.2	Wæs me andfencge, god, ecere hælu	deus meus et susceptor salutis meae
88.40.1	wealdend drihten	domine
88.41.1	mære god	domine
88.43.1	ece drihten	domine
88.45.1	ece drihten	domine
88.46.1	ece drihten	dominus
89.2.3	wuldres god	deus
89.4.1	ece drihten	addition
89.15.1	halig drihten	domine
89.18.2	ece drihten	domine
89.19.1	bliðan drihtnes	domini
89.19.2	þæs godan godes	dei
90.1.2	heofonrices weard	in protectione dei caeli
90.2.2	fæle fultum	susceptor meus
90.2.3	min se goda god	deus meus
90.9.1	halig drihten	domine
91.1.3	þone heahestan hæleða cynnes	altissime
91.4.1	mihtig drihten	domine
91.7.2	heofonrices weard	domine
91.14.1	sylfa drihten	dominus deus noster
92.4.1	ece god	deus
92.6.4	halig drihten	dominus
93.1.1	wracena god	deus ultionum dominus deus
93.2.1	eorþan dema	qui iudicas terram

93.7.3	Iacobes god	deus Iacob
93.11.1	ece god	domine
93.16.3	mihtigan drihtnes	domine
93.19.1	wealdend drihten	dominus
93.20.1	god ælmihtig	dominus
93.20.4	drihten eallmihtig	dominus
93.20.4	dema soðfæst	deus noster
94.3.1	se micla god mihtig drihten	deus magnus dominus
94.3.2	se micla cyningcg	rex magnus
94.7.1	drihten god	dominus deus
95.1.2	eceum drihtne	domino
95.2.3	drihtnes hælu	salutare eius
95.4.1	se mycla god	magnus dominus
95.4.2	egeslic god	terribilis
95.5.2	halig drihten	dominus
95.12.4	ecean drihtnes	domini
97.7.4	ecean drihtnes	domini
98.2.1	dema se mæsta	(dominus)...magnus
98.5.1	heofena drihten	dominum deum
98.9.1	halig drihten	domine deus noster
98.9.2	meahtig god	deus
98.10.1	hælend drihten	dominum deum nostrum
98.10.4	heofonrices weard	dominus deus noster
99.1.1	mihtigum drihtne	deo
99.2.2	wealdend god	dominus ipse est deus
100.1.1	mihtigan drihtnes	domine
101.1.1	mære drihten	domine
101.1.2	heofenes weard	addition
101.1.3	þeoda reccend	addition
101.2.2	wuldres ealdor	addition
101.2.5	heofenes weard	addition
101.11.1	mihtig god	addition
101.14.1	ece drihten	dominus
102.8.2	ece drihten	dominus
102.11.2	mihtig drihten	dominus
102.13.2	mihtig god	dominus
102.14.1	mihtig god	domine
102.16.1	mihtig drihten	domini
102.18.1	halig drihten	dominus
102.19.1	ecne drihten	dominum
102.19.2	bliðne frean	addition
102.21.1	ecne drihten	dominum
103.1.2	min drihten god	domine deus meus
103.23.1	mihtig drihten	domine

103.23.4	scyppend mære	addition
103.25.4	ece drihten	domine
103.29.1	weruda drihtne	domini
103.31.1	lustum drihtne	domino
104.15.5	halig god	domini
104.37.2	halig heofenes weard	sancti sui
105.1.1	ecum drihtne	domino
105.8.3	lifes ealdor	addition
105.10.1	lifes ealdor	addition
105.19.1	wuldres aldor	addition
105.27.5	Chananea god	Chanaan
105.29.2	ece drihten	dominus
105.31.3	lifes ealdor	addition
105.36.1	halig drihten	domine
105.36.2	se goda god	deus noster
105.37.1	Israhela god	dominus deus Israhel
105.37.2	wealdend drihten	addition
106.1.1	ecne drihten	domino
106.1.2	þæne goodan god	quoniam bonus
106.2.1	sylfa god	domino
106.2.2	lifes weard	addition
106.6.1	lifes ealdor	addition
106.7.1	mihtigan drihtnes	domino
106.14.1	mihtigan drihtnes	domino
106.20.1	ecum drihtne	domino
106.42.3	mihtigan drihtnes	domini
107.1.1	halig drihten	deus
107.1.3	soþum drihtne	domino
107.3.1	ece drihten	domine
107.5.1	halig drihten	deus
107.6.2	hælynd drihten	deus
107.10.1	se sylfa god	deus
107.12.1	mihtig drihten	deo
108.1.1	lifigende god	deus
108.21.1	min drihten god	domine domine
108.22.1	lifes weard	addition
108.25.2	drihten god	domine deus meus
108.25.3	hælynde Crist	addition
110.1.1	ece drihten	domine
110.3.2	mihtig drihten	dominus
111.4.4	mihtig dryhten	dominus
112.1.1	hælynd drihten	dominum
112.4.2	se heahsta hæleða cynnes	excelsus...dominus
112.5.2	þam halgan gode	deus noster

113.7.1	ecan dryhtnes	domini
113.7.3	Iacobes gode	dei Iacob
113.9.1	nergend dryhten	domine
113.10.4	heora agen god	deus eorum
113.11.1	ure se halga god	deus...noster
113.18.3	fælne fultum	protector
113.21.1	mihtig dryhten	dominus
113.22.1	mihtig dryhten	dominus
113.23.3	halig dryhten	domino
113.25.1	leofne dryhten	dominum
114.1.1	leofa drihten	dominus
114.5.1	leofa god	domine
114.5.3	mihtig dryhten	dominus
114.8.5	leofum drihtne	domino
115.8.1	halgum dryhtne	domino
116.1.1	ecne drihten	dominum
117.1.1	ecum dryhtne	domino
117.1.2	þam godan gode	quoniam bonus
117.2.2	se goda god	quoniam bonus
117.3.2	se goda god	quoniam bonus
117.4.3	se goda god	quoniam bonus
117.6.1	fæle dryhten	dominus
117.7.1	fæle dryhten	dominus
117.18.2	dryhten ælmihtig	dominus
117.20.1	ece dryhten	domine
117.21.3	halig dryhten	domino
117.23.1	dryhten god	domine
117.24.4	drihten god	deus dominus
117.26.1	min dryhten god	deus meus
117.26.3	min hælend god	deus meus
117.27.1	ecne dryhten	domine
117.28.1	eceum dryhtne	domino
117.28.2	se goda god	quoniam bonus
118.3.2	mihtigan drihtnes	addition
118.7.1	ece dryhten	domine
118.33.1	ece dryhten	domine
118.41.1	ece dryhten	domine
118.52.2	ðeoden dryhten	domine
118.64.2	mihtig drihten	domine
118.85.3	ece dryhten	domine
118.88.2	mihtig god	addition
118.97.1	ece drihten	domine
118.103.2	ece drihten	addition
118.107.2	ece god	(domine)

118.116.1	fæle drihten	addition
118.129.1	wealdend dryhten	domine
118.146.2	halne heahcyning	addition
118.146.2	heofona wealdend	addition
118.146.3	hælende Crist	addition
118.149.1	halig drihten	domine
118.151.1	wuldres drihten	domine
118.156.1	mihtig drihten	domine
118.159.2	leofa drihten	domine
118.166.1	halig drihten	domine
118.170.1	ece drihten	domine
118.174.2	drihten ælmihtig	domine
119.2.1	lifes drihten	domine
120.5.1	halig drihten	dominus
120.6.3	halig drihten	dominus
120.7.1	ece drihten	dominus
120.7.2	sawla soðcyningc	addition
122.1.1	ece drihten	addition
122.3.3	ece drihten	dominum
122.3.4	urum þam godan gode	deum nostrum
122.3.5	mihta wealdend	addition
122.4.1	mihtig drihten	domine
123.1.1	ece drihten	dominus
124.2.2	ece drihten	dominus
124.3.1	lifes drihten	dominus
124.5.2	ece drihten	dominus
125.3.2	mihtig drihten	dominus
125.3.4	mihtig drihten	dominus
125.4.1	halig drihten	domine
126.1.1	halig drihten	dominus
126.2.1	halig drihten	dominus
126.4.2	ecean drihtnes	domini
127.1.1	ecne god	dominum
129.1.2	drihten, drihten	domine
129.3.2	drihten, drihten	domine, domine
129.4.1	mihta wealdend	addition
129.4.2	ece drihten	domine
131.2.3	Iacobes god þone mæran	deo Iacob
131.5.3	Iacobes gode	deo Iacob
131.14.1	sylfa drihten	dominus
132.4.1	halig drihten	dominus
133.2.3	þæs halgan godes	dei nostri
134.2.3	þæs godan godes	dei nostri
134.4.1	Iacob drihten	Iacob...dominus

134.13.2	mihtig drihten	domine
134.21.1	holdne drihten	dominum
134.21.3	ecne drihten	dominum
135.1.1	ecum drihtne	domino
135.2.2	ealra godena god	deo deorum
135.3.2	drihtna drihten	domino dominorum
135.24.1	ece drihten	nostri dominus
135.27.1	þam ecean gode	deo
135.28.1	ealra godena gode	domino dominorum
137.1.1	ecne drihten	domine
138.12.1	ece drihten	domine
138.21.3	lifes ealdor	addition
139.1.2	ece drihten	domine
139.4.4	lifes ealdur	addition
139.6.1	dyre god	deus meus
139.6.2	halig drihten	domine
139.7.1	Drihten, drihten	domine, domine
141.6.1	hæleþa wealdend	addition
142.7.1	drihten leofa	domine
142.7.3	wuldres ealdur	addition
142.8.2	mihtig drihten	domine
142.10.1	frea drihten	domine
143.1.1	min se deora god	deus meus
143.2.2	fæst andfengea	susceptor meus
143.3.1	mihtig scyldend	protector meus
143.4.1	mihtig drihten	domine
143.6.1	halig drihten	domine
143.10.2	þam godan gode	deus
143.19.4	drihten god	dominus deus
144.1.1	heahne god	deus
144.15.1	halig god	dominus
144.20.1	halig drihten	dominus
145.1.1	hælend drihten	dominum
145.1.3	holdum gode	deo meo
145.4.2	Iacobes god	deus Iacob
145.4.2	geara fultumiend	adiutor eius
146.5.1	mihtig drihten	dominus
146.12.1	wuldres drihten	domino
147.1.2	þinne soðne god	deum tuum
148.1.1	hælend drihten	dominum
150.1.1	holdne drihten	deum
150.1.2	mære hælu	addition

Appendix Four

Hapax Legomena in the *Paris Psalter*

æbebod	104.40, 118.102, 118.126 'injunction of the law, command'	N+N
æfenlac	140.3 'evening, eventide'	N+N
ægype	106.10 'without skill or cunning'	N+N
æteglan	88.20 'to harm'	Prep+Vb
ætfele	72.23 'adhesion'	Prep+N
afæman	118.131 'to foam'	Prep+Vb
ahyltan	139.5 'to trip up'	Prep+Vb
amawan	101.4 'to mow, cut down'	Prep+Vb
anmede	54.12 'unanimity, concord'	N+N
arscamu	68.19 'shame, modesty?'	N+N?
aspreotan	140.9 'to sprout forth'	Prep+Vb
atreddan	118.69, 138.2 'to investigate, know' 'to keep the faith, the laws'	Prep+Vb

bealuinwit	54.23 'deceit, treachery'	N+N
begretan	77.63 'to lament'	Prep+Vb
brechrægl	108.28 'garment, robe'	N+N
byrgend	78.3 'grave digger?'	N+Sfx
camp	149.8 'battlefield; plain; struggle?'	Simplex
cyme	65.4, 68.11, 105.18 'beautiful thing'; 'lovely, suitable'	Simplex
dædfrom	109.7 'energetic, strong in deeds'	N+Aj
eallhalig	131.8 'all-holy, all-sacred'	Aj+Aj
eallmiht	135.12 'great power'	Aj+N
eardgyfu	71.10 'present from one's homeland'	N+N
eardhæbbend	86.6 'inhabitant, native'	N+N+Sfx
eardland	134.12 'native land'	N+N
earfoðcynn	77.10 'race of difficult ones, a troublesome people'	Aj+N
earfoðdæg	76.2 'day of affliction'	Aj+N
earwunga	68.4, 108.2, 118.161, 119.6 'without a cause, guiltlessly'	Simplex

eaðbede	89.15 'easily entreated, exorable'	Aj+N
edwitstæf	78.4, 108.24, 118.42 'disgrace, reproach; open source of scorn'	N+N
efenmid	73.11 'in the middle'	Adv+Prep
efenscearp	63.3 'very sharp'	Adv+Aj
egewylm	106.24 'fearful boiling, terrible wave'	N+N
ellencræft	98.5 'might, power'	N+N
eorðstede	73.6 'place on the earth, earthly location'	N+N
eorðtudor	117.22 'offspring of the earth'	N+N
eowdesceap	64.14 'flock of sheep'	N+N
erinaces	103.17 'hedgehogs'	Simplex
facendæd	118.53 'deed of evil, crime'	N+N
facengeswipere	82.3 'deceitfully, cunningly with evil'	N+Adv
fæderenbroðor	68.8 'relatives, father and brother'	N+N
færslide	114.8 'sudden falling'	Aj+N
fæststeall	121.2 'in a secure position, standing firmly'	Adj+N

fengnett	140.12 'net for (capturing) prey'	N+N
gefeohtdæg	139.7 day of battle'	Pref+N+N
feondæt	105.24 'food sacrificed to idols'	N+N
feorhlif	142.2 'life'	N+N
feorhþearf	69.1 'urgent necessity, worldly need'	N+N
ferhtlic	95.10 'honest, just'	Aj+Sfx
firenwyrcend	70.3, 72.2 'sinner, worker of crimes'	N+N+Sfx
fleohcynn	104.27 'a kind of fly, fly'	N+N
folcegsa	88.34 'terror of the people, widespread dread'	N+N
folcned	77.16 'need of the people, general need'	N+N
forslitan	77.46 'to consume, devour'	Prep+Vb
forspyrcan	101.3 'to dry out, dry up, empty'	Prep+Vb
frumsprecend	86.5 'those speaking from the beginning'	Aj+N+Sfx
fyhtehorn	74.9 'battle-horn'	N+N
fyrenwyrhta	93.3 'evil-doer, sinner'	N+N

gærsbedd	102.15 'grass-bed, i.e. grave'	N+N
gasthus	54.14 'guest-house, guest chamber'	N+N
gnornscendend	89.10 'hastening in sorrow'	Aj+N+Sfx
gramhicgend	68.24 'enemy, hostile-minded one'	Aj+N+Sfx
gramword	74.5 'evil speech, cruel words'	Aj+N
hæðenstyrc	105.17 'heathen calf'	N+N
handgeweald	105.30 'power in hand, possessions'	N+Pref+N
hathige	89.7 'heated in mind, angry'	Aj+N
heahbeorg	94.4 'high hills, mountains'	Aj+N
heahbliss	118.111 'great happiness, exultation'	Aj+N
heahgaldor	57.4 'great incantation, strong charm'	Aj+N
heahgnornung	101.18 'deep grief, great mourning'	Aj+N
heahgod	56.2 'the Most High, God'	Aj+N
heahmiht	150.2 'high authority, great might'	Aj+N
heahsæl	101.11, 118.108 'great happiness'	Aj+N

heahstrengðu	107.7 'great strength, endurance'	Aj+N
heahþearf	117.16, 117.20, 117.27 'great need'	Aj+N
hearmedwit	68.20 'grievous reproach, harmful abuse'	N+N
hemman	106.41 'to stop up, close'	Simplex
heofonham	102.18, 122.1, 137.6, 148.4 'heavenly home, heaven'	N+N
heofonhlaf	104.35 'bread of heaven, manna'	N+N
hildedeoful	95.5 'war-devil, demon'	N+N
hinderþeostru	85.12 'the farthest darkness, hell'	Prep+N
hlafgebrecu	147.6 'piece of bread, loaf'	N+Pref+N
hlafweard	104.17 'guardian of the food, steward'	N+N
hleorsceame	68.8 'confusion, state of being shame-faced'	N+N
hlidan	79.11 'to come forth, spring up'	Simplex
hopig	68.2 'eddying, surging'	Simplex
hwætecynn	147.3 'wheat, a kind of wheat'	N+N
hygeclæne	104.3 'pure in heart, righteous'	N+Aj

ingebed	87.2 'prayer, earnest prayer'	Prep+N
inwitgyren	139.5 'treacherous snare, evil trap'	N+N
inwitstæf	54.14, 140.5 'wickedness, evil'	N+N
lacgeofa	67.18 'generous giver?'	N+N
leawfinger	72.11 'index-finger, forefinger'	N+N
leodstefn	82.7 'voice of the people, assembly'	N+N
liciendlic lycendlice	67.16, 68.13 140.8 'agreeable, pleasant'; 'agreeably, pleasantly'	Simplex
limwæd	103.2 'garment, clothing'	N+N
lofmægen	105.2 'praise, strong praise'	N+N
mægenweorc	91.4, 103.22 'mighty work'	N+N
mærweorc	110.4 'noble work'	N+N
mamrian	63.5 'to think out, design?'	Simplex
manfolm	143.8 'evil-doer, one with evil hands'	N+N
mangewyrhta	77.38 'sinner, evil worker'	N+Pref+N
manidel	143.9, 143.13	N+Aj

'evil and useless, criminal and vain'

mansceat	54.10, 71.14 'usury?'	N+N
manword	58.12 'evil speech, wicked words'	N+N
manwyrhta	93.3, 118.3, 118.85 'sinner, evil-doer, worker of evil'	N+N
mearhcofa	101.3 'marrow-house, i.e. bone'	N+N
mindom	54.7 'state of exile?'	Aj+N
modblissiend	67.17 'happy in mind, exulting'	N+N+Sfx
modorcild	68.8 'child of a mother, child'	N+N
morhæð	82.10 'mountain heath'	N+N
mundbeorg	124.2 'protecting hill'	N+N
murc	145.6 'dismal, wretched?'	Simplex
mysci	104.27 'flies (pl.)'	Simplex
nahtfremmend	58.2 'worker of evil, evil-doer'	N+N+Sfx
neodlof	148.12 'eager praise'	N+N
neodspearuwa	123.6 'sparrow'	N+N

neodweorðung	142.11 'eager praise, zealous admiration'	N+N
nihtegsa	90.5 'night terror, nocturnal fear'	N+N
niðcwealm	77.50 'violent death'	N+N
niðerdæl	138.13 'lower region, hell, the part below'	Prep+N
ofergeatu	128.6 'forgetfulness, oblivion'	Prep+N
oferhleoður	93.9 'failing to hear, sound passing over'	Prep+N
oferhylmend	118.119 'dissembler'	Prep+N+Sfx
oflecgan	68.1 'to lay down'	Prep+Vb
ombihtmæcg	101.12, 143.11 'servant, servant-kinsman'	N+N
onmetan	88.39 'to cover over; paint?'	Prep+Vb
restbedd	131.3 'bed, couch'	N+N
reðemann	108.11 'violent man; usurer?'	Aj+N
samheort	149.1 'together in mind, i.e. unanimous'	Pref+N
sceuccgyld	105.26 'golden devil, idol'	N+N
gescotfeoht	54.20, 75.3 'shooting, battle; joining of battle'	Pref+N+N

scrind	103.24 'swift course?'	Simplex
sealmfæt	70.20 'psalms as vessel (of praise)'	N+N
snytruhus	77.60 'house of wisdom'	N+N
sundoryrfe	67.10 'private inheritance, special bequest'	Pref+N
swiðmihtig	85.13 'very mighty'	Adv+Aj
swyld	114.3 'pang, pain, i.e. pains of death'	Simplex
swyltdeað	55.10 'death'	N+N
geswyru	64.13, 71.3, 113.4, 113.6, 148.9 'hills, little hills'	Pref+N
teofrian	117.21 'to allot, appoint?'	Simplex
teosuspræc	139.11 'harmful speech, injurious words'	N+N
treaflice	102.6 'grievously'	Simplex
getyne	115.8 'entrance, court, hall of judgment?'	Pref+N
þearfigend	71.13 'needy one, the starving'	N+Sfx
þeccend	70.2, 70.5 'protector, defender'	N+Sfx
þeodstefn	83.9 'tribe, nation, voice of the people'	N+N

þunurradstefn	76.14 'voice of thunder'	N+N
unaga	112.6 'one who owns nothing, i.e. poor man'	Pref+N
unbealu	100.2 'lack of evil; i.e. virtue?'	Pref+N
unmæge	68.8 'not akin, unrelated'	Pref+N
unsæd	100.5 'unsated, even insatiable?'	Pref+N
uphebbe	103.17 'uplifted, elevated'	Prep+Vb
utgemæru	60.1, 71.8 'going out, departure, exodus'	Prep+Pref+N
wæpenstræl	56.5 'arrow, arrow-weapon'	N+N
wætergrund	106.23 'depths of sea, water-ground, seabed'	N+N
wæterstefn	92.5 'voice of waters'	N+N
wæterðyrþ	106.22 'rush of waters'	N+N
wealdendgod	56.2, 67.16 'Lord God'	N+N
wealsada	139.5 'rope for binding, lit. cord for slaves'	N+N
westweg	74.6 'western way, western direction'	Adv+N
weþan	106.28 'to assuage, make calm'	Simplex

wictun	95.8, 99.3	N+N
	'vestibule, court'	
wigsmið	113.12	N+N
	'maker of idols'	
wisboc	138.14	Aj+N
	'wise book, instructive book'	
witehrægl	68.11	N+N
	'penitential garb, sackcloth'	
wiðerhabban	72.20	Prep+Vb
	'to resist, come against'	
wliteandette	103.2	N+N
	'confession of splendour?' or 'forgiving visage?'	
wohgod	77.58	N+N
	'false god, idol'	
wordgebeot	105.34	N+Pref+N
	'promising words, vows in speech'	
worldþearfa	69.6	N+N
	'needy in the world, poor one'	
woruftord	112.6	N+N
	'excrement of beast, dung of cattle'	
worulddead	142.4	N+N
	'the dead of the world, the dead'	
wudufeld	131.6	N+N
	'wooded plain, wood'	
wundorbeacen	73.4	N+N
	'wonder-sign, glorious token'	
wundortacen	104.23	N+N
	'wonder-sign, miracle'	
wynburg	127.2	N+N
	'happy town, glad city'	

wynele	108.18	N+N
	'gladdening oil, joyous anointing'	
wyngesið	100.3	N+N
	'happy companion'	
wynngraf	64.13	N+N
	'delightful grove'	
wynpsalterium	56.10	N+N
	'psalm of joy'	

Appendix Five

a) Metrical Analysis of the *Paris Psalter*, Psalms 118-122

118.1.1	lA*lb	a1c
.2	3B1b	2A1a
.2.1	lA*la	2C2b
.2	d1b	2Ala
.3	a1d	2A1a
.4	1D*2	2Ala
.3.1	d2c	2Ala
.2	3B1b	2A1a
.4.1	a1d	2A1a
.2	2A2	2A1a
.5.1	2C1b	2Ala
.2	a1c	lA*la
.3	3B*lc	2Ala
.6.1	a1f	lA*la
.2	lA*lc	2Ala
.7.1	d1b	2Ala
.2	a1c	lA*la
.3	a1e	3B1b
.4	a1d	2Ala
.8.1	2A1	2Ala
.2	2Ala	3B1b
.3	a1c	lA*lb
.9.1	1A1b	3B1a
.2	1A*la	1A1a
.3	a1e	1A1a
.10.1	a1c	2Ala
.2	2Ala	3B1b
.3	a1d	1A1a
.11.1	a1f	2Ala
.2	a1d	1A1a
.3	a1e	2Ala
.12.1	a1c	2Ala
.2	1A*1a	3B1b
.3	2A1	2Ala
.13.1	a1d	2Ala
.2	a1d	2Ala
.14.1	2Ala	2Ala
.2	d1e	1A1a
.3	a1d	2Ala
.15.1	2A1	lA*la
.2	a1c	2Ala
.3	2A2	lA*la
.16.1	2A1	lA*la
.2	a1d	1A1a
.17.1	1A1b	2Ala
.2	d2b	2Ala
.3	2Ala	d1a
.18.1	1A1c	2C1b
.2	e1c	2C1-
.3	2Ala	3B1b
.19.1	a1c	1A1a
.2	a1d	1A*1a
.20.1	3B1a	2A1a
.2	3B1c	2C1a
.3	3B1a	2A1a
.21.1	2A1a	2Ala
.2	a1c	2A1a
.3	a1d	2A1a
.22.1	3B*1a	1A1a
.2	2Ala	2Ala
.3	d1f	2Ala
.23.1	d5b	lA*la
.2	lA*la	2Ala
.3	a1c	2Ala
.4	1A*la	2Ala
.5	3B1d	1A*1a
.24.1	a1d	1A1b
.2	a1d	2Ala
.3	3B1c	2C1b
.4	2A1	2Ala
.25.1	1A1a	1A*1a
.2	a1f	1A1a
.26.1	2Ala	2Ala
.2	a1d	2Ala
.3	1A1b	2A1a
.4	2A1	1A*1a
.27.1	rem	1A*1a
.2	a1e	1A1a
.28.1	2B1a	2B1b
.2	d1a	1A1a
.3	a1c	2A1a

.29.1	3E1	2A1a	.44.1	2C1b	1A*1a
	.2 2B1e	2A1a		.2 1A*1a	2A1a
.30.1	3B*1b	2A1a		.3 d1b	1A*1a
	.2 a1f	2A1a	.45.1	a1c	2A1a
.31.1	3B*1b	2C1b		.2 d1f	1A1a
	.2 d1c	1A1a	.46.1	d1d	2A1a
	.3 a1e	1A*1a		.2 a1b	2C1-
.32.1	3B1c	2A1a		.3 3B1d	1A1b
	.2 2A1a	3B1b		.4 e1d	1A*1a
	.3 3B*1b	2A1a	.47.1	a1f	2A1a
.33.1	1A1b	2A1a		.2 d1a	3B1b
	.2 2A1a	2A1a		.3 2A1a	2A1a
	.3 a1c	2A1a	.48.1	a1d	1A1a
.34.1	3B1c	2C1b		.2 a1e	2A1a
	.2 1A*1a	2A1a		.3 a1e	1A*1a
	.3 a1e	2A1a		.4 d2d	1A*1b
.35.1	a1d	2A1a	.49.1	1A1a	2A1a
	.2 a1d	2A1a		.2 a1d	1A1a
	.3 a1e	2A1a	.50.1	a1d	2A1a
.36.1	a1d	3B1b		.2 d2c	2A1a
	.2 d1d	1A*1a		.3 e1d	2A1a
	.3 1A*2a	2A1a	.51.1	1D*3	2A1a
.37.1	a1e	2C1c		.2 a1d	1A*1a
	.2 a1c	3B1c		.3 e1c	2C1-
	.3 a1d	2A1a	.52.1	a1c	2A1a
.38.1	a1d	2A1a		.2 a1c	2A1a
	.2 a1d	2C1-		.3 3B*1c	1A*1a
	.3 2A1a	2Ala	.53.1	a1c	1A1a
.39.1	3B1c	1A1a		.2 2A1a	2A1a
	.2 a1c	2A1a		.3 2C1b	1A1a
	.3 a1g	3B1a	.54.1	a1c	2A1a
.40.1	a1f	2A1a		.2 2A1	2A1a
	.2 1D6	1A*1a		.3 d2c	2Ala
	.3 a1d	1A1a	.55.1	1A*1c	1A*1a
.41.1	2A1a	2A1a		.2 2A1a	2A1a
	.2 3B1a	2A1a		.3 2C1b	2A1a
	.3 a1d	2A1a	.56.1	d2b	1A*1a
.42.1	d2b	2A1a		.2 2A1	2Ala
	.2 1D*2	3B*1c	.57.1	a1c	2A1a
	.3 a1d	2A1a		.2 2Ala	2C1b
.43.1	1A1b	2A1a		.3 2C1b	2A1a
	.2 a1d	2A1a	.58.1	d1e	2A1a
	.3 3B1b	2A1a		.2 a1d	2Ala
	.4 a1e	1A*1a		.3 a1d	2A1a

	.4 a1d	2A1a
.59.1	2A1a	2A1a
	.2 d1a	2A1a
	.3 d1f	1A1a
.60.1	1A*1b	2A1a
	.2 2C1b	2A1a
.61.1	2A1a	2A1a
	.2 1A*1a	1A1a
	.3 2A1a	2C1b
	.4 2A1a	1A*1a
.62.1	3B1b	1A*1a
	.2 1A*1a	2A1a
	.3 d1c	1A1a
	.4 1A*1b	2A1a
.63.1	2C1b	3B1c
	.2 1A*1a	2A1a
.64.1	3B1a	1A1a
	.2 2A1	2A1a
	.3 2A1	3B1b
.65.1	a1d	2A1a
	.2 1D1	1A*1a
	.3 2C1c	1A1a
.66.1	3E2	2A1a
	.2 d1a	1A1b
	.3 2B1c	1A*1a
.67.1	a1d	1A1a
	.2 d1a	2A1a
	.3 3B*1e	1A1a
.68.1	1A1b	2C1b
	.2 3B*1c	2A1a
	.3 3B1a	2A1a
.69.1	3B*1b	1A1a
	.2 2A1a	a1c
	.3 2A1a	2A1a
	.4 e1d	1A1a
.70.1	3B1c	1A1a
	.2 2A1a	1A*1a
	.3 2C1a	2A1a
	.4 d2a	2A1a
.71.1	1A*1c	3B1b
	.2 1A*1a	2A1a
	.3 3B1a	2C1-
.72.1	2A1a	2A1a
	.2 3B*1b	1A1a
	.3 2A1a	1A*1a
.73.1	1A*1a	1A*1a
	.2 a1b	2A1a
	.3 a1d	2C1b
	.4 1A*1a	2A1a
.74.1	2A1a	3B*1c
	.2 a1a	1A1a
	.3 a1d	1A1a
.75.1	3B*1b	2A1a
	.2 2A2	3B1b
	.3 rem	1D*2
.76.1	3B1c	1A*1a
	.2 a1c	1A*1a
	.3 a1e	1A1a
	.4 a1b	1A*1a
.77.1	a1e	1A*1a
	.2 3B*1b	2A1a
	.3 a1d	d2a
	.4 2C1b	2A1a
.78.1	2A1a	1A*1a
	.2 d1b	2A1a
	.3 a1d	1A*1a
.79.1	3B*1a	3B*1b
	.2 2A1a	3B1a
	.3 d1d	2A1a
.80.1	3B1b	2A1a
	.2 3B1d	1A*1a
	.3 1A*1a	1A*1a
.81.1	2B1a	1A*1a
	.2 a1e	1A*1a
	.3 a1e	1A1a
.82.1	1A*1a	2C1-
	.2 a1d	2A1a
	.3 2A1a	3B1a
	.4 a1c	2C1-
.83.1	a1d	1A*1a
	.2 2A1a	2A1a
	.3 2A1	3B1b
	.4 3B2b	2A1a
.84.1	a1d	2A1a
	.2 3B*1d	1A*1a
.85.1	d2a	1A*1a
	.2 2A1a	2B1c
	.3 2C1c	2A1a

.86.1	3B*1d	1A*1a		.2 a1e	1A*1a
	.2 3B1a	2A1a	.101.1	a1c	2A1a
	.3 3B1a	2A1a		.2 2A1a	2A1a
.87.1	3B1b	2A1a		.3 2C1d	1A1a
	.2 d2b	1A*1a	.102.1	a1e	2A1a
	.3 2B1a	1A1a		.2 d4d	2A1a
	.4 a1c	1A1a	.103.1	a1c	1A1a
.88.1	a1f	1A1		.2 3B1a	2A1a
	.2 3B1b	1A*1a		.3 d2b	2A1a
	.3 d1c	1A1a		.4 2C1a	1A*1a
	.4 2A1a	2C1b	.104.1	2A1a	2B1b
.89.1	d1a	2A1a		.2 2A1a	1A*1a
	.2 2C1a	1A1a		.3 2C1d	1A1a
.90.1	3B1b	1D*5	.105.1	2A1a	2A1a
	.2 d1a	2A1a		.2 2C1c	1A1a
.91.1	a1b	2A1a		.3 3B1d	2A1a
	.2 a1d	2A1a	.106.1	3B1a	2C1a
	.3 3B1c	1A*1b		.2 3B1b	2A1a
	.4 a1c	2A1a	.107.1	d2b	2A1a
.92.1	e1c	1A1a		.2 2A1a	3B1c
	.2 a1c	2A1a		.3 a1f	2A1a
	.3 a1c	d2a	.108.1	3B1b	2A1a
	.4 d2e	1A1a		.2 d2a	1A*1a
.93.1	1A*1a	d1a		.3 3B*1d	2A1a
	.2 f1c	1A*1a	.109.1	f1a	1A*1a
	.3 3B*1c	2A1a		.2 2A1a	3B1e
.94.1	f1c	3B1b		.3 1A*1a	2A1a
	.2 f1d	1A*1a	.110.1	2A1	2A1a
.95.1	2A1	2A1a		.2 2A1a	3B1b
	.2 1A*1a	1A*1a		.3 1A1c	1A1a
	.3 d1d	1A1a	.111.1	3B*1b	2A1a
.96.1	2B1a	3B1a		.2 d1c	1A1a
	.2 a1d	2A1a		.3 d1a	1A*1a
	.3 3E*1	2C1a		.4 a2b	2A1a
.97.1	2C1b	2A1a	.112.1	1A*1c	2A1a
	.2 2A1a	2A1a		.2 3B1c	2A1a
	.3 a1d	2A1a		.3 a1d	2A1a
.98.1	1A*1a	1A*1b	.113.1	d1b	2A1a
	.2 1A*1a	2A1a		.2 2C1b	2A1a
	.3 d1c	2A1a	.114.1	3B1b	1A*1a
.99.1	3B1b	2C1b		.2 d1a	1A*1a
	.2 a1d	2A1a		.3 e1d	1A1a
	.3 d1e	2A1a	.115.1	3B*1a	3B1a
.100.1	2A1a	2B1b		.2 1A*1a	2A1a

.116.1 d1c	2A1a
.2 a1e	1A*1a
.3 a1d	2A1a
.4 a1e	2B1c
.117.1 a1d	3B1d
.2 2A1	2A1a
.118.1 1A*1b	d1b
.2 2A1a	1A1a
.3 a1c	2A1a
.119.1 2A1	1A*1a
.2 3B1b	2A1a
.3 d1f	2A1a
.120.1 a1e	2A1a
.2 a1d	2A1a
.121.1 3B1a	2A1a
.2 d1e	2A1a
.122.1 a1e	1A*1a
.2 2A1	1A*1a
.3 2C1-	1A*1a
.123.1 2A1a	1A*1a
.2 a1e	2A1a
.3 a1d	1D1
.124.1 a1c	2A1a
.2 hyperm	3B1b
.3 3B1a	2A1a
.125.1 3B1b	a1b
.2 d1e	2C1-
.126.1 3B1b	f1c
.2 2A1a	2A1a
.3 d5a	1A*1a
.127.1 e1e	2A1a
.2 3B1b	2A1a
.3 2A1a	2A1a
.128.1 3B*1c	2A1a
.2 2A1a	2A1a
.129.1 1A*1c	2A1a
.2 f1d	2A1a
.130.1 1A*1a	1A*1a
.2 2A1a	2A1a
.3 2A1a	d2-
.131.1 1A1b	2A1a
.2 a1c	1A1a
.3 2B2a	1A*1a
.132.1 e1d	1A1b
.2 1A*1a	2A1a
.3 2A1a	2A1a
.133.1 a1e	3B1c
.2 a1d	2A1a
.3 2A1a	2A1a
.134.1 d2d	2A1a
.2 a1e	2A1a
.135.1 a1c	2A1a
.2 1A*1a	1A1a
.3 3B1c	1A*1a
.136.1 rem	3B*1a
.2 2A3a	2A1a
.3 3B1b	2C1a
.4 2B1b	2A1a
.137.1 1A*1a	3B1b
.2 1A*1a	1A*1a
.138.1 3B1b	2A1a
.2 d1d	1A1a
.3 1A*1a	2A1a
.4 2A1a	2C1b
.139.1 2C1a	2A1a
.2 3B1a	3B1a
.3 2C1b	1A1a
.4 3B1b	2A1a
.140.1 3B1b	2A1a
.2 hyperm	3B1a
.3 3B1a	2A1a
.141.1 d1c	1A*1b
.2 2A1	2A1a
.3 f1c	2A1a
.142.1 d1b	2A1a
.2 d1a	3B1b
.3 d1a	1A*1a
.4 2A1a	2C1a
.143.1 d1a	1A*1a
.2 2A1	1A*1a
.3 1A1c	1A*1a
.4 2A1a	2A1a
.144.1 a1d	1A*1a
.2 a1d	2A1a
.3 a1e	2A1a
.145.1 3B*1b	1A1a
.2 2A1a	1A*1a
.3 2A1a	d1b

	.4	1A*1a	2A1a	.160.1	2A1a	2A1a
	.5	2A1	1A*1a	.2	e1c	2A1a
.146.1		3B*1a	d1b	.3	d1b	1A*1a
	.2	1D*2	2A1a	.4	3B1d	1A*1a
	.3	3E1	3B1b	.161.1	d1a	1A*1a
	.4	a1e	1A*1a	.2	3E*2	2A1a
.147.1		3B*1d	2A1a	.3	3B1b	3B1c
	.2	2A1a	d1b	.4	2A1a	2A1a
	.3	1A1a	2A1a	.162.1	a1a	2A1a
	.4	a1e	1A1a	.2	a1d	1A*1a
.148.1		2A1a	1A1a	.3	a1c	3B1b
	.2	d2a	3B*1a	.4	2A1a	2A1a
	.3	a1b	2A1a	.163.1	3B*1b	2A1a
.149.1		1A1b	2A1a	.2	d1a	2A1a
	.2	a1f	2A1	.3	2C1c	2A1a
	.3	a1e	1A1a	.164.1	2A1a	2A1a
.150.1		a1c	2A2	.2	2A1a	2A3a
	.2	d1b	2A2	.3	2A1a	3B1e
	.3	2C1a	1A*1a	.4	2C1a	1A*1a
.151.1		rem	2A1a	.165.1	2C1b	a1b
	.2	a1e	1A*1a	.2	2A1a	2A1a
.152.1		d1b	2Ala	.3	3B*1c	1A*1a
	.2	2C1a	3B1b	.166.1	3B1c	2A1a
	.3	d1a	1D1	.2	a1d	2A1a
.153.1		3E*2	1A1a	.167.1	f1b	1A1a
	.2	a1c	2B1b	.2	d1c	2A1a
	.3	2C1e	2A1a	.3	a1c	2A1a
.154.1		3E1	3B*1b	.168.1	1A*1c	2A1a
	.2	a1c	d1b	.2	d1d	2A1a
	.3	d1a	3E1	.3	a1f	2A1a
.155.1		3E2	2A1a	.4	a1d	2A1a
	.2	2A1	2A1a	.169.1	d1b	2A1a
.156.1		1A*1a	2A1a	.2	2A1a	3B1b
	.2	a1d	1A1a	.3	a1d	2A1a
.157.1		3B*1a	2C1a	.4	a1d	d1c
	.2	2C1b	a1b	.5	a1d	1A*1a
	.3	d1c	1A*1a	.170.1	3E1	2A1a
.158.1		3B*1a	1A1b	.2	a1d	1A*1a
	.2	2A1	2A1a	.3	a1d	d1a
	.3	2B1b	2A1a	.4	a1d	1A*1a
	.4	a1b	1A1a	.171.1	3B1c	2A1a
.159.1		2B1c	2B1c	.2	2A1a	3B1b
	.2	2A1a	2A1a	.3	2A1	2A1a
	.3	2A1	1A1b	.172.1	3B1a	1A*1a

.2 a1c	2A1a
.3 1A1b	2A2
.173.1 a1d	3B1a
.2 d1b	2C1a
.3 3B*1f	1A*1a
.174.1 a1c	2C1-
.2 2A2	1A1a
.3 2C1b	2A1a
.175.1 2A2	2A1a
.2 a1d	2A1a
.176.1 a1b	3B1b
.2 a1c	2A1a
.3 a1e	2A1a
.4 rem	2A1a
119.1.1 a1c	2A1a
.2 d1c	1A*1a
.3 a1d	2A1a
.2.1 1A1b	2A1a
.2 a1b	2C1a
.3 a1d	2A1a
.3.1 3B1c	3B1b
.2 2A1	2A1a
.4.1 1A*1a	1A*1a
.2 2A1a	1A*1a
.5.1 1A1c	2B1b
.2 3B*1b	1A*2a
.3 2C1b	3B1b
.4 rem	f1b
.5 a1c	1A*1a
.6.1 a1d	2A1a
.2 3B*1a	2A1a
.3 3B1d	1A*1b
.4 d1c	1A*1a
120.1.1 1A*1b	2C1b
.2 3B1b	1A*1a
.2.1 3B1b	1A*1a
.2 2A1a	2A1a
.3.1 e1f	3B*1a
.2 a1d	3B1b
.4.1 a1d	1A*1a
.2 2A1a	1D5
.3 3E2	1A*1a
.5.1 3B1a	2A1a
.2 d2b	2A1a
.3 3B1c	1A*1a
.6.1 1A*1a	1A1b
.2 3B*1b	1A1b
.3 a1c	2A1a
.4 3B*1a	2A1a
.5 a1c	1A*1a
.7.1 1A*1c	2A1a
.2 1D*2	1A*1a
.3 3B1a	1A*1a
121.1.1 3B1b	2A1a
.2 3B1b	2A1a
.3 3B1b	2A1a
.2.1 d2b	2A1a
.2 2A1	f1b
.3 2A1	2A1a
.3.1 2A1	1A*1a
.2 a1b	1A*1a
.3 2A1a	2A1a
.4.1 d1a	2A1a
.2 1A1b	1A*1a
.3 d1e	1D*3
.4 a1b	2A1a
.5 d1a	2A1a
.5.1 a1d	1A*1a
.2 a1d	3E1
.3 2A1a	1A1a
.6.1 1A*1a	2A1a
.2 2A1	2A1a
.3 2C1b	3B1b
.4 a1c	2A1a
.7.1 3B1e	1A1a
.2 2A1a	1A*1a
.8.1 a1c	3B1a
.2 a1d	2A1a
.3 3B*1b	2A1a
.9.1 2A1a	2A1a
.2 a1d	2A1a
.3 2B1b	2A1a
122.1.1 3B1e	2A1a
.2 2A1	1A*1a
.2.1 3B1d	1A*1a
.2 3B1b	d1b
.3 d1a	1A*1a
.3.1 3B1b	2A1a

	.2 d1f	2A1a
	.3 3B*1c	2A1a
	.4 2A1a	2A1a
	.5 a1c	2A1a
.4.1	1A*1a	2A1b
	.2 1A*1a	3B1c
	.3 2A1	1A*1a
.5.1	3B1b	2A1a
	.2 e1b	1A*1a
	.3 d1a	1A*1a
	.4 3E*2	1A1b

b) Summary of Metrical Analysis of Psalms 118-122

	(i)	(ii)	(iii)
a1a	0	1	0
a1b	0	12	2
a1c	0	47	1
a1d	0	72	0
a1e	0	30	0
a1f	0	11	0
a1g	0	1	0
a2b	0	1	0
none a2c, a2d, a2e, a2f, a2g			
d1a	0	22	2
d1b	0	11	6
d1c	0	11	1
d1d	0	6	0
d1e	0	6	0
d1f	0	5	0
d2-	0	1	0
d2a	0	4	2
d2b	0	8	0
d2c	0	3	0
d2d	0	2	0
d2e	0	1	0
d3a-b-c-d-e none			
d4a-b-c none			
d4d	0	1	0
d5a	0	1	0
d5b	0	1	0
d5c-d none			
e1b	0	2	0
e1c	0	3	0
e1d	0	5	0
e1e	0	1	0
e1f	0	1	0
1*A*1	0	1	0
1*D*1 none			
2*A*1	4	26	1

3*E*1 none

1A1a	0	3	65
1A1b	2	9	9
1A1c	0	3	0
1A2a	0	0	1
1A2b none			

1A*1a	13	21	115	
1A*1b	0	5		6
1A*1c	5	3	0	
1A*2a	0	1	0	
1A*2b, 1A*3, 1A*4 none				

1D1	1	0	2
1D2, 1D3, 1D4 none			
1D5	0	0	1
1D6	1	0	0
1D*1, 1D*4, 1D*6 none			
1D*2	4	0	1
1D*3	1	0	1
1D*5	0	0	1

2A1a	29	37	307
2A1b, 2A3b, 2A4 none			
2A2	3	2	3
2A3a	1	0	1

2B1-, 2B1d, 2B2-, 2B2b, 2B2c, 2B2d none			
2B1a	2	2	0
2B1b	1	2	5
2B1c	1	1	3
2B1e	0	1	0
2B2a	0	1	0

2C1-	0	1	9
2C1a	3	4	8
2C1b	0	16	12
2C1c	1	3	1
2C1d	0	2	0
2C1e	0	1	0
2C2-, 2C2a, 2C2c, 2C2d, 2C2e none			
2C2b	0	0	1

2E1a, 2E1b, 2E2a, 2E2b none

3B1a	3	14	10
3B1b	5	23	27
3B1c	3	11	6
3B1d	0	8	1
3B1e	0	2	2
3B2b	0	1	0
3B2c none			
3B*1a	0	9	3
3B*1b	4	8	2
3B*1c	0	7	2
3B*1d	0	4	0
3B*1e	0	1	0
3B*1f	0	1	0
3E1	1	3	2
3E2	1	2	0
3E3 none			
3E*1	1	0	0
3E*2	0	3	0
3E*3 none			
Remainders	0	6	0
Hypermetric	2	0	0
f1a	0	1	0
f1b	0	1	2
f1c	0	3	1
f1d	1	1	0