The coordinated glosses of the Eadwine Psalter and their source(s)

Summary

The paper presents the results of an extensive study into double glosses employed in the Old English gloss to the Eadwine Psalter in order to verify the possible sources of this linguistically complex manuscript. The analysis shows that the affiliation of the gloss is complicated, with numerous glosses which do not belong to the established Old English psalter glossing tradition. Additionally, the results may account for several problematic issues related to the Old English gloss to the Eadwine Psalter, such as the number of hands and the glossing practice behind the production of this manuscript. Ultimately, the paper shows that contrary to popular opinion, the Old English gloss to the Eadwine Psalter – and especially the corrections introduced to it – can offer solid data regarding the “transitional” language and the scribal practice in post-Conquest, twelfth-century England.
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Podwójne glosy w Psalterzu Eadwine’a i ich źródła

Streszczenie

Artykuł przedstawia wyniki szeroko zakrojonego badania na temat podwójnych glos zastosowanych w staroangielskiej glosie do Psalterza Eadwine’a w celu zweryfikowania możliwych źródeł tego złożonego pod względem językowym manuskryptu. Analiza wykazała, że afiliacja glosy jest skomplikowana, oraz że wiele glos nie należy do istniejącej tradycji głosowania psalterza w języku staroangielskim. Co więcej, wyniki analizy mogą wyjaśnić niektóre problematyczne kwestie związane ze staroangielską glosą do Psalterza Eadwine’a, jak na przykład liczba skrybów czy praktyka głosowania zastosowana przy produkcji tego manuskryptu. Artykuł udowadnia, że wbrew obiegowej opinii staroangielska glosa do Psalterza Eadwine’a – a szczególnie liczne poprawki do niej wprowadzone – oferuje wartościowe źródło danych odnośnie „przejściowej” angielszczyzny oraz pracy skrybów w dwunastowiecznej Anglii po najazdzie normańskim.

Słowa-klucze: manuskrypt, glosa, staroangielski, Psalterz Eadwine’a, najazd normański, dwunastowieczna angielszczyzna
1. Introduction

Produced in the mid-twelfth century, in Christ Church, Canterbury, the *Eadwine Psalter* has attracted considerable scholarly attention.\(^1\) It is a *deluxe* edition of the psalter,\(^2\) a complex, trilingual text offering all three Latin versions of the psalter – Romanum (with an Old English gloss), Gallicanum (with a Latin gloss), and Hebraicum (with an Anglo-Norman gloss). It is a genuine product of its times, in which the Old English, Anglo-Norman and ecclesiastic Latin traditions both intersect and intertwine, following the events of the Norman Conquest.

For reasons unknown, the Old English (OE) gloss to the first half of the manuscript underwent numerous, substantial corrections, which were a result of a highly unusual scribal practice: the original gloss has been traditionally believed to be based on an A-type psalter,\(^3\) and the corrections – on a D-type psalter\(^4\) (Lindelöf 1904; Heinzel 1926; Sisam and Sisam 1959; O’Neill 1992). Given that the more modern and popular D-type was obviously available in Christ Church at the time (since it was the source of the corrections), copying from the archaic A-type gloss is a highly surprising and clearly deliberate choice. These corrections are responsible for the fact that the Old English language is a relatively poorly investigated facet of the *Eadwine Psalter* manuscript; the OE gloss in the *Eadwine Psalter* has been assumed to be irrelevant to the OE glossing tradition (O’Neill 1992: 123) and as such – inappropriate for historical investigations and analyzing other glosses (Sisam and Sisam 1959: 56ff). Interestingly, despite being an obviously promising research topic, the corrections have never been studied in their own right.\(^5\)

The affinity of the gloss is further complicated by the presence of many independent glosses of an undetermined source, which is yet another surprise, since all the surviving OE psalter glosses display similarity to one another, especially in terms of

---

\(^1\) Various aspects of the gloss and the whole manuscript have been studied by, among others, Mark Faulkner, Sara Harris, Elaine Trehaerne, Roy Liuzza, George Younge, Orietta Da Rold, Richard Dance, and others.

\(^2\) Its 166 colorful outline drawings, several hundred fully painted initials, and the generous use of gold make it literally the most richly illustrated twelfth-century manuscript (Heslop 1992: 25).

\(^3\) I.e. *Vespasian Psalter*, the oldest known OE psalter gloss to Romanum, dating back to the mid-ninth century. Generally considered to be the most popular and influential version of the OE gloss in Anglo-Saxon England until the OE gloss to the *Regius Psalter*.

\(^4\) *Regius Psalter*, a more modern OE gloss than *Vespasian Psalter*, eventually surpassing it in terms of popularity.

\(^5\) The corrections to the Old English gloss to the *Eadwine Psalter* were the main subject and data source of my unpublished PhD dissertation, defended in 2017, from which the present paper is derived. Extensive literature review conducted for the purpose of the thesis revealed no papers devoted strictly to the analysis of these corrections. Moreover, to the best of my knowledge, since 2017 there have been no new studies devoted to this topic, except my own. See, for example, Zagórska (2020), in which I analyze the 232 lexical substitutions provided by both the original scribe(s) and the corrector – a study based on the same material as the present paper (i.e. the corrections to the OE gloss to the *Eadwine Psalter*), offering a more extensive literature review.
THE COORDINATED GLOSSES OF THE EADWINE PSALTER...

The OE gloss also contains “lexical pairs”, i.e. double OE glosses for one Latin lemma,6 out of which most are indeed derived from A and D, but there are also many independent ones, further complicating the issue of the gloss’s affinity, which is typically clear-cut in the case of other known OE psalter glosses.

The present paper is devoted to the analysis of 378 double glosses collected from the corrected part of the OE gloss to the Eadwine Psalter and scrutinized for their possible source(s). The aim of this paper is to present and discuss the results of this study, and ultimately to account for (at least) some peculiarities of the OE gloss to the Eadwine Psalter.

2. The study

2.1. Materials and methods

The paper analyses and discusses lexical pairs from the corrected parts of the OE gloss to the Eadwine Psalter so that its complex affiliation can be untangled through a comparison to other known OE psalter glosses. The study is based on the following sources:

(1) A high-resolution electronic facsimile of the Eadwine Psalter, available online, which served as the major source;

(2) Harsley’s 1889 edition of the Eadwine Psalter (the only one published to date), which catalogues all the corrections found by Harsley; it was used as reference for verifying the data found in the facsimile;

(3) Pulsiano’s 2001 Old English glossed psalters, a lemma-by-lemma analysis of how the Latin version of the psalter was translated into Old English in all the surviving OE glosses; it was used for a comparative analysis.7

The data were collected as follows: an online edition of the manuscript was scrutinized for all the examples of double glosses. In total, 378 cases of double glosses coordinated with <ł> (a Latin symbol meaning and or or) were found. In most cases, they were co-written by the original scribes and the corrector – typically the corrector added a word to individual glosses written by the original scribes, but there are also numerous examples of coordinated glosses which were written entirely by the original scribes or the corrector. When it comes to organizing the data, the glosses to Psalms 2–25 and 26–50 are analysed separately, since Webber (1992: 18-20) suggests that the Old English gloss to them may have been copied by two different scribes based on palaeography; such a grouping can help discover whether linguistic evidence can support or disclaim this suggestion.

6 Such double glosses are generally rare; they occur sporadically outside of the Lambeth Psalter and the Eadwine Psalter.

7 The scope of Pulsiano’s work – the first 50 psalms – is a limitation to the scope of the present study, which consequently ends on psalm 50. Psalm 1 is also excluded, since it is a contemporary translation.
2.2. Results

2.2.1. Introduction

The results are divided into coordinated glosses which result from the corrector’s additions, those written entirely by the original scribes, and those written entirely by the corrector. In order to test the lexical affiliation of the coordinated glosses, each pair is examined separately to see whether its components are more consistent with the *Vespasian Psalter* (A), the *Regius Psalter* (D), or if they are independent glosses, i.e. glosses which do not belong to either A or D.

2.2.2. Psalms 2–25

2.2.2.1. Introduction and overview

There are 181 lexical pairs in Psalms 2–25. Table 1 below shows an overview of the coordinated glosses found in this part of the psalter:

| Authorship                              | Coordinated glosses | Tokens | %    |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------|--------|------|
| Corrector added a word to create a pair |                     | 85     | 46.96|
| Original scribe wrote the entire pair   |                     | 58     | 32.05|
| Corrector wrote the entire pair         |                     | 38     | 20.99|
| TOTAL                                   |                     | 181    | 100.00|

As can be seen, most (85) pairs were co-written by the original scribe and the corrector, i.e. the corrector added words to the glosses written by the original scribe, which results in a lexical pair glossing one Latin lemma. 58 coordinated glosses were written entirely by the original scribe, and 38 entirely by the corrector. The affiliation of those glosses was tested using Pulsiano (2001) in order to see whether there is any tendency towards an A- or a D-type psalter. The results are summarized in the table below:

| Affiliation                                                   | Coordinated glosses | Tokens | %    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------|------|
| AD + independent$^{8}$                                        |                     | 69     | 38.12|
| A + D                                                        |                     | 53     | 29.28|
| D + independent                                              |                     | 29     | 16.02|
| D has the same coordinated gloss                              |                     | 19     | 10.51|
| Both words in the pair are independent glosses               |                     | 9      | 4.97 |
| A + independent                                              |                     | 2      | 1.10 |
| TOTAL                                                        |                     | 181    | 100.00|

$^{8}$ i.e. the first gloss is identical in both A and D, and the second one does not belong to either A or D.
2.2.2.2. Original scribe

The glosses comprising the lexical pairs have been tested for their affiliation against the *Vespasian Psalter* (A) and the *Regius Psalter* (D). The results are presented in the table below:

Table 3. Coordinated glosses in Psalms 2–25: Original scribe, data overview.

| Affiliation                                      | Coordinated glosses |  |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------|--|
|                                                  | Tokens              | %  |
| A + D                                           | 17                  | 29.31 |
| AD + independent                                | 21                  | 36.21 |
| D has the same coordinated gloss                | 6                   | 10.34 |
| D + independent                                 | 12                  | 20.69 |
| Both words are independent glosses              | 2                   | 3.45  |
| TOTAL                                           | 58                  | 100.00 |

As can be seen, apparently an A-type psalter was not the only source of the OE gloss for the original scribe, as there are many examples of glosses affiliated with a D-type psalter as well. Firstly, there are six pairs which are exactly the same as in the *Regius Psalter*, which – considering the fact that both manuscripts employ lexical pairs for the same lemma – may not be a coincidence. This finding indicates a possibility that the original scribe had access to a D-type psalter, which, in turn, suggests that the choice of A as the original exemplar must have been deliberate. Moreover, in 17 instances (29.31%), the original scribe used double glosses in which one gloss is affiliated with A and the other one with D, and there are also 12 instances of pairs which consist of one gloss affiliated with a D-type psalter, and the other is independent, which lends more support to this hypothesis. On the other hand, the presence of glosses characteristic of a D-type psalter could also be explained with the fact that it was the most widespread OE gloss to the *Romanum* (Toswell 2012: 475), and as such it was definitely well known to contemporary scribes.

Secondly, the original scribe employed as many as 37 independent glosses. As has been said, in 10 instances the original scribe wrote one gloss consistent with D, and the other one independent of both A and D, and he also wrote two coordinated glosses in which both glosses are independent. Moreover, in 21 instances the pairs consist of one gloss which is affiliated with both A and D, i.e. both A and D employ the same gloss, and the other gloss is of unknown affiliation.

There seem to be three possibilities. The first one is that the original scribe did not rely solely on an A-type psalter, but that he also employed a D-type psalter (or relied on his knowledge of the gloss to this psalter) and/or a third, unknown psalter as an exemplar, which would account for the numerous independent glosses. The second one is that the original scribe indeed used an A-type psalter, but it was a highly contaminated version. The third one is that the numerous instances of independent
glosses may in fact be spontaneous translations and/or examples of modernization, which reveal the idiosyncrasies of the language of the original scribe.

2.2.2.3. The corrector

38 pairs were written entirely by the corrector. The most noteworthy observation is that most (20) of them consist of one gloss belonging to both A and D (i.e. both A and D translate the Latin lemma with the same word), and the other one being an independent gloss. Moreover, there are three coordinated glosses in which both components are independent, and three in which one gloss is consistent with D, and the other one is an independent gloss, which means that in total, there are 26 independent glosses used by the corrector in this part of the psalter. This is rather surprising, as the corrector was supposed to rely on a D-type psalter, although this anticipated tendency is however visible, as almost one third of the glosses from coordinated glosses are the same as in D, and in six cases D has exactly the same pair. Moreover, in the 20 unaffiliated glosses containing one independent gloss, the other one is consistent with the established glossing tradition, i.e. it is the same as in both A and D.

Table 4. Coordinated glosses written entirely by the corrector in Psalms 2–25: Affiliation.

| Affiliation | Number of tokens |
|-------------|-----------------|
|             | Tokens | %     |
| Both words in a pair are independent glosses | 3 | 7.89  |
| A + D       | 6     | 15.79 |
| AD + independent | 20  | 52.64 |
| D has the same coordinated gloss | 6 | 15.79  |
| D + independent | 3  | 7.89  |
| TOTAL       | 38    | 100.00|

2.2.2.4. Coordinated glosses co-written by the original scribe and the corrector

85 lexical pairs were created by the corrector by adding another gloss to the original scribe’s translations. The table and the graph below show the affiliation of the glosses added by the corrector compared with those provided by the original scribe:

Table 5. Psalms 2–25: Affiliation of lexical items in coordinated glosses co-written by the original scribe and the corrector.

| Affiliation | Original scribe | Corrector |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------|
|             | Tokens | %   | Tokens | %   |
| independent | 43     | 50.59 | 3       | 3.53   |
| A           | 34     | 40.00 | 2       | 2.35   |
| D           | 7      | 8.23  | 55      | 64.71  |
| A = D       | 1      | 1.18  | 25      | 29.41  |
| TOTAL       | 85     | 100.00| 85      | 100.00 |
The data show that half of the results are consistent with what previous scholarship concluded regarding the exemplars used by the original scribe and the corrector. However, the other half of these glosses’ affiliations are quite unexpected.

First of all, there are numerous examples of independent glosses used by the original scribe: they appear in 50.59% of the coordinated glosses co-written by the original scribe and the corrector. In 25 of these lexical pairs, the corrector added glosses affiliated with both A and D\(^9\) to the original scribe’s independent glosses. This tendency means that the corrector may have decided to combine independent glosses with those which belong to the OE glossing tradition. In further 18 examples, the corrector added D-type glosses to independent glosses written by the original scribe. Interestingly, there are two examples of the corrector adding independent glosses instead of the expected D-type glosses. Also, in one case both the original scribe and the corrector wrote glosses which are inconsistent with either A or D: *helm\[crown\]*, *helm* added by the corrector (Psalm 20.4, 35r).

Secondly, there seems to be more evidence in support of the hypothesis that the original scribe may have had access to and perhaps even used a D-type psalter. There are five pairs in which both glosses are affiliated with D, i.e. D also has a pair for the same lemma. These coordinated glosses are co-written by the original scribe and the corrector, which means that the original gloss was also affiliated with D. This finding is completely unexpected, as it does not explain the reason for using a highly archaic A gloss as the original exemplar, when apparently the revised, more modern and popular D version was available to the original scribe. Furthermore, in one pair the original scribe used a gloss consistent with D, whereas the corrector added glosses consistent with A: *dune\[mountain\]*, *munte* added by the corrector (Psalm 14.1, folio 23v). Finally, there is one case in which the original scribe used an independent gloss, and the corrector added an A-type gloss: *sword\[sword\]*, *sword* added by the corrector (Psalm 16.13, folio 26v).

\(^9\) i.e. the lemma is glossed with the same word in these two psalter glosses.
In summary, although at first glance indeed the major tendencies displayed by the original scribe and the corrector are in line with previous scholarship, in fact there is a lot of lexical variety and a surprising inclination towards independent glosses of both the original scribe and the corrector, especially the former. It is interesting why the corrector decided not to substitute the original scribe’s glosses, but instead decided to pair them with other glosses. The analysis of coordinated glosses found in Psalms 2-25 also raises some important questions regarding the scribal practice and the use of exemplars; bearing in mind the high number of independent glosses and the fact that the original scribe must have had knowledge of a D-type psalter – either because he had access to this exemplar, or because he knew it – the traditional picture with the original scribe relying on an A-type psalter and with the corrections based on a D-type psalter seems to be inaccurate.

2.2.3. Psalms 26–50

2.2.3.1. Introduction and overview

There are 197 lexical pairs in Psalms 26–50:

Table 6. Coordinated glosses co-written by the original scribe and the corrector in Psalms 26-50.

| Authorship                                           | Coordinated glosses |
|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
|                                                       | Tokens   | %       |
| Corrector added a word to create a pair               | 162      | 82.23   |
| Original scribe wrote the entire pair                  | 12       | 6.09    |
| Corrector wrote the entire pair                        | 23       | 11.68   |
| TOTAL                                                 | 197      | 100.00  |

In this part of the psalter, most coordinated glosses result from the corrector’s additions, with just a handful of examples of coordinated glosses written entirely by the original scribe or entirely by the corrector, which marks a clear change in the glossing practice, suggesting that there indeed were two original scribes who wrote the first 50 psalms. As to the affiliation of the components of the coordinated glosses, the results are presented in the table below:

Table 7. Coordinated glosses found in Psalms 26–50: Affiliation overview.

| Affiliation                                 | Number of tokens |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------|
| The coordinated gloss is identical with A   | 1                |
| A + independent                             | 3                |
| A + D                                       | 64               |
| AD + independent                            | 84               |
| The coordinated gloss is identical with D   | 12               |
| D + independent                             | 33               |
| TOTAL                                       | 197              |
As can be seen, most examples consist of one gloss which is affiliated with both A and D, i.e. it belongs to the established glossing tradition, and another one which is independent of it. The second most numerous group are coordinated glosses consisting of one gloss from A, and the other one from D.

### 2.2.3.2. Original scribe

There are only 12 pairs which were written entirely by the original scribe. Most of them (7) consist of one gloss which is the same as in A and D and an independent gloss. Surprisingly, there are also three pairs in which one gloss is affiliated with D, and one is independent. Moreover, there are two pairs which are affiliated with both A and D. These two findings, although statistically insignificant, lend more support to the hypothesis that the choice of A was not a coincidence. Also, in comparison with Psalms 2–25 there is a drop in the number of the coordinated glosses written entirely by the original scribe. Apart from this clear difference in numbers, in Psalms 26–50 there are no coordinated glosses written entirely by the corrector which would be exact copies from a D-type psalter, which was the case in Psalms 2–25. These changes in style provide another piece of evidence suggesting that there were two scribes responsible for the OE gloss. Figure 2 presents the differences found in the tendencies displayed by the original scribes of Psalms 2–25 and 26–50:

![Figure 2. Coordinated glosses written entirely by the original scribes in Psalms 2–25 and 26–50: A comparison.](image-url)
2.2.3.3. Corrector

There are 23 coordinated glosses which were written entirely by the corrector. The largest group (9) are coordinated glosses which are equally affiliated with both A and D, i.e. one gloss is the same as in A, and the other one is the same as in D. Also, the corrector copied five coordinated glosses from a D-type psalter. Finally, the corrector also used independent glosses, which can be found in nine examples.

The data – although not substantial – once again suggest that the generally established theory regarding the use of exemplars is inconsistent with the affiliation of the lexical items of the coordinated glosses. Although in most cases the corrector used glosses which belong to the OE glossing tradition, especially those affiliated with D, he also employed independent glosses on several occasions, which is unexpected, as generally, contrary to the original scribe, the corrector displayed a tendency towards restoring the traditional glosses.

Table 8. Coordinated glosses written entirely by the corrector in Psalms 26-50: An overview.

| Affiliation                              | Number of tokens |
|------------------------------------------|------------------|
|                                          | Tokens | %      |
| A + independent                          | 2      | 8.70   |
| A + D                                    | 9      | 39.13  |
| AD + independent                         | 3      | 13.04  |
| The coordinated gloss is the same as in D | 5      | 21.74  |
| D + independent                          | 4      | 17.39  |
| TOTAL                                    | 23     | 100.00 |

2.2.3.4. Coordinated glosses co-written by the original scribe and the corrector

There are 162 lexical pairs in which the corrector added glosses to the ones written by the original scribe. Table 9 and Figure 3 below present the affiliation of the lexical components of these pairs:

Table 9. Psalms 26–50: Affiliation of lexical items in coordinated glosses co-written by the original scribe and the corrector.

| Affiliation                       | Original scribe | Corrector |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|
|                                  | %               | %         |
| Independent                      | 93, 57.41       | 8, 4.94   |
| A                                | 47, 29.01       | 8, 4.94   |
| D                                | 7, 4.32         | 73, 45.06 |
| AD                               | 8, 4.94         | 66, 40.74 |
| The resulting pair is the same as in D | 7, 4.32         | 7, 4.32   |
| TOTAL                            | 162, 100.00     | 162, 100.00 |
In this part of the analyzed material, the original scribe and the corrector display completely opposite tendencies; the former uses mainly independent and A-type glosses, whereas the major tendency of the corrector is towards a D-type psalter, as well as glosses which are found in both A and D. The first described tendency is consistent with the generally accepted theory about the exemplars used by the original scribe (A-type psalter) and the corrector (a D-type psalter): in 80 cases (49.38%), the corrector adds glosses which are affiliated with the *Regius Psalter*. The results are presented in Table 10:

Table 10. Coordinated glosses in Psalms 26–50 resulting from D-type additions by the corrector.

| Affiliation                        | Number of tokens |
|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Original scribe: A                |                  |
| Corrector: D                       | 47               |
| Original scribe: D/A              |                  |
| Corrector: D (the resulting pair is the same as in D) | 7                |
| Original scribe: unaffiliated      |                  |
| Corrector: D                       | 26               |
| TOTAL                              | 80               |

In most of these cases (47), the corrector adds a D-type gloss to an A-type gloss employed by the original scribe. Moreover, there are seven examples of lexical pairs which are the same as in a D-type psalter, and in 26 cases the corrector adds D-type glosses to independent glosses written by the original scribe. Regarding the D-type glosses added by the corrector, there are seven more noteworthy examples: glosses which were added to either A- or D-type psalter glosses written by the original...
scribe,\textsuperscript{10} which results in creating pairs which are identical with pairs from D. Again, this shows that there was a possibility that the original scribe had access to or knowledge of a D-type psalter.

The second major tendency is adding a gloss which is affiliated with both A and D, i.e. both the \textit{Vespasian Psalter} and the \textit{Regius Psalter} use the same gloss for a given lemma, whereas the original scribe uses unaffiliated glosses. In total, there are 66 such examples, which account for 40.74\% of the lexical pairs created through the corrector’s additions. This tendency again shows the corrector’s inclination to conservative glosses.

Apart from these two major tendencies, there are a handful of examples of the corrector using glosses affiliated with A and independent glosses. The former are rather unexpected in the light of his clear inclination towards D; there are nine examples of such glosses, and in seven of them the original scribe used D-type glosses. As to the remaining two, one is the same as in the \textit{Vespasian Psalter}, which also uses a pair for the same lemma, and the other one is paired with an independent gloss by the original scribe. These results are summarized in Table 11:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Affiliation & Number of tokens \\
\hline
Original scribe: A & 1 \\
Corrector: A (the resulting pair is the same as in A) & \\
Original scribe: D & 7 \\
Corrector: A & \\
Original scribe: unaffiliated & 1 \\
Corrector: A & \\
TOTAL & 9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Coordinated glosses in Psalms 26–50 resulting from A-type additions by the corrector.}
\end{table}

There are also several examples of the corrector using unaffiliated glosses; in seven cases he pairs them with A-type glosses written by the original scribe.

2.2.4. Independent glosses

It has already been shown in this analysis that there are quite a lot of glosses which do not belong to either A or D. It is hypothesized that:

(A) They may be spontaneous translations, thus constituting evidence of twelfth-century English;

(B) They are indeed related to A-type and D-type psalters respectively, however, the exemplars used for the \textit{Eadwine Psalter} were highly contaminated copies (i.e. they had intrusions from other known psalter glosses);

(C) They may be evidence of a third, now lost exemplar used for copying the gloss.

\textsuperscript{10} If A and D had the same gloss, it would be impossible to tell whether the original scribe copied these glosses from an A- or D-type exemplar.
In order to test these hypotheses, other affiliations will be verified: the independent glosses will be compared with other known complete OE glosses in Pulsiano (2001).

2.2.4.1. Psalms 2–25: original scribe

In total, there are 35 independent glosses in the coordinated glosses written entirely by the original scribe (Appendix A), and further 44 in pairs co-written by the original scribe and the corrector (Appendix B), which gives the total of 79 pairs containing independent glosses.\textsuperscript{11} The glosses which have been found to be independent of the A- or D-type psalter traditions have been compared with other known OE psalter glosses, as listed in Pulsiano (2001). In total, 25 Eadwine glosses have been found to have affiliation other than A or D, which probably results from cross-contamination. Interestingly, most of these independent glosses have been found to be affiliated with the Gallicanum psalters, especially the Lambeth Psalter.\textsuperscript{12} The remaining 54 examples have not been found in any other known psalter glosses, which means that they are independent of the known OE psalter glossing traditions, i.e. unaffiliated.

2.2.4.2. Psalms 26–50: original scribe

In Psalms 26–50, there are 104 examples of glosses written by the original scribe which are independent of either A or D; in 10 cases these unaffiliated glosses appear in pairs written entirely by the original scribe (Appendix C), and in 94 cases they appear in coordinated glosses written by the original scribe and the corrector (Appendix D). Out of these 104 glosses, only 24 have been found in other psalter glosses. Hence, 80 glosses show no affiliation with any known psalter glosses, i.e. they are unaffiliated. Similarly to psalms 2–25, in psalms 26–50 glosses which are independent of A and D can also be found in the Gallicanum psalters, especially in the Lambeth Psalter (I).

The similarities may indicate the peculiarities of the exemplar or exemplars that was/were used by the scribes who copied the OE gloss; although it must have been closely affiliated with an A-type psalter, there are also pronounced differences, caused most likely by contamination from other psalter glosses, especially the Lambeth Psalter (Gallicanum). Such cross-contamination is not unexpected; contaminations from the Gallicanum are a common feature in the Romanum glosses, especially in terms of lexicon. This could also be the case with the exemplar(s) used for copying the gloss to the Eadwine Psalter.

\textsuperscript{11} However, some of these glosses are repeated, i.e. there are fewer than 79.

\textsuperscript{12} I London, Lambeth Palace, 427, written in the first half of the 11th century in Winchester, Gallicanum (Pulsiano 2001). It is one of the more academic psalters with Old English glosses. It contains a word-for-word gloss, however, the correct Old English word-order is provided through a system of dots (Brown 1995:131). Similarly to the Eadwine psalter, the Old English gloss to the Lambeth psalter has numerous double and independent glosses (yet many more than Eadwine, as many as 1400) (Pulsiano 1991). In fact, lexicon-wise it is the richest OE psalter gloss (Toswell 2014).
2.2.4.2. The corrector

There are 40 glosses independent of A and D written by the corrector found in Psalms 2–50 (for Psalms 2–25 they are listed in Appendix E, and for Psalms 26–50 in Appendix F). 12 of those glosses have been found outside A or D; unlike the original scribes, the independent glosses used by the corrector seem to be closest to the Stowe Psalter, yet the numbers are so small that this similarity does not have any statistical significance.

Compared with the glosses written by the original scribes, which have been found outside A or D, those written by the corrector have a slightly different affiliation profile, which can indicate the peculiarities of the exemplar that he used for correcting the Eadwine’s gloss, as well as the corrector’s training/education. Although, admittedly, the numbers are statistically insignificant, the results suggest some information regarding the corrector: contrary to the original scribes, the corrector did not use any Romanum glosses, which could indicate that he may have been a psalteratus who knew the Gallicanum.

In summary, the presence of some of the seemingly independent glosses could be explained with lexical idiosyncrasies of the exemplars used for copying the original gloss and for correcting it. It has been shown that probably these glosses were contaminated by the Gallicanum version.

2.2.5. Unaffiliated glosses

There still remains the question of unaffiliated glosses, i.e. glosses which cannot be found elsewhere in the known OE psalter glossing tradition. The original scribe of Psalms 2–25 used 54 such glosses; the original scribe of Psalms 26–50 – 80; and the corrector – 28. It is possible that these were lexical modernizations introduced by the scribes who copied the gloss, especially that the corrector did not erase and substitute the independent glosses; instead, he opted for pairing them, typically with glosses which were either the same in both A and D, or the same as in D, the major source of corrections. As a result, there are numerous pairs in which one gloss belongs to the established, OE psalter glossing tradition, and the other one which does not. It is possible, especially that if indeed an A-type psalter had been used as the source of the original gloss, it must have been seen as archaic by the scribes copying it in the mid-twelfth century. Bearing this in mind, it is likely that in the case of some lexical items, the original scribes decided to deviate from the exemplar and use a more modern word instead. The corrector, despite his conservative attitude, might have thought it practical to keep these innovative glosses, and to connect them to the conservative tradition, and so he added another gloss which belonged to it, thus creating double contamination.

---

13 F London, BL, Stowe 2, so-called Stowe psalter or Stelman psalter, mid-eleventh century, Gallicanum. It is based on a D-type psalter (Toswell 2014: 252).

14 i.e. familiar with the psalter to the point of knowing it by heart. Psalteratus was also a medieval synonym for “literate”, since the psalter was commonly used as a reading primer (Gross-Diaz 1996: 37).

15 Though it was probably a version which had some contamination from the Gallicanum glosses.
glosses. Bearing in mind factors such as the time of production, the dating of the exemplar used as the source of the original gloss, as well as the fact that the corrector typically paired these glosses with those consistent with A or D, it seems reasonable to suggest that the independent glosses indeed could be modernizations introduced by the original scribes.

3. Summary and conclusions

The analysis of the lexical pairs introduced to the OE gloss to Psalms 2–50 seems to provide answers to several of the issues surrounding its peculiarities. Firstly, the linguistic data presented in this study indicate that there were in fact two scribes who wrote the OE gloss, which has been concluded based on the change in the tendencies displayed by the corrector, corroborating Webber’s suspicions (Webber 1992: 19). Secondly, the study has shown that indeed, probably an A-type psalter was used as the exemplar for the original gloss, and a D-type psalter was the main source of corrections. However, the analysis revealed numerous glosses which are independent of either A- or D-type glosses – these were tested with Pulsiano (2001), and some of these glosses indeed have been found in other known OE psalter glosses, mostly glosses to the *Gallicanum* version of the psalter. This indicates the peculiarities of the exemplar that was used, especially that these *Gallicanum* glosses were consistent in the gloss produced by both original scribes, which differed from the lexical material introduced by the corrector. In summary, it suggests that the copies used for producing the *Eadwine Psalter* were contaminated with the *Gallicanum* glosses. Thirdly, the evidence indicates that the scribes who produced the gloss did not rely solely on an A-type psalter (original scribes) and a D-type psalter (corrector). This analysis has shown that the original scribes at times referred to a D-type psalter, whereas the corrector seems to have occasionally used an A-type psalter. This finding raises the question of the choice of the exemplar; after copying the gloss to the first 77 Psalms the first exemplar was changed, and the new exemplar was probably the source of corrections introduced to the first 77 Psalms. Although the usage of D-type glosses could be explained with memorization of this gloss by the scribes, or with cross-contamination, the possibility that the original scribes may have had access to and used a D-type exemplar is probable. Still, regardless of what the source of D-type glosses for the original scribes was, in the light of their familiarity with it the choice of A must have been deliberate. Finally, the analysis seems to indicate that the original scribes most likely modernized the gloss, deviating from the known OE psalter glossing tradition, whereas the corrector aimed at restoring the conservative character of the original gloss. He may have simply been pragmatic – the coordinated glosses could be a compromise between preserving conservatism and providing an understandable gloss, hence he tended to add glosses consistent with A or D to the independent glosses written by the original scribes rather than substituting them.

All these findings on the one hand provide an insight into the glossing practice of the scribes who worked on the OE gloss, and on the other, raise further questions...
regarding the same topic. The most intriguing question regarding the glossing practice is probably the choice of exemplars and the source of independent glosses. This analysis has shown that it was not just the corrector who relied on D as a source of corrections he introduced to the gloss, but also the original scribes may have used a D-type psalter for some parts of the gloss – though it is impossible to tell the source exactly, or whether they had access to the same exemplar as the one used by the corrector. Therefore, the choice of both the Romanum version and the OE gloss derived from an A-type psalter must have been deliberate, and the question remains why these particular versions were selected.
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Appendix A

Glosses independent of either A or D (in bold) written by the original scribe in psalms 2–25:

| Psalm.verse | folio | pair | Latin | Other glosses\textsuperscript{16} |
|-------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------------------|
| 3.5         | 8r    | \textit{cige l cleopede} | clamavi |                               |
| 3.5         | 8v    | \textit{dune l munte} | monte | I                             |
| 3.8         | 8v    | \textit{ofsole l smite} | percussisti |                               |
| 9.16        | 16v   | \textit{blissige l winsumnie} | exultabo |                               |
| 9.18        | 17r   | \textit{gewirfede l gecherred} | convertantur | G,J                           |
| 9.20        | 17r   | \textit{swipie l framie} | prevaleat | I                             |
| 9.25        | 17v   | \textit{micelnesse l mænigfeldnisse} | multitudinem | G                             |
| 10.5        | 19v   | \textit{sunu l bearn} | filius | K                             |
| 10.8        | 19v   | \textit{onsiene l andwhite} | vultus | F                             |
| 12.6        | 21v   | \textit{winsumap l blisseð} | exultabit | G,J                           |
| 13.1        | 22r   | \textit{sint l hyoð} | sunt |                               |
| 16.3        | 26r   | \textit{ameredest þu me l streddest} | me examinasti |                               |
| 16.12       | 26v   | \textit{gehildum l holum} | abditis |                               |
| 16.14       | 27r   | \textit{lytingum l cyldum} | parvulis |                               |
| 17.3        | 27v   | \textit{gescyld l gehyht} | refugium |                               |
| 17.7        | 28r   | \textit{on geswince l eaerfoþnesse} | tribulatione | B,F,K,C,I                     |
| 17.8        | 28r   | \textit{forhtæde l beuede} | contremuit terra |                               |
| 17.9        | 28v   | \textit{smic l rec} | fumus | F,I                           |
| 17.14       | 28v   | \textit{gef l selde} | dedit |                               |
| 17.29       | 30r   | \textit{blecerna l leohftet} | lucernam | H,F,K                        |
| 17.45       | 31r   | \textit{gehlyste l hiernesse} | abaudivit |                               |
| 20.3        | 35r   | \textit{gewilununge l gyrminge} | desiderium |                               |
| 20.7        | 35v   | \textit{onsine l andwhite} | vultu |                               |
| 20.8        | 35v   | \textit{onwended l astyred} | commovebitur |                               |
| 20.8        | 35v   | \textit{geweneþ l hyhteð} | sperabit | G,J                           |
| 20.10       | 35v   | \textit{onsine l andwhite} | vultus | G,K,J                         |
| 20.12       | 35v   | \textit{geþeahtunge l gernn} | consilium |                               |
| 20.13       | 36r   | \textit{nipre l adune} | deorsum | I                             |
| 21.6        | 37r   | \textit{hopodon l gehihton} | speraverunt |                               |
| 21.32       | 39r   | \textit{cyþed l bodad} | adnuntiabitur | I                             |
| 25.10       | 44v   | \textit{læcum l medseattum} | muneribus | K,I                           |

\textsuperscript{16} Letter references to other psalter glosses after Pulsiano (2001).
Appendix B

Glosses independent of either A or D (in bold) written by the original scribe in pairs co-written by the original scribe and the corrector in psalms 2–25:

| Psalm.verse | folio | pair | Latin | Other glosses |
|-------------|-------|------|-------|---------------|
| 2.4         | 7r    | *hyseþelt* | *holeð* | subsannabit |
| 2.5         | 7r    | *wylme* | *hatheortynysse* | furore |
| 4.3         | 9r    | *swæræ* | *heuie* | graves I |
| 6.3         | 11v   | *seac* | *l untrum* | infirmus |
| 9.5         | 16r   | *euennesse* | *l enlicnesse* | iudicas |
| 9.10        | 16r   | *heæhsetle* | *l primselte* | thronum |
| 9.22        | 17r   | *gehyþnesse* | *l gerecvm* | opportunitatibus |
| 9.38        | 18v   | *geqilnunge* | *l gyrnenga* | desideria I |
| 9.38        | 18v   | *gewillnung* | *l gyrnigge* | desiderium J |
| 10.07       | 19v   | *firen* | *l senfulen* | peccatores |
| 11.4        | 20v   | *inwiddæn* | *l facne* | dolosa |
| 12.5        | 21v   | *earfoþigæþ* | *l swencað* | tribulant |
| 12.5        | 21v   | *hyhtaþ* | *l blyssied* | exultabunt |
| 12.5        | 21v   | *magude* | *l swiþige* | prevalui |
| 13.1        | 22r   | *unwise* | *l unsnotra* | insipiens |
| 13.3        | 22r   | *ciolæn* | *l hracen* | guttur I |
| 13.3        | 22v   | *hreepe* | *l snelle* | veloces |
| 14.3        | 23v   | *inwyld* | *l facn* | dolum |
| 16.12       | 26v   | *hlowe* | *l reaflace* | predam |
| 16.13       | 26v   | *sword* | *l meche* | frameam |
| 17.8        | 28r   | *grundwealles* | *l dunæ* | motium |
| 17.16       | 29r   | *stywdon* | *l ataudon* | apparuerunt |
| 17.28       | 30r   | *geniðarast* | *l ædmedest* | humiliabis |
| 17.38       | 30v   | *fylge* | *l ehte* | persequur |
| 18.2        | 32r   | *cyphæp* | *l bodiað* | annuntiat |
| 18.6        | 32v   | *winsumæde* | *l blitsode* | exultavit lingua |
| 18.12       | 33r   | Geheordnesse + *to bewitena* | custodiendo F, I |
| 18.13       | 33r   | *gyltes* | *l scyldes* | intelligit G; J |
| 20.2        | 35r   | *wynsumæde* | *l blissade* | exultuvit |
| 20.4        | 35r   | *helm* | *l coruna* | coronam G; J |
| 21.3        | 36v   | *unsnyternesse* | *l unwisdome* | insipienciam |
| 21.8        | 37r   | *hiþraðen* | *l anscumedon* | apernabuntur I |
| 21.12       | 37v   | *geswinc* | *l ærfoðu* | tribulatio |
### Appendix C

Glosses independent of either A or D (in bold) written by the original scribe in psalms 26–50:

| Psalm.verse | folio | pair | Latin | Other glosses |
|-------------|-------|------|-------|---------------|
| 34.3        | 58v   | beluc l betiene | conclude |
| 34.15       | 59v   | swipæn l swyngla | flagella |
| 41.6        | 74r   | sari l unrot | tristis |
| 41.10       | 74v   | unrot l sari | tristis |
| 41.10       | 74v   | utawyltest l anyldest | repulisti |
| 43.23       | 78r   | anyd l ædrif | repellas |
| 43.24       | 78r   | eaerfoðnesse l swinc | tribulationem |
| 47.12       | 83v   | hihtaæp l favogen | exultent |
| 47.12       | 83v   | munt l dun | mens |
| 48.21       | 86r   | unsnytrum l unwise | insipientibus |

### Appendix D

Glosses independent of either A or D (in bold) written by the original scribe in pairs co-written by him and the corrector in psalms 26–50:

| Psalm.verse | folio | pair | Latin | Other glosses |
|-------------|-------|------|-------|---------------|
| 26.3        | 45r   | gehyhte l gewen | sperabo |
| 26.7        | 45v   | chige l clypie | clamavi |
| 26.9        | 45v   | hyld l becyrre | declines |
| 27.7        | 47r   | gehyhte l geweneþ | speravit |
| 27.9        | 47r   | genim l ahefe | extolle |
| 28.1        | 48r   | weþraes l romma | arietum |
| 28.3        | 48r   | ontyneþ l onswegde | intonuit |
| 28.9        | 48v   | þiccettu l hioræ | condensa |
| 29.3        | 49r   | chige l cleopode | clamavi |
| Page | Line | Transliteration | Translation |
|------|------|-----------------|-------------|
| 29.6 | 49v  | uhtlicum l ðægred | matutinum    |
| 29.7 | 49v  | onwendel astyred | movebor     |
| 29.10| 49v  | gegripnesel onbrosnunga | corruptionem |
| 29.13| 50r  | ne sigel ne beo onbryd | non conpungar |
| 30.2 | 50v  | gewene l hyhte | speravi     |
| 30.7 | 51r  | emettgenel unnytlce | super vacue |
| 30.8 | 51r  | winsumnie l fægenie | exultabo    |
| 30.15| 51v  | gewene l hyhte | speravi     |
| 30.20| 52r  | gewenedel l hyhte | sperantibus |
| 31.4 | 53v  | on geriwo l on angnisse | in erumpna |
| 31.10| 54r  | firenfulrael synfulra | peccatorum |
| 31.10| 54r  | swipo l swingella | flagella    |
| 32.10| 55r  | biodael folca | populorum   |
| 32.16| 55v  | mycelnesel l menigo | multitudine |
| 33.3 | 56v  | gepwernesel l bilewitan | mansueti |
| 33.7 | 57r  | eerfopnessumel geswincum | tribulationibus |
| 33.8 | 57r  | ynbhwyrftel gaenge | circuitu    |
| 33.18| 58r  | eerfopnessumel geswincum | tribulationibus |
| 34.4 | 59r  | sin gewirfede l sin gecyrrede | avertantur |
| 34.4 | 58v  | cirrede l wandien | reverauntur |
| 35.7 | 61v  | dun l muntas | montes |
| 35.8 | 62r  | hyhtatel geweneÆp | sperabunt |
| 36.3 | 63r  | gewene l hyht | sperma     |
| 36.5 | 63r  | gewene l hyht | sperma     |
| 36.14| 63v  | wedlen l hearfan | pauperem    |
| 36.16| 64r  | selrel betere | melius     |
| 36.31| 65r  | underwirtwælede l plantade | supplantabuntur |
| 36.37| 65v  | forletnesse l laue | reliquiae |
| 36.40| 65v  | geweneÆp l hihton | speraverunt |
| 37.20| 67v  | liebhæp l lifiad | vivent |
| 38.2 | 68v  | forlete l agytle | delinquam |
| 38.9 | 69r  | unsnytro l unwisum | insipienti |
| 39.4 | 70v  | geweneÆp l gehihtad | sperabunt |
| 39.7 | 70v  | ansægidnissel ofrunge | holocausta |
| 39.7 | 70v  | tobrengnesse l ofrunge | oblationem |
| 39.11| 71r  | gemotstowel gesomnunga | synagoga |
| 39.15| 71v  | gewirfede l forwandian | reverauntur |
| Line | Page | Text | Translation | Notes |
|------|------|------|-------------|-------|
| 41.5 | 74v  | **eærdunge** l geteldes | tabernaculi | I |
| 41.6 | 74v  | **onsien** l andwitan | vultus |  |
| 41.11| 74v  | **earfoþon** l swencað | tribulant |  |
| 42.2 | 75v  | **ædrife** l **arydde** | reppulisti | G; H; K |
| 42.5 | 75v  | **gewene** l hyht | spera |  |
| 43.2 | 76v  | **cypledon** l bodedon | annuntiaverunt |  |
| 43.3 | 76v  | **gebige** | adfixisti |  |
| 43.3 | 76v  | **plante** l **wirtwælædæst** | plantasti |  |
| 43.4 | 76v  | **andwéitan** l **onsien** | vultus |  |
| 43.13| 77r  | **stirengum** l behwearfum | commutationibus |  |
| 43.13| 77r  | **sældes** l cyptest | vendidisti |  |
| 43.14| 77r  | **hýrwnesse** l hogunge | contemptum |  |
| 43.15| 77v  | **díodum** l folcum | pleibibus | F |
| 43.16| 77v  | **onsien** l andwitan | vultus | I; K |
| 44.13| 79v  | **onsin** l andwilton | vultum |  |
| 44.16| 80r  | **hyhte** l gefægnunge | exultatione |  |
| 45.2 | 80v  | **swincum** l **earfoþnessum** | tribulationibus | K |
| 45.2 | 80v  | **gescildent** l frofr | refugium |  |
| 45.3 | 80v  | **oferfarende** l borene | transferentur | I |
| 45.5 | 81r  | **geteld** l **eaerdungstowe** | tabernaculum |  |
| 45.5 | 81r  | **stræmæs** l flodes | fluminis |  |
| 45.6 | 81r  | **andwiten** l **onsine** | vultu |  |
| 45.6 | 81r  | **onweden** l astired | commovebitur |  |
| 46.2 | 82r  | **hihte** l blisse | exultationis |  |
| 46.2 | 82r  | **heofæð** l blissiad | plaudi |  |
| 47.3 | 83r  | **mun** l **dune** | mons |  |
| 47.4 | 83r  | **gitende** l cnawen | dinoscitur |  |
| 47.6 | 83r  | **onfarede** l astyrede | commoti |  |
| 47.13| 83v  | **bewindæp** l ymbelypepað | complectimini | I |
| 47.14| 83v  | **cneowrisce** l cynrede | progeniae |  |
| 48.4 | 84v  | **gleawnisse** l **wisdom** | prudentiam |  |
| 48.8 | 85r  | **gecwemnesse** l licunæ | placationem |  |
| 48.11| 85r  | **unwis** l **snitro** | insipiens | I |
| 48.12| 85r  | **eaerdungæ** l geteld | tabernacula | I |
| 48.13| 85v  | **unwisum** l unsnytrum | insipientibus |  |
| 49.1 | 86v  | **chigð** l cleopede | vocavit |  |
| 49.8 | 87v  | **offrunge** l onsegdænisse | holocausta |  |
| 49.15| 87v  | **geswinkes** l **eaerfoðnesse** | tribulationis |  |
| Psalm.verse | folio | pair | Latin | Other glosses |
|------------|-------|------|-------|--------------|
| 4.5        | 9v    | onbryrdəð | compungimini |
| 9.6        | 16r   | ðreadest | increpasti |
| 9.11       | 16r   | wenen   | sperent |
| 9.11       | 16r   | cuðen   | noverunt |
| 10.2       | 19r   | aleor   | transmigra F; G; J |
| 10.7       | 19v   | ysta    | procellarum |
| 13.2       | 22r   | ongetende | intelligens K |
| 16.15      | 27r   | ablice  | apparebo |
| 17.14      | 28v   | denede  | intonuit |
| 18.8       | 32v   | cyþues  | testimonium |
| 19.8       | 34r   | wenum   | curribus |
| 19.10      | 34v   | gecygen | invocaverimus |
| 20.3       | 35r   | becyredest | fraudasti I |
| 20.3       | 35r   | welere   | labiorum |
| 21.5       | 37r   | hyhton   | speraverunt |
| 21.8       | 37r   | welleron | labis |
| 21.9       | 37r   | gehyhte  | speravit I; F |
| 21.10      | 37r   | hope    | spes F |
| 21.10      | 37r   | breostwelmum | uberibus |
| 21.17      | 38r   | geþeaht  | concilium |
| 26.8       | 45v   | andwltan | vultum F; K; H; I; J |
| 29.12      | 50r   | tostille | conscidisti |
Appendix F

Glosses independent of either A or D (in bold) by the corrector in Psalms 26–50:

| Psalm.verse | folio | pair | Latin | Other glosses |
|-------------|-------|------|-------|---------------|
| 18.12       | 33r   | biebreæd l hvnicamb | custodiendo |                |
| 20.4        | 35r   | helm l coruna | coronam | F; G; H; I; J |
| 27.7        | 47r   | blostmaet l bleow | refloruit |                |
| 44.12       | 79v   | white l hiw | speciem | I; K |
| 44.15       | 79v   | femnae l medenan | virgines |                |
| 47.5        | 83r   | beoð l sint | sunt |                |
| 48.7        | 84v   | genihtsummunga l fulsumnesse | abundantia |                |
| 48.12       | 85r   | cneowrise l cynrene | generatione | F; I |
| 48.14       | 85v   | æswic l wroht | scandalum | J |
| 49.20       | 88r   | gesignæ l flit | scandalum |                |