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ABSTRACT

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS. 278 is an early-fourteenth-century trilingual manuscript of the Psalms from Norwich Cathedral Priory, an urban cathedral church staffed by Benedictine monks. This manuscript is notable because it contains one of six Middle English Metrical Psalters, the earliest Middle English translation of the Psalms, as well as a full Anglo-Norman Oxford Psalter, the most popular French translation of the Psalms in late medieval England. While the Middle English Metrical Psalter is a remarkable and understudied text in and of itself, the Metrical Psalter of CCC 278 is even more interesting because of its monastic provenance and innovative layout.

This thesis explores the questions of why a monastic institution would produce a manuscript of two complete, prominently displayed, vernacular Psalters with only highly abbreviated Latin textual references; what sociolinguistic and political forces drove the production of this innovative manuscript; and how the Middle English Metrical Psalter in particular was read, and by whom. Because there are no annotations, colophon, prologue or external documentation to provide clues to either the intended or actual use of the manuscript by the Priory monks, this thesis undertakes a detailed historicization and contextualization of the book in its urban, religious, linguistic and social settings. In addition, the lenses of community, mediation, and authority are applied, leading to the conclusion that CCC 278 and its Middle English Metrical Psalter were likely used by the monks to reach out to Norwich’s élite laity in order to form a mixed reading community around the book—a reading community controlled by the Priory.
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INTRODUCTION

0.0 Thesis Topic

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS. 278 (CCC 278) is an early fourteenth-century, trilingual manuscript of the Psalms from Norwich Cathedral Priory that has barely been acknowledged in the scholarship on medieval manuscript culture, vernacular biblical translations, or monastic textuality. The manuscript contains two complete vernacular Psalters, both divided into eight parts covering the entire cursus of 150 Psalms, with Psalm 118 sub-divided into 11 sections in accordance with monastic liturgical practice. Both Psalters are further augmented with an identical Latin apparatus consisting of Latin incipits in narrow ruled columns and headings at the beginning of each Psalm. Abbreviated as they are, these incipits and headers constitute a third complete Psalter—if not for lay readers then certainly for monastic readers whose weekly praying and recitation of the full Psalter would have allowed them to recall entire verses or Psalms based on these cues. The first vernacular Psalter is the earliest Middle English version of the Psalms—a verse paraphrase of the Vulgate Psalter in a Yorkshire dialect, referred to most often as either the Middle English Metrical Psalter (MEMP) or the Surtees Psalter. It is extant in six manuscripts in various contexts and geographic locations. The second half of the manuscript is an Anglo-Norman prose translation known as the Oxford or Montebourg Psalter, which was the most

---

1 This manuscript was accessed via the Parker Library on the Web, an online repository of manuscripts from the Parker Library at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge University.
3 Mary Kay Duggan, "The Psalter on the Way to the Reformation," in *The Place of the Psalms in the Intellectual Culture of the Middle Ages*, ed. Nancy van Deusen (Albany: SUNY, 1999), 177. Duggan states that “Memorization of the psalms was a requirement of monastic life”.

popular French version of the Psalms in England from the twelfth century onwards, and is extant in twelve manuscripts, according to Dean and Boulton.

It is remarkable that CCC 278 is so understudied because it presents a number of fascinating problems, which include the complex linguistic dynamics of collocated Psalters in three languages; its highly unusual *mise-en-page*; its total lack of the usual ancillary texts, such as creeds, canticles or antiphons; and that it appears to be a primarily vernacular biblical manuscript produced by a monastery whose primary working liturgical and textual language would have been Latin. With respect to the *MEMP* in particular, Annie Sutherland has observed that while the Psalms were “translated into the vernacular more often than any other scriptural texts” and “occupied a unique position in Middle English biblical culture”, this earliest of Middle English Psalters has been curiously neglected by scholars, and a review of the literature shows that there is scarcely any scholarship on this text. In fact, the literature on medieval English Psalm culture falls neatly before and after the *MEMP*, with significant amounts of published scholarship on the tenth-century Anglo-Saxon metrical Psalter, and later Middle English versions such as Richard Rolle’s mid-fourteenth-century *Prose Psalter* and the later fourteenth-century Wycliffite Psalters.

---

6 A fully digitized version of the codex is accessible through the *Parker Library on the Web*, a repository of 559 medieval manuscripts housed at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.
8 Ibid.
9 For instance, Even in Evelyn Birge-Vitz’s 25-page chapter “Medieval Verse Paraphrases of the Bible” in the *New Cambridge History of the Bible c. 600-1450* (2012), not a single reference is made to the *Middle English Metrical Psalter*. 
What little scholarship on the *MEMP* that exists falls into two distinct groups. The older scholarship dates from the early- to mid-twentieth-century and focuses almost entirely on the texts’ linguistic connections to Old English, and its relation to other early dialects of Middle English. Scholars such as Dorothy Everett, Laurence Muir and Henry Hargreaves do not address the reading practice required of these texts—that is, how they may have been read and by whom, and in what social, religious or manuscript contexts.

The only recent scholarship focused on the *MEMP* has been published by Annie Sutherland. In her article “English Psalms in the Middle Ages”, she focuses on one manuscript setting in particular, Bodleian Library MS. 425, with only a passing mention of CCC 278’s *MEMP*. Similarly, her 2015 monograph *English Psalms in the Middle Ages, 1300-1450*, fails to devote any sustained attention to the Norwich *MEMP*. Similarly to earlier authors, she does not address the mechanics of how any of the *MEMPs* would have been read, or by whom, and she certainly does not discuss the local social, political, and religious milieu of Norwich as this thesis proposes to do. Rather, Sutherland’s work focuses its attention on the *MEMP*’s emergence in the context of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century anxieties related to penitential literature and the efficacy of vernacular scripture, and makes the rather perfunctory assertion that it would have been suitable for non-Latinate readers to “follow along” during the liturgy, an assertion I will challenge in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

While CCC 278 was certainly liturgical in a general sense, given its structure, content and

---

monastic provenance, this thesis will argue that it had a different purpose, related to, though separate from, the performance of masses and Offices. In short, it was culturally liturgical, if not functionally so.

As a cultural force, the Psalms were the most ubiquitous text (written and spoken) of the middle ages, and had a multitude of liturgical, monastic, literary and devotional functions. They formed the foundation of the mass as well as the monastic Divine Office, were the basis of what became the Book of Hours, and were used as a tool of private devotion and pedagogy by both monks and laypersons. Many scholars have concluded that lay people were encouraged to join in the recitation or singing of the Psalms during liturgical celebrations in both cathedrals (including monastic cathedrals like Norwich) and parish churches in late medieval England, providing ample evidence that laity were very familiar with the Psalms, in various formats and settings. In short, it was a text that pervaded medieval culture and was, in varying degrees, heard, read, memorized, and quoted by members of all social groups at all levels of society. When James McKinnon warns that “we may take this overwhelming Psalmic presence for granted, but we should not”, he is indicating that the Psalms were a foundational element of medieval religious, liturgical and social life, and of medieval culture in general. Bruce Holsinger has similarly argued that the liturgy, of which the Psalms formed the core element, was medieval society’s “frame

---

narrative”, and that “liturgy forces linguistic and formal innovation in the vernacular even as its central texts and mysteries reach their audience mostly (but not always) in Latin.”

These aspects of linguistic and formal innovation, vernacularity, the pervasiveness of liturgical culture, and the continuing authority of Latin even as it is mediated by the vernacular will be themes that run throughout this thesis, which will argue that the CCC 278 and its MEMP was a liturgically-inspired manuscript in which all of Holsinger’s aspects of liturgico-literary innovation were present for the purpose of creating a textual community which encompassed both monastic and lay participants. The fact that CCC 278 was a Psalter in two vernacular languages as well as Latin, with clear liturgical associations, meant that it was a book with the widest possible audience in late medieval English society.

This thesis will seek to answer the question of why a monastery, whose liturgical functions were performed in Latin, created a book with two vernacular, liturgically structured Psalters, and more specifically how the Middle English Metrical Psalter was read within the proposed mixed reading community. I will argue that CCC 278 is a manuscript uniquely designed to appeal to the literary, linguistic and liturgical sensibilities of both monastic and non-monastic (lay) residents of Norwich, and as such can be interpreted as a tool of community formation, and not just a crib for following along during the mass, as Eamon Duffy has contended. Further, I will argue that it was the institutional authority and spiritual prestige of the Benedictine Priory that made the innovative vernacularity of this manuscript possible. It was largely through the manuscript’s highly intentional pairings of languages, and arrangement of texts, that the Priory facilitated the mediation of scripture into

---

17 Ibid, 300; 295.
English and French, while maintaining its authority over both texts and lay readers. I will conclude that this codex—the material object—is an embodiment of those local concerns and shifting socio-linguistic dynamics that led to the production of the manuscript and the reading community imagined by its creators. Specifically, I will argue that the Middle English Metrical Psalter constitutes a new element of the cultural and religious exchange between the Priory and the citizenry of Norwich and manifests a shift in the relationship between these sometimes hostile neighbours.

0.1 Thesis Themes: Community, Mediation, and Authority

At the highest level of analysis, this thesis will treat the multiple relationships that give texts meaning. This over-arching concept of how ‘the relational’ constructs and conveys meaning will be examined through three main lenses: community, mediation, and authority. In the case of CCC 278, there are multiple relationships inscribed into the manuscript that contribute to the construction of meaning. The codex contains three Psalters in three languages, providing access to the text for both lay and monastic readers. Just these two basic contextual elements—languages and social groups—open up many relational possibilities that are facilitated by various modes of mediation and are shaped by Priory’s authority. Within these relationships there is not only complimentarity and concord—the normal expectation of ‘community’—but also difference, so that as these entities occupy the same space within the codex or the church, they are forced into relationships of contest and hierarchy, neighbours in overlapping communities of languages, texts and readers.
0.1.1 Community

Community is generally defined in sociological literature as a group of people sharing “common customs or shared circumstances…often centered around a common interest and/or locale”\(^{19}\), and who share a common sense of identity (a “consciousness of kind”).\(^{20}\) This group “often functions as an ideal type and conveys notions of engagement, cohesion, solidarity and continuity”, all of which describe how groups and individuals relate to one another.\(^{21}\)

Medieval Christianity was a communal religion, with many units of religious practice—for example, the parish, monastery and school—based on the assembling of believers in a corporate activity and identity. The Church was the body of Christ, the corpus of all believers, encompassing all nations, languages, times, and liturgical traditions. It formed a single entity, including the living and the dead in an eternal and undying community that would continue to exist in heaven.\(^{22}\)

Brian Stock’s concept of ‘textual community’ places literacy, authority and interpretation and at heart of certain types of religious communities in the middle ages, with a group of like-minded individuals gathering together into community around a central text (whether read, recited or interpreted). While Stock’s case studies from *The Implications of Literacy* focus on heretical movements of the eleventh century whose nucleus “was not a written version of text…but an individual, who, having mastered it [the text] then utilized it

---


for reforming a group’s thought and action”\(^23\), the model of textual community he elaborated has been taken up by many scholars. It is a very useful concept for framing the process by which lay and monastic readers could gather in community around a multilingual Psalter. As Stock’s definition states, there is the need for one who has mastered the text to lead the group. In the case of the proposed textual community centered around the CCC 278, the leadership of the group would clearly lay with the priory monks—the religious élite—who produced the codex, and who would be the acknowledged ‘masters’ of the text, mediating it through reading and interpretation to the community—which could have consisted of laity, novices, nuns or students. This thesis will use the theme of ‘the reading community’ as a lens to focus the examination of CCC 278 in its social, literary and institutional contexts, and will dwell more than Stock’s model on how authority, paratext and translation into vernacular languages—especially English—shape the community’s engagement with and response to the text.

While the notion of community gives a sense of belonging and working-in-concert, there are other aspects of community that suggest a more dynamic and ambiguous relationship between the entities (‘neighbors’) within any group. Apropos to this thesis’ focus on the relational and communitarian aspects of a psalter book, scholars have identified both a theological and mediating function of neighbor relationships. Freud and Lacan both critiqued the imagined community enjoined upon Christian society by the book of Leviticus (‘love thy neighbor as thyself’)\(^24\), which seemed to require a total openness and service to the


\(^{24}\) Leviticus 9:17-18: “You shall not hate your brother in your heart, but you shall reason frankly with your neighbor, lest you incur sin because of him.\(^18\) You shall not take vengeance or bear a grudge against the sons of your own people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself: I am the LORD.” (ESV)
Other, considering it impossible. As many theorists of community have shown, community is instead a “center for power and conflict…as much about confrontation and negotiation as it is about…collaboration and coordination.” It is therefore a complex social, political and cultural concept, multifaceted in its mechanics and implications, and as such it is a useful conceptual approach to understanding how texts and people can be interpreted as working together, while simultaneously acknowledging the tensions which make the imagined community difficult, or even impossible, to achieve.

As the analysis of the manuscript and its readers builds on the ideal of community as a unifying force (‘imagined community’), this study will consider three sub-themes of community that illustrate how complex the relationships were between social groups, texts, languages, and between readers and texts, all of which are embodied by this manuscript. The first and most important of these sub-themes is George Edmondson’s conceptualization of ‘the neighbor’—a word that concentrates the notion of community into a specific relationship between identifiable, closely related parties, such as the Priory and town. In *The Neighboring Text*, Edmondson’s use of the neighbor trope draws on Freud’s concept of the *Nebenmensch* (literally “the man alongside me”): that which is close and familiar, but simultaneously alien, unsettling and destabilizing. This concept will inform my discussion throughout the paper as to how, for instance, the posited invitations to community from the monastic priory to the laity, and the inclusion of the three literary languages of England in the manuscript, were part of a process which created “heterogeneity, hierarchy and conflicts

---

of interest” instead of unity. Edmondson argues that what we normally think of as community (inclusivity and cooperation) is in fact a “fantasy of intersubjective relation”, agreeing with sociologists’ observations regarding the disconnect between imagined community and lived reality. SlavojŽižek agrees, identifying the neighbor relationship as mode of mediation, and states that its mediating dynamic is political, and constitutes a struggle for power and resources, and my examination of the conflicts, hierarchies and networks of exchange between the Priory and the citizens of Norwich will bear this out.

The trope of the neighbor also provides a metaphor through which related texts are examined according to how they work with and against each other over time and space, intertextually. This sub-conceptualization of ‘the neighboring text’ will be especially relevant in the contextualization of CCC 278’s *Middle English Metrical Psalter*—first within the community of six extant *MEMP* manuscripts from across the north and east of England, and second, within CCC 278’s community of Psalters and languages.

0.1.2 Mediation

The idea of mediation is at the heart of Christian belief and practice. St. Augustine called Christ “the Great Mediator” because he brought God and humanity back into relationship, and Felix Heinzer has characterized the Psalms as having “enormous potential for intermediation” due to its highly varied contents and modes of interpretation, and broad

---

27 Ibid., 5.
28 Ibid., 10.
dissemination throughout medieval society.\textsuperscript{31} For most lay people in medieval society the Bible was not directly read. Instead, medieval society’s experience of Holy Scripture was mediated via liturgical chant, imagery, sermons, prayer and ritual. Eyal Poleg, while discussing the role of mediation in medieval religious culture, acknowledges that there are major questions still unanswered about how it worked and what its implications might be. For instance, Poleg asks whether the process of mediation worked more effectively through certain media, or whether it was “a carefully guided project led by the clergy and a means to reinforce social boundaries and church hierarchy.”\textsuperscript{32} This thesis will discuss various forms of mediation which flowed from CCC 278 and its \textit{MEMP}—mediation between biblical texts, between languages and between lay and monastic communities in Norwich.

Poleg has defined mediation in the context of biblical literature as “the constant effort to bridge between a text and its reception, between a society and its Scripture.”\textsuperscript{33} It is the process by which meaning is transmitted through culture—across social, linguistic or temporal boundaries via a mediating agent, in this case CCC 278, a book designed, I will argue, to bridge gaps between languages and reading communities. In Chapter 2 this thesis will examine the roles of paratext and language choice as ways to mediate readers’ relationship with the text and its ‘author’.\textsuperscript{34} In late medieval culture, the Bible was often mediated through verse paraphrasing: in the Latin tradition in works such the \textit{Aurora} of Peter Riga, through Middle English biblical histories like \textit{Cursor Mundi}, and through versified scriptural translations and paraphrases such as the \textit{MEMP}.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[31] Felix Heinzer, "Holy Text or Object of Display? Functions and Guises of the Psalter in the Middle Ages," \textit{Bodleian Library Record} 21 (2008): 46.
\item[33] Ibid., 4.
\item[34] In Chapter 2 I will argue that the Priory was the ‘institutional author’ of this manuscript.
\end{footnotes}
June Mecham has suggested that within the context of lay-convetual relations in the middle ages, material objects played a mediating role, noting that “material culture mediated between the secular and monastic worlds”, with statues, clothing, liturgical objects, and manuscripts connecting the lay and monastic worlds, ultimately supporting what she calls “collective Christian practice.”

0.1.3 Authority

A third theme that will run throughout the examination of CCC 278 and its context is ‘authority’. Emily Steiner begins her theorization of authority in medieval textual culture by stating that “Authority is something that one is always in relation to”, that it is “constructed [on] models of social hierarchy” and that it is often embodied or at least displayed symbolically in order to signify its presence and status within its sphere of influence. All of these aspects of authority will be applied in the analysis of CCC 278 and its posited function as a tool of community formation: Latin’s authorizing relationship to vernacular biblical texts (which in turn mediate the authoritative Latin text to a broader community); the authority and prestige of the monastery within the religious field of Norwich; and the relationship of the monks, as ‘masters of the text’, to lay readers within the textual community. However, authority has secondary effects that are also discernable in the Norwich trilingual Psalter, that are important to understanding how it was made and read. According to David Lawton’s “Englishing the Bible”, authority enables innovation—in this case early Middle English biblical texts that appear to put the mother tongue of the English

people front and centre while backgounding Latin, *the* biblical language of Western Christendom. The innovative vernacularity of CCC 278, is therefore accomplished, perhaps unexpectedly, through the authorizing power of Latin (linguistic authority) and the Priory (institutional authority), allowing English to stand-in for, or mediate, the Vulgate Latin text for the English-speaking readership of Norwich.

**0.2 The Social and Religious Field of Norwich**

The analysis of CCC 278 and the themes of community, mediation, and authority will be firmly rooted within the social, political and religious contexts of late medieval Norwich. By the early fourteenth century, Norwich was England’s second-largest city and one of it’s wealthiest. It was a cosmopolitan commercial and religious hub, and the type of bustling multilingual city where “on any given day, speakers … had the opportunity to hear several languages, including English, French, Latin, Dutch, Italian and German…And if there were lots of languages, there were lots of bilingual speakers populating a complex social world of commerce, government and religion.”

At the heart of the city was the Cathedral Priory, completed in 1146, which dominated the urban and religious landscape. Its size and central location were meant to “emulate, or even rival” the massive Norman castle which was “one of the most impressive secular buildings in north-western Europe.” Both were designed and built by the Normans as “statements of colonial domination”, and were central symbols of spiritual and political
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authority within the city and diocese of Norwich, which encompassed both Norfolk and Suffolk counties in East Anglia.\textsuperscript{40} It is therefore no surprise that the bishops of Norwich were frequently trusted advisors to, and emissaries for, the kings of England throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{41}

The Normans also put their religious stamp on the city, importing the liturgy of Fécamp (derived from Cluny) as well as dozens of French monks to perform it,\textsuperscript{42} and invested the cathedral with rights and privileges that extended Norman dominance of the English population into the spiritual realm. This highly privileged status, as well as its encoded and embodied authority, proved to be the source of multiple conflicts between the city and the church over the next 200 years. Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of ‘field’ will be useful to understand late medieval Norwich as both context and community for the reading of CCC 278: a constructed social space, in which the priory and other religious houses, as well as the laity, vied for power and influence. Bourdieu’s concept of field dovetails with this thesis’ overarching concepts of community and neighboring, which describe the simultaneously cooperative and antagonistic interaction of the players within the field of Norwich.

The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were a time of competition between the Benedictine Cathedral Priory and the diocese’ parish churches, as well as the new religious orders such as the Franciscan friars and the Augustinian cannons, all of whom offered many

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., 73.
\textsuperscript{41} William Page, \textit{The Victoria History of the County of Norfolk}, vol. 2 (London: Constable, 1906), 233.
similar pastoral, educational and sacramental services to the laity as the Priory did.\footnote{These are what Bourdieu identifies as “the goods of salvation”—things like sacraments and memberships in ecclesiastical organizations that can only be offered by the spiritual élite, usually to the laity. See Terry Rey, "Marketing the Goods of Salvation: Bourdieu on Religion," \textit{Religion} 34 (2004).} The manuscript, with complete English and French Psalters that would have facilitated lay reading, may also have contributed to the Priory’s capacity to compete against these other religious institutions for patronage and prestige by attracting élite lay readers or auditors. This is another illustration of how the concepts of community and the neighbor play out around both the Priory and CCC 278. The Priory would have been one member in an interconnected community of religious orders in Norwich, whose members lived lives distinct from, but often in service to, the laity of the city. In addition, members of the various orders saw themselves as part of a wider “canonical community”, and writings such as the \textit{De Claustro Animae} of Hugo de Folieto, a copy of which was part of the Norwich Priory library, were intended for all cloistered religious.\footnote{Terrie Colk, "Twelfth-Century East Anglian Canons: A Monastic Life?," in \textit{Medieval East Anglia}, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005), 219. N. R. Ker lists this work as item 20 in his catalogue of manuscripts from Norwich Cathedral Priory.} However, the differences between those religious houses clearly led to competition between them—for followers, donors, and status: after a century of conflict “The monks had lost the confidence and respect of the trading classes, who had everywhere been transferring their allegiance to the friars”, according to the \textit{Victoria History of Norfolk County},\footnote{Page, \textit{The Victoria History of the County of Norfolk}, 2, 232.} and Norman Tanner has observed that “the four Friaries (Franciscan, Dominican, Carmelite and Augustinian), with their large churches, preachers and religious services, challenged the role of the parish churches” and
Priory alike. At the heart of these shifting allegiances was competition for donors and resources, and the laity’s search for new modes of spiritual engagement in a time of change.

However, the monks also had surprisingly close relations with the citizens of the town through the many existing connections between the city and the Priory—social, economic, religious and even familial—which may have made the formation of community between laity and Priory more a matter of solidifying existing connections than forming new ones. However, the relationship between the city and the Priory occasionally flared into violence, demonstrating that ‘neighbor’ is not only a relationship of affinity in this context but also of difference, based on the degrees of authority and power exercised by the Priory over its city neighbors. Even within the Cathedral Priory itself, a community enclosed within the precinct’s symbolically excluding walls, the neighbouring dynamic is clearly evident. The bishop and his court and the monks worked together within the uniquely English construct of the Cathedral Priory—a hybrid community comprised of the cathedral church and the monastic chapter. The cathedral was the seat of the bishop, and so had an elevated status amongst local churches as well as wealth and status. The monks, who benefited from the cathedral’s wealth and power, nevertheless had an uneasy working relationship with the bishops and his familia, and were problematically collocated with one of the country’s most powerful magnates whose business was as much secular and political as it was spiritual, and whose visitation reports were often sharply critical of the monks. There were several other points of tension between the bishop and the monks, including issues such as “the division of property and possessions” and who had the authority to select

---

or elect a new abbot.\textsuperscript{47} The Cathedral Priory precincts could therefore be considered a contested field unto itself, a site of uneasy neighbor relations.

\textbf{0.3 Thesis Structure}

In \textit{The Order of Books}, Roger Chartier, considering his approach to historical communities of readers, urges that “we pay close attention to the interworkings of three things—the texts that people read, the material format in which those texts appear, and the ways that people actually read those texts.”\textsuperscript{48} These three facets of book history correspond to the three chapters of this thesis.

In the first chapter, I will briefly examine the literary culture of late medieval East Anglia, which corresponds to Chartier’s first consideration: “the texts that people read”. Specifically, I will discuss a selection of vernacular or multilingual manuscripts which were produced or circulated in the area prior to 1350; the Norwich Priory library, which included a number of thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century vernacular texts; and also the relationships between lay and monastic readers in East Anglia, which hinged on networks of textual exchange and community. In the second chapter I will examine the paratext and materiality of the manuscript, especially its languages, layout and codicology, which corresponds to Chartier’s injunction to pay attention to “the material format” of the book in question. Third, he asks that we try to understand “the ways that people actually read those texts”, which I will undertake in the third chapter, which is devoted to the \textit{Middle English Metrical Psalter}, and how it was read within the social, religious and literary contexts of


both late medieval England and, more specifically, the mixed reading community that I argue was desired by the Priory. In the closing section I will consider the significant implications of scriptural mediation, before concluding that the *MEMP* is in several respects an embodiment of both the imagined textual community the priory wished to construct, and the fraught reality of the contest for status and authority within the community.

While this thesis will argue that CCC 278’s function was to bring lay and monastic, vernacular and Latin, readers into a wider textual community around the Psalter, there is no conclusive evidence that makes this book’s original intended purpose (or purposes) clear. It is often the case that, even with careful study, the particulars of a manuscript’s use cannot be discovered. In his analysis of the manuscript commonly referred to as the ‘Campsey collection’ (BL Additional MS. 70513), a compilation of Anglo-Norman saints’ lives from Campsey-Ashe convent in Suffolk, Delbert Russell acknowledges that it is not always possible to precisely identify a manuscript’s function, or sometimes even its creator, and so one must seek to understand the manuscript instead as “a series of choices…made within specific seigneurial, family, monastic and ecclesiastical networks.” This thesis will take a similar approach, as this manuscript and the records of late medieval Norwich Priory leave no discernable traces of precisely who conceived of, paid for, or read CCC 278, or what its intended function(s) was. Instead, this unusual trilingual Psalter will be considered as a series of choices within a specific social, literary and religious context, and my argument

---


will be based on the possibilities of use within the known networks of languages, readers and relationships that surrounded it.

Fig. 2: Plan of Norwich Cathedral Priory Precincts During the Middle Ages.
CHAPTER ONE

Context: Textual Culture and Community in Late Medieval Norwich

1.0 Introduction and Outline

The Introduction posited that community, mediation and authority—all relational dynamics—are lenses through which to discern the function and utility of medieval texts. It also set out the religious landscape of late medieval Norwich and identified several sub-communities that competed for worshippers and donors—for status and power—within the city. In order to further understand the social, textual and institutional context in which CCC 278 was created and used, Chapter 1 will further explore the monastic reading community based at the Priory and the library that supported it (1.1); the textual cultures and networks of exchange of lay reading communities in late medieval East Anglia (1.2); as well as the degree to which these two constituencies of readers interacted liturgically and socially (1.3). This background will support the premise that the necessary relationships and reading practices were in place to allow for a common reading community to be formed around CCC 278, and its Metrical Psalter in particular.

1.1 Monastic Textuality: The Example of Norwich Priory

In his article “Monastic Productions”, Christopher Cannon sees in late-medieval monastic textuality not only continuity with pre-Conquest English culture, but also a mediating function within their contemporary literary and religious culture, stating that “monasteries, more than any other institution in England, possessed the means…for turning doctrinal truths preserved in Latin or French, to English.” It is this mediating function, he
argues, which explains the numerous translations of Latin or French texts that are to found in the library catalogues and extant collections of monastic libraries.¹ He has characterized medieval English monastic textuality as innovative, and has observed that “The vast liturgy that comprised the monastic Office was endlessly elaborated by monastic writers,” and that the same spirit of liturgical influence and openness guided monastic book production and acquisition, and the varieties of reading practiced within the monastery.²

Importantly for thesis’ focus on vernacular—and in particular, English—textuality, Cannon also posits that English monasteries played a key role in the development of early Middle English literature, as they were not dispossessed of English cultural traditions by the Norman rulers like other English institutions³, stating that “the rich literacy of monastic culture offers sure connections where Middle English writing is otherwise only hiccupping its way towards continuous production.”⁴ John Frankis, in his study of the social context of thirteenth-century vernacular writings, supports Cannon’s argument, observing that, based on the number of vernacular manuscripts localizable to specific religious houses, there is a clear “concern for vernacular writing in many monasteries, especially in some of the great Benedictine houses.”⁵ Frankis concludes his study by stating “a picture of the clergy [including monks] emerges…mediating vernacular writings, partly to other clergy and partly

---

² Ibid., 319, 21.
³ Ibid., 322.
⁴ Ibid., 320.
to the laity.”⁶ Perhaps contrary to expectations, the late medieval English monastery was a key centre of vernacular literary production, translation and dissemination.

Cannon further argues that monasteries’ outward orientation towards their wider communities, their innovative textuality based in liturgy, and their willingness to engage in vernacular textual culture allowed monks to provide a perhaps unexpected “mediating function” in which vernacular languages “could function as alternatives rather than substitutes” for Latin.⁷ Malcolm Parkes observes that by the twelfth century “When vernacular poetic texts were committed to writing, they were set down by monks who had acquired an interest in them”⁸, and Marie-Luise Ehrenschwendtner describes how “writings in the vernaculars from then on [after the twelfth century] gathered momentum” in monastic libraries.⁹ Tony Hunt states that “about half the surviving twelfth-century manuscripts containing French come from Benedictine houses and almost half of these are Psalters”¹⁰, adding that “we must not forget that the monasteries were assiduous instigators of translation, beginning with the Psalter.”¹¹

---

⁶ Ibid., 184.  
1.1.1 The Priory Library

In the history of Norwich Cathedral Priory, the year 1272 stands out as one of the most infamous. Ongoing conflict with the townspeople over the Priory’s authority and privileges came to a head when disagreement over a disputed, liminal tract of land claimed by both Priory and town sparked violent riots that culminated in the citizens setting fire to the Priory. The result was the destruction of the cloister and the Priory’s entire library except for a few volumes. Following these events, the Priory set out to rebuild its collection, which grew rapidly thanks to a combination of substantial donations and commissioning of new books. Most of the donations came from the monks themselves, whose individual names are inscribed in many of the extant manuscripts, though not in CCC 278. On a second front, the records also show the purchase of very large quantities of parchment and large sums of money paid for the contracting of scribes in the late thirteenth century by the praecentor and magister celarii, the obedientiaries with responsibility for books and related purchases of writing supports and inks. While book production in a monastic scriptorium was the norm for the early and high middle ages, Nigel Morgan’s study of late medieval liturgical books shows that by the late thirteenth century the wealthier monasteries were contracting out most book production. It is estimated that by 1325 the

---

Norwich library was back up to approximately 400-500 books,¹⁶ and by Dissolution “was one of the finest libraries in medieval England” with an estimated 1350 volumes.¹⁷ This effort to rebuild the library reveals a monastic engagement in textual culture at the individual and corporate levels that is in keeping with Cannon’s and Frankis’ arguments for the massive contribution to cultural continuity and vernacular textuality made my monastic institutions. While books were symbolic objects signifying the monastery’s learning, wealth and connection to the divine, most volumes were first and foremost for reading—monastic communities were reading communities.

The Rule of St. Benedict prescribed both public and private reading for monks, and reading took place in almost every area of a monastery. Public reading could take the form of lessons during the mass, the reading of texts during the Offices, or reading in refectory and evening collation. Private reading could be for devotional (lectio divina) or leisure purposes (otium). Sometimes the reading of texts could be continued from one context to another, such as when reading that began as part of the liturgical offices was continued in refectory.¹⁸ In addition to being hourly, daily and weekly, the textual cycles of the monastery could also be annual: in a ritual that was at once symbolic and pragmatic, books from all over the Priory were collected back into the chapter each year at the beginning of Lent, and a mass was sung for the library’s benefactors.¹⁹ This was a custom common to Benedictine houses, and therefore not peculiar to Norwich. It is nevertheless a fascinating

---

reflection of how the Priory monks would have sought to annually reconstitute the community of texts within the monastery that formed the library, and at the same time give thanks to and memorialize those who provided many of the books. It is also an example of the types of cultural exchanges between monks and laity that mixed prayer, community, textuality and ritual.

The library’s collection represents a sub-community of books and texts within the wider community of volumes which resided in different repositories around the Cathedral Priory and which served different functions.20 Because reading took place in many locations within a monastic complex, book repositories could be found in other locations besides the library, when a central repository even existed. David Bell begins his article on late medieval conventual libraries by reminding us that a library in this context amounted to a “shifting accumulation of changing materials housed in diverse locations.”21 However, monastic communities were reading communities to such an extent that the cloister, the symbolic and spiritual heart of the monastery, was usually equipped with several book cupboards (armoria) or chests (cistis securibus), and this was the case for the east and south walks of Norwich Priory’s cloister.22 Books were also stored in the Norwich chapter house for reading at meetings, even after a separate library was built around 1386.23

---

20 The term books, as opposed to texts, is important as the text of the Psalter, for instance, could be found in different areas within the Priory, but it is their differing divisions, arrangements and collocation with other texts within the codices that could give them unique functionality. In short, the book serves the purpose, and the text is one part of the book.

21 David N. Bell, "The Libraries of Religious Houses in the Late Middle Ages," in Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland, Volume 1: To 1640, ed. Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Theresa Webber (Cambridge: Cambridge University Publisher, 2006), 132.


23 Beeching and James, "The Library of the Cathedral Church of Norwich," 86. Beeching also notes that even at Canterbury Cathedral Priory a separate, purpose-built library was not in place until 1414, well after Norwich’s.
It is important to emphasize the distinction between the two main repositories of books within the Cathedral Priory complex—the monastic library, likely residing in the chapter house in the early fourteenth century, and the church. The Priory library’s books were intended to be used for study, teaching, and leisure reading by the monks, whereas books such as lectionaries, missals, processions, antiphonals and most Psalters were stored in the main church and its various chapels, and were intended for use during mass, Offices and other liturgical events within the church.\textsuperscript{24} In their study “Books for the Liturgy and Private Prayer”, Morgan and Thomson confirm that service books were normally stored in cupboards and chests within the church itself.\textsuperscript{25}

Manuscript pressmarks roughly correspond to different classes of books, and CCC 278 was a Norwich Priory library book according to its pressmark (\textit{N.xlvij}), inscribed on the upper right corner of f.1r (Fig.1).\textsuperscript{26} Books with a pressmark that began with ‘A’, all of which were produced before the fire of 1272, were used and stored in the church, and out of the seven books so-marked, six are likely to have survived the fire due to their being stored there versus monastery library. They include books that are typical of a church setting: three “small psalters” containing Norwich calendars, as well as three collections of homilies, one each by Gregory the Great, Norwich Cathedral Priory’s founding bishop, Herbert de Losinga, and one anonymous collection.\textsuperscript{27} Finally, the \textit{Ormesby Psalter} (Bodleian MS. Douce 366) is another example of a book of the Psalms kept not in the library but in the choir of the church. This “splendid” illuminated Psalter was an early-fourteenth-century

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{24}] Ibid., 79.
\item[\textsuperscript{25}] Morgan, "Books for the Liturgy and Private Prayer," 292.
\item[\textsuperscript{27}] Ker, "Medieval Manuscripts from Norwich Cathedral Priory," 6-7.
\end{itemize}
donation by the Norwich Priory monk Robert de Ormesby, who after having acquired it had a Norwich calendar and litany added to the manuscript, specifying that “it was to be permanently placed in front of the sub-prior’s stall in the choir.” It is likely that all these service-oriented Psalters from the church contained some combination of calendar, canticles, a litany of saints and collects, as these were “the basic structure” of service books of the Psalms, “found in an overwhelming majority of liturgical psalters from different countries…throughout the middle ages”. Of all the Psalters identified by Ker from Norwich Priory, only CCC 278—which contains none of the liturgical add-ons listed above—seems to have come from the library, meaning it was not a regular service book, despite its monastic liturgical structure, and so likely had a separate function. Though liturgically-structured, it was not truly service-oriented.

It is the Priory’s known library holdings, much more varied in content, form and genre from the books in the church, which show that the monks who created and used CCC 278 were a community of readers interested in a broad range of texts and all the languages of England. Contrary to stereotypical views of monks as readers of exclusively Latinate texts, British monastic libraries have been characterized as rich in all sorts of texts—secular as well as religious and “in all the languages spoken and written in this period on the island”, including texts irrelevant to lectio divina, such as vernacular romances. Cannon summarizes the situation thus: “The breadth of these library holdings demonstrates the degree to which the textual culture of British monasteries recognized only the most fragile boundaries between available languages and textual kinds.”

---

31 Ibid., 326.
the Norwich Cathedral Priory library from the late-thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are Latin, including biblical commentaries (Haimo of Auxerre), histories (Vincent of Beauvais), chronicles (Bartholomew Cotton), theology (Hugh of St. Victor and St. Bonaventure), sermons (St. Augustine), political theory (John of Salisbury) and several miscellanies combining multiple genres and authors. In addition to the multiple Latin Psalters listed by Ker from the Norwich Priory library and church, there was also Cassiodorus’ *Expositio psalmorum*, as well as a twelfth-century manuscript of Peter Lombard’s *Magna glossatura*, the standard commentary on the Psalms from the twelfth century onwards.32

However, in addition to the expected Latin texts, the Norwich Priory library also contained a number of multilingual volumes that demonstrate the monks’ ability and desire to engage with vernacular texts. The following are examples that will be referenced elsewhere in this thesis, especially in Chapter 2. The short descriptions are based on N. R. Ker’s entries in his “Medieval Manuscripts from Norwich Cathedral Priory”.

- Cambridge, Trinity College MS. R.14.7; c. 1300, a *Rule for Nuns*. This manuscript is an Anglo-Norman adaptation of the *Ancrene Wisse* for use in a male context, collocated with a chronicle of the miracles of England, also in French.

- British Library MS. Arundel 292; late 13th century. A miscellany of Latin, Middle English (in an East Anglian dialect) and French texts, with later additions.

- Cambridge, University Library MS. Ee.6.11; 13th century. A miscellany including Marie de France’s *Fables* and *St. Patrick’s Purgatory*, and an Anglo-Norman version of the *Life of St. Margaret*.

- British Library MS. Harley 3950, early 14th century. A Latin Psalter and calendar with Anglo-Norman prayers.33

32 The manuscript may have come from St. Mary’s in the Marsh, a church within the Priory precincts, explaining why a non-service book from before the fire of 1272 survived. See note on provenance in Paul Binski and Patrick Zutshi, *Western Illuminated Manuscripts: A Catalogue of the Collection in Cambridge University Library* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 60.
33 Ker, "Medieval Manuscripts from Norwich Cathedral Priory," 13-22. Some descriptive language also taken from the online records of the British Library’s digitized manuscripts (https://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/) and Cambridge University Library (http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/).
While Psalters in the church and library may have served different functions within the community of books and texts, they also complimented each other: if lay attendees of the mass and other liturgical functions in the nave prayed the Psalms together, then the use of CCC 278, another liturgically-structured psalter book, was a natural vehicle for bringing these two constituencies together outside the formal setting of mass and Office. This, in combination with the monks’ familiarity with at least two manuscripts containing English texts, as well as several in Anglo-Norman, shows that the resident monks had broader reading habits than might be expected, and that vernacular reading was a monastic practice that overlapped with lay tendencies, establishing a common ground on which textual community and a mixed reading practice could be constructed. D. H. Green has urged that we reexamine the assumed cultural barriers between monk and lay person for these very reasons, suggesting instead that from the early fourteenth century onwards the conditions were in place for a much broader, integrated reading society to form.\textsuperscript{34}

Marilyn Oliva’s study of female religious textual community in East Anglia also shows that “The texts owned collectively by the convents and by individual nuns mirror the collections of secular women who were transmitters and patrons of a specific lay piety.” But not only did separate but similar collections closely resemble each other, but exchange between these two literary communities was normal: “They [nuns who traded books between convents and within families and circles of friends] complemented their secular sisters then in the development and spread of vernacular literature by encouraging English translations of prayer books and saints’ lives.”\textsuperscript{35} This was not only the case in female houses. Stratford and

\textsuperscript{34} Dennis Howard Green, "Orality and Reading: The State of Research in Medieval Studies," Speculum 65, no. 2 (1990): 276.
\textsuperscript{35} Marilyn Oliva, The Convent and the Community in Late Medieval England: Female Monasteries in the Diocese of Norwich, 1350-1540 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998), 69-70.
Webber provide the example of Bordesley Abbey, Worcestershire, in the early fourteenth century, a religious house used by lay patrons as a secure repository for their book collections, from which they could retrieve and return volumes as needed. These networks of textual exchange even extended to the lending of conventual and monastic library books, though “only [to] those considered worthy and reliable.” As we have seen in the Introduction and Chapter 1, this “opening out into society in the later middle ages [by monastic culture] led to important devotional networks of religious and lay readers…as important for women as for men.”

1.2 Lay Reading Culture and Literacy

While many scholars rightly contend that medieval reading was almost always an aural, group activity, a reading community of élites including lay and monastic readers of multilingual texts would be consistent with the evidence from Norwich Priory and from East Anglia in general. The region, with Norwich at its centre, was both literate and literary enough to produce active, lay readers—both oral and aural. An examination of local textual culture as well as levels of literacy strongly suggest that there was a flourishing community of multilingual, textually-engaged men and women, lay and religious, who could potentially have been readers of CCC 278. There was also a well-developed culture of book production and exchange—a literary culture—in thirteenth- and early-fourteenth-century East Anglia.


38 Bell, "The Libraries of Religious Houses in the Late Middle Ages," 145.

that would have allowed a lay reading community to engage with the Priory around a trilingual psalter like CCC278.

1.2.1 East Anglian Literary Culture: Production and Exchange

In his study of élite reading habits in late medieval England, Ralph Hanna concludes that English magnatial and gentry libraries show a marked early interest in English scripture, and indicate the multilingual tastes of their owners.\(^{40}\) He further notes the role of London “city magnates” in acquiring manuscripts and forming textual community, demonstrating “cultural acquisitiveness”, and emulation of monastic and aristocratic textual culture.\(^{41}\) These traits are fully present in East Anglia and Norwich as well. Christopher Harper-Bill has remarked on the “lively and varied literary culture” of medieval East Anglia, which encompassed a wide range of literary practices, including the commissioning, translating, reading and exchanging of texts, both Latin and vernacular.\(^{42}\) Similarly, A.S.G. Edwards has observed that “Norfolk was a county that had quite extensive traditions of copying Middle English works from the thirteenth century onwards.”\(^{43}\) East Anglian wealth allowed for a burgeoning market in luxury manuscripts for lay consumption, and it was around this time that an East Anglian school of illumination and decoration arose. Bruce Watson’s analysis of this environment reveals that “traditional feudal duties were often commuted to cash


payments, stimulating the wealth of barons and bishops alike. The increasing taste of these patrons for luxury and worldliness was reflected in the books they commissioned, thus providing an excellent example of how manuscripts can inform our understanding of their contexts—and even embody them.

This efflorescence of East Anglian book production and illumination was particularly strong in Psalter production, resulting in such thirteenth- and early-fourteenth century luxury codices as the Gorleston Psalter, Ormesby Psalter, Luttrell Psalter and the Macclesfield Psalter, to name just a few. This fits the broader pattern of élite engagement in textual culture, also exemplified in late medieval London, and focuses much of that engagement on Psalters. In this respect, the situation in Norwich is a local manifestation of broader trends in lay textual interests.

Beyond the rarified world of luxury Psalters, examples of East Anglia’s strong literary culture include the late-thirteenth-century Bodleian Library MS. Laud. Misc. 108, characterized as “possibly the first substantial collection of verse exclusively in Middle English”, and “a manuscript of considerable historical and cultural importance to the study of early Middle English literature”. The manuscript’s East Anglian associations come

---

45 The shelfmarks of these manuscripts are: British Library Additional MS. 49622 (*Gorleston Psalter*); Oxford, Bodleian MS. Douce 366 (*Ormesby Psalter*); British Library Additional MS. 42130 (*Luttrell Psalter*); Cambridge, Trinity College R.7.3 (*Macclesfield Psalter*).
from both familial names inscribed in the book as well as dialect analysis, but Andrew Taylor expands the association of the book with local vernacular culture, arguing that

“the manuscript appears to have been a purposeful commission from a prosperous, sophisticated, and highly literate patron, with a strong interest in the oral traditions of East Anglia...someone who might have enjoyed courtly or learned texts, and French romances as well as English ones, but who found a particular solace in being inscribed into a fictional commons of East-Anglian ‘good men’.”

Taylor clearly makes the case for books as vehicle for community, for English as a literary and religious language, and for East Anglia as a site for the early production of Middle English texts. The manuscript contains the two earliest extant Middle English romances (*Havelok the Dane* and *King Horn*), but also a number of works of religious literature, including biblical paraphrase (*a Vision of St. Paul*), hagiography (*the earliest version of the South English Legendary*), and lyric poetry (*versified Sayings of St. Bernard*). This East Anglian manuscript is remarkable not only for compiling so many Middle English texts, but for the mix of secular and religious texts in English at such an early date. In the late thirteenth century romances in French were still the norm, and biblical and other religious texts were still overwhelmingly circulated in Latin or French. In its contents and language choice BL MS. Laud. Misc. 108 therefore constitutes a significant innovation, standing out as “a rare early example of a monolingual [English] manuscript” in a thirteenth- and early-

---


49 Andrew Taylor, ""Her Y Spelle": The Evocation of the Minstrel Context in a Hagiographic Context," ibid., 85-86.
fourteenth-century culture where “English was still considered to be an essentially oral medium” and writing in English “a new enterprise”.50

In addition to book production, literary exchange was common in East Anglia, as it was elsewhere. Many books in the collections of religious institutions’ libraries were donated or bequeathed by lay friends or patrons, and vernacular books passed back and forth between the monks or nuns and their lay associates.51 For instance, Bodleian MS. Auctarium D.4.8 is a Latin collection of biblical texts and distinctiones from Norwich Priory library. It dates from the mid- to late-thirteenth century and is inscribed with the name “Magistri Ricardi de felningham” on the terminal flyleaf. Ker cites Blomefield, who identifies this donor to the Priory library as the Norwich bailiff Richard de Felingham,52 providing an example of a learned Latin text being given to the Priory by a lay donor. The Priory library also held a volume of Paterius’ collection of Gregory the Great’s exegetical writings which has inscribed next to the pressmark “Orate pro animabus Galfridi de Forshan et Alicie uxoris eius.”53 This inscription may or may not indicate donation of the book by Galfridus to the Priory, but it does connect a lay couple with close ties to the monastic community to a Priory book, and turns the codex into a memorial to a lay-monastic community based in text and prayer that went beyond the death of the patrons. One final example is the Campsey collection of Anglo-Norman saints lives referred to in the

---

51 Oliva, The Convent and the Community in Late Medieval England: Female Monasteries in the Diocese of Norwich, 1350-1540, 69.
52 Ker, "Medieval Manuscripts from Norwich Cathedral Priory," 14. Ker’s description of the book’s contents is “Biblia”, and the Bodleian’s online manuscript catalogue only provides “Bible” and dates it to 1240-1245. Greatrex provides the additional detail that it included distinctiones and was comparable to standard texts found in other Cathedral Priory libraries. See Greatrex, The English Benedictine Cathedral Priories: Rule and Practice 1270-1420, 116n.
Introduction. Delbert Russell, building on earlier work by Jocelyn Wogen-Browne, lays out a convincing case for this collection to have been devised by a local aristocrat, widow and landowner, Isabel de Warenne, Countess of Arundel, and donated by her to the convent.54

Moving from Suffolk right to the borders of Norwich itself, Carrow Priory was an example of the ambivalent neighbour relationship described by Edmondson. It was a conventual house of nuns and anchoresses who struggled with the Cathedral Priory over land rights, payment of tithes and the administration of assets, but also had many connections of a more positive nature: Carrow was a Benedictine sister house to the Priory, and the location for the consecration of at least one bishop (Walter de Suffield in 1244). It was visited by bishops on a regular basis and was considered the most desirable house to for notable families in the diocese to send their daughters to be educated, or to become nuns.55 The convents of Carrow and Campsey Ash are known to have been nodes in a network of literary production and exchange that also included Norwich Priory. Both houses had libraries to store their book collections and the facility in Anglo-Norman to read them, and some scholars have even suggested, based on archaeological evidence, that a scriptorium once existed at Carrow.56

Many books in conventual collections were donated or bequeathed by lay friends or patrons, and sometimes books donated to the convent passed back to the lay supporter. For instance, Reginald Rous of Dennington bequeathed to the nuns of Campsey Ash “the three best french books which belong to me which they have custody” [i.e. they were already in

56 Oliva, The Convent and the Community in Late Medieval England: Female Monasteries in the Diocese of Norwich, 1350-1540, 67.
possession of them], and further stipulated that a fourth book, which the Campsey nuns already had, should be returned to his [Rous’] son.⁵⁷ A similar bequest was made by a nun of Shouldham, Norfolk, Elizabeth Fincham, who asked that “all her books should be divided between between her daughter Elizabeth and her fellow nuns, and Elizabeth’s brother Simon”, showing the disposition of a personal library to both lay and conventual beneficiaries. Oliva assesses that such bequests paint a picture of active groups of readers (within the convent) “who not only traded books with each other but also with local people.” In addition, the residents of Carrow Priory are known to have bequeathed English books to the Priory.⁵⁸ Carrow and Campsey Ash were communities of readers exchanging texts with other readers inside and outside the convent, with lay and religious contacts alike. Oliva concludes that this is why lay collections of vernacular devotional literature tend to mirror those of conventual houses in East Anglia.⁵⁹ Carrow Priory and Campsey Ash were thus sites of literary exchange between lay and conventual readers who shared social and textual bonds.

These examples of vernacular textual circulation in late-thirteenth- and early-fourteenth-century East Anglia establish that Norwich and its environs were active, even pioneering, areas in late medieval vernacular textual culture. As such, Norwich had a foundation of vernacular readers and textual culture that the Priory could engage with around a book like CCC 278 and which served to create relationships based on texts, literacy, family ties and sociability which crossed whatever lay-convivial boundaries, real or symbolic, may have existed.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 69.
⁵⁹ Oliva, The Convent and the Community in Late Medieval England: Female Monasteries in the Diocese of Norwich, 1350-1540, 69-70.
1.2.2 Literacy

By the early fourteenth century, the time of CCC 278’s production, “England had made the transition from a society whose habits of thought and notions of authority were largely oral and memorial to one based more on the written word, in which the lineaments of power in government were thoroughly literate.” Oliva’s work on reading communities in medieval East Anglia also indicates that “a significant number of women from the middle ranks of medieval society were able to read” which “supports the work of several historians who identify a trend in this later period of increasing literacy among people of middling social status.” We can therefore conclude that not only the élite of society could read in varying degrees, but that this key cultural competency was being acquired by more and more people across the spectrum—or perhaps down the hierarchy—of English society.

Malcolm Parkes’ classic study of literacy in late medieval England describes an ever more complex economy that led to more and more ‘middle class’ individuals with a need to write and read, often in more than one language. He states that “From the 12th century onward...the history of lay literacy is dominated by the steady growth in literacy among the expanding middle class.” What Parkes terms “pragmatic literacy”—the ability to read and write basic or formulaic texts specific to one’s business—“is implicit in the mass of documents that survives from all aspects of mediaeval administration.” He notes that while most writing done by this emerging professional class was Latin, instructions and correspondence received by these lawyers, estate administrators and merchants were likely
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61 Oliva, *The Convent and the Community in Late Medieval England: Female Monasteries in the Diocese of Norwich, 1350-1540*, 70.
63 Ibid.
received in English and French, meaning that they would have had varying degrees of multilingual literacy. Parkes further argues that the pragmatic reader went on to pursue more cultivated cultural pursuits based in the literacy acquired through mundane, business-related reading. “The problem”, he says, “is not whether there were literate laymen, but how far they used this literacy outside their professional activities”, going on to state that “evidence for pragmatic literacy can be linked with other evidence that shows the pragmatic reader becoming progressively more cultivated.” Parkes states that a number of account books that would have been written by this emerging literate class also contain literary texts, sometimes even written in documentary hands, suggesting that they not only read romances or lais, but they copied the texts themselves. Just as the monks of Norwich Priory possessed vernacular literary texts that had little relation to there ‘core business’ of liturgy and lectio divina, so too these reeves, lawyers or traders were branching out from their formulaic professional texts into new realms of leisure reading, which also carried implications related to status and authority, but also sociability. Ralph Hanna’s study of élite readers in late medieval England also suggests that gentry and urban professionals showed “the highest propensity for English texts alongside texts in England’s other two literary languages”, pointing not only to their literacy in English, but also their multilingualism.

Norwich Priory was the biggest landowner and landlord in East Anglia and the biggest employer in Norwich. It would have required the services of high numbers of clerks, bailiffs and other professionals to help manage its vast estates and accounts, and many of the lower élites, (as Hanna has characterized them), with their “intellectual pretensions”,
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64 Ibid., 278-80.
65 Ibid., 278.
66 Ibid., 284.
67 Hanna, "Literature and the Cultural Elites," 112.
68 Tanner, "The Cathedral and the City," 269.
multilingual literacy, and desire “to emulate their betters”,\textsuperscript{69} were likely employed by the Priory. Elizabeth Rutledge’s analysis of medieval documents from Norwich supports the idea of high literacy rates amongst its urban professional class. Her study reveals that the city had an exceptionally high number of literate clerks (\textit{clerici}),\textsuperscript{70} who would have had the capacity to read both vernacular languages and Latin, who often worked under contract for Norwich Cathedral Priory, and who were also property owners. These credentials mark the Norwich \textit{clerici} as urban professionals who not only had the capacity for reading multilingual books, but also had the relative affluence and social status to enter into an exclusive group of readers where exchanges of capital and religious services between Priory and lay participants would have been expected.\textsuperscript{71}

\textbf{1.3 Community Formation}

While the foundations of East Anglian literary culture and literacy allowed lay readers to form a reading community with the monks of the Priory, it is also necessary to contextualize the institution from which CCC 278 emerged and how that institution engaged with, and related to, its lay neighbors.

Throughout the twentieth century, it was a widely held view that late medieval English monasticism was “moribund”\textsuperscript{72} and that “monasteries were no longer central players in the religious and social life of the day.”\textsuperscript{73} However, recent scholarship has revisited some of these assessments and concluded that apparent signs of decay, such as monastic
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participation in vernacular literary culture and increased contact with laity, were actually indicative of a monasticism that was “above all outward-looking”\textsuperscript{74}, showing a “desire to engage with the world outside the cloister”\textsuperscript{75}, according to Martin Heale. The brief examination of Norwich Priory’s library has already shown a monastic interest in vernacular texts, and the tendency for the monks to live and worship in close proximity with the laity of Norwich is easily demonstrated. There was a highly integrated relationship between the Priory and the town that provided the regular social and religious contact that could pave the way for community to be formed—or possibly renewed—after a century of conflict.

1.3.1 Town and Priory

Like other monastic precincts, Norwich Priory’s precinct was enclosed by a wall, delineating sacred space from the secular town that surrounded it. The Priory’s position within the city has been characterized in typical medieval rhetorical style as “the hill of the Lord next to the garrison of the Philistines.”\textsuperscript{76} Norman Tanner, describing the attitude of this monastic institution—in theory eschatologically-oriented and separated from the world—states that “the cathedral Priory performed a wide range of religious, social, economic, charitable and educational roles in Norwich”…forming a “quite outward-looking institution, one that was active in the city.”\textsuperscript{77} The border between monastery and town—physical and otherwise—was as much symbolic as it was functional, as there was continual communication and contact between the townspeople and the monks. They were neighbors who worked and worshipped together, but were also occasionally drawn into conflict, the
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great fire of 1272 being the primary example. The Cathedral Priory was therefore both separate and integrated—a community within a community, and a sub-community within the wider religious field of late medieval Norwich.

Under the English Priory model, the monks served an urban cathedral church. This meant that there was continual exposure to lay participants in the various liturgical and other events hosted in the church, and the early-fourteenth-century visitation records of Bishop Salmon reflect some of the problematic aspects of lay presence in the church. He notes that there were “many gatherings of the common people for various causes” and also “frequent access of the nobles”,78 who we must interpret as the cultural and political élite of Norwich society. Salmon was also observes that “there were too many lay people crowding into the Lady Chapel for mass”,79 signaling that access of a range of laity to the cathedral church was so common and voluminous that it was disruptive to the liturgical work of the monks. Joan Greatrex notes that at “certain festivals in the liturgical year townspeople thronged the monastic/cathedral church nave”,80 and obedientiary accounts and episcopal registers record that “monks preached in the cathedral on greater festivals and solemnities when the laity would have been well represented.”81

There are a number of specific examples of lay activity within the cathedral church. Norwich cathedral was a pilgrimage center centered around the tomb of the child martyr

81 The English Benedictine Cathedral Priories: Rule and Practice 1270-1420, 279.
William, though in the mid-fourteenth century, we are told, William’s body had to be moved to a new location, away from the high altar of the cathedral, because pilgrims were continually interrupting the monks’ services. Lay guilds used the Cathedral Priory church for meetings and annual liturgical celebrations, and the guild of St. George maintained a chantry priest in the cathedral. The Priory also hosted the meetings of the town’s aldermen, administered two schools for local children as well as a liberal arts school, local lay notables gathered in the Priory for synod, and there was continuous interchange between local aristocracy and gentry whose sons had entered the monastery. Many of these local notables also funded the many private altars within the Church and became (or continued to be) benefactors to the Priory.

Lay-monastic interaction within the precincts was not confined to the cathedral church. Norwich’s most wealthy and influential citizens—of the same sophistication and social rank posited as patrons of Bodleian MS Laud Misc. 108—are also known to have performed penance in the cloisters, being whipped for their transgressions, revealing the deep penetration of the laity into what might have been assumed to be purely monastic space. In addition, the Priory’s more distinguished guests were permitted by the monks to stay in the
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‘inner hostelry’, which was “close to the prior’s dwelling” (at the centre of the precinct), while less distinguished guests were in the ‘outer hostelry’, near the almonry gate (near the outer walls).\textsuperscript{89} In addition, Norwich Priory and other conventual houses hosted corrodians, lay persons who paid to stay at monasteries or convents over the long term.\textsuperscript{90}

When we consider the degree of interaction of the laity with the monks, we see that the Priory’s precincts were less of a remote ‘desert’ or secluded ‘hill of the Lord’, and more of a shared community space based on liturgy, education and sociability. As some boundaries were crossed, new ones in the form of social distinction and new communal identities— which both included and excluded—were formed. These instances of mixed liturgical and extra-liturgical activity were new sites where various forms of capital could be exchanged between lay and religious.

Throughout late medieval England, the prayers of the monks were offered for lay donors in exchange for their material support of the Priory, an economy which has been described as the most prevalent form of lay-monastic border-crossing of the late middle ages,\textsuperscript{91} and Norwich Priory had many benefactors amongst the laity. Wills from this period show that while many citizens left bequests to the friaries and parish churches, many also left money, land and other assets to the Cathedral Priory, which some specifically referred to in their wills as “my mother church”.\textsuperscript{92} Brian Golding’s work on monastic-lay relationships focused on prayer and benefaction puts all of these forms of exchange into perspective:
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while “prayer was the cement of community, binding all together”—which donors often desired in perpetuity—“in such transactions there was always a counter-gift, a reciprocity in the relationship” consisting in “acts of conspicuous charity” that sometimes involved “one-off cash payments or rents”, as well as other media of exchange.  

He lists numerous examples of arrangements between lay benefactors and monasteries in late medieval England that make it abundantly clear that while there was the desire on both the donor’s and monastery’s part to do good, there came with it expectations of a mutually enriching deal as part of a “seamless web of spiritual exchange.”

However, as we have seen, relations between lay and Priory communities were not always cooperative. Most notably, the great fire of June 1272, which has been described as “one of the most violent assaults on a religious institution in medieval England”, was the result of an angry mob laying siege to the monastery for three days. The *Historia Anglicana* of Norwich monk Bartholomew Cotton records that townspeople killed sub-deacons and lay people inside the monastic precinct, and looted the “sacred vessels, books, gold and silver and everything the fire had spared.” This resulted in King Henry III personally travelling to Norwich to intervene and mete out severe justice in September 1272, when several of the attackers were hanged and burned. In addition, the king not only upheld the Priory’s royal privileges that had so enraged the citizens, but fined the city £2000, an enormous sum.

Amongst the powers that caused friction were those invested in the ecclesiastical courts, which were accused throughout England of extorting far greater payments from the
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people than any lay court. The people of Norwich were amongst the loudest complainants against this practice. But even after the promulgation of the royal decree *Circumspecte Agatis*, which was intended to limit the abuses, the people of Norwich continued to petition the crown for further action, claiming the edict had not gone far enough.\(^98\) Despite the townspeople’s dissatisfaction with the Priory’s powers and privileges, and the competing alternatives offered by other religious institutions, the Priory continued to be viewed by many—including by local lay magnates—as the centre of spiritual authority and prestige in Norwich, and so continued to attract worshippers, child and adult oblates, students, and donors. That is, despite the many difficulties between the citizenry and the monks, the townspeople continued to enter into relationships of support, exchange, spiritual mediation and community. In fact, there were likely many who looked to the Priory monks, and their devotional and textual practices, as even worthy of emulation.

1.3.2 Lay Emulation of Monastic Practices

Priory monks and lay benefactors had similarly eschatological outlooks, and the tendency of many lay benefactors to specify burial within the monastery in exchange for substantial donations of land or money was common: “if he [the lay donor] died his body should be received for burial *as for one of the brethren*” (italics added).\(^99\) This indicates that lay benefactors, and likely others, wished to emulate monastic practice—in death as well as in life. This imitative practice was recorded at Norwich Priory where major donors such as John Berney and his wife were buried in the cathedral’s St. Anne chapel. He was a local

---


merchant who was also a steward of the Priory. Further, the Cathedral Priory’s precincts included a lay cemetery adjacent to the west doors of the church, just beyond the preaching yard—the cemetery no doubt doubling as a burial ground for patrons and a reminder of each soul’s ultimate disposition as they listened to the homily or left the church after mass.

Strong ties with local laity, on whom they depended for support, was a hallmark of late medieval Benedictine culture, and local laity “emulated monastic virtues and participated in the liturgies and prayers provided by the religious” in a broad system of exchange and mutual benefit between these co-dependent communities. For example, many lay people with the required status and capacity to enrich the monastery entered the monastery later in life or pledged their children to the monastery as oblates, and high-status women emulated monastic devotional practice, often through the reading and praying of the Offices and the Psalms, and CCC 278’s monastically-structured Psalter could have served this purpose. More self-reflexive devotional practices that arose in the thirteenth century are reflected in manuscript illuminations, in which laity are pictured engaging in the devotional practices of male monastic communities. Alexa Sand states that “owners depicted in thirteenth-century books come from across the spectrum of the bookish class—they represent men and women in and out of monastic orders” who “struggled to reconcile…their secular lives with the institutionalized imperative (and perhaps their individual desires) to perform an exemplary devotional life.”

---
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1.4 Conclusion

Literary and spiritual networks of exchange, often incorporating the collecting and sharing of books, brought people from across the social spectrum together into community. These networks of exchange between the laity and religious of East Anglia crossed symbolic boundaries, which included the precinct walls, the division between cathedral church and cloister, and the seemingly imaginary boundary between Latin and vernacular texts. It is therefore plausible that these exchanges of economic and cultural capital—which included books—were themselves a vehicle to bring readers into community, providing not only the edification and spiritual benefit that came with reading and explicating the Psalms, but also other more pragmatic benefits that might be gained through these exchanges and mediations, such as status and authority. As the Introduction showed, there was no more common textual basis for a mixed community of readers than the Psalter. While the fire of 1272 represents the height of conflict between the Priory and town, Tanner observes that the fourteenth century “was a time of relative quiet, due in part to an agreement reached between the two parties in 1306”, which would have been around the same time that CCC 278 was produced.103 Wendy Scase has contended that examples of “bespoke book production” went beyond the desire to build libraries of standard texts, and instead often betrayed a patron’s or buyer’s desire to directly address “local interests and agendas.”104 In this respect, it is tempting to see in CCC 278 a connection to the reconciliation of town and Priory in 1306, an unusual Psalter in which the most well-known text in medieval culture was available in the three most common languages of both the laity and monks of Norwich.

103 Tanner, "The Cathedral and the City," 262.
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Having established the foundations and impetus for such community, I will in Chapter 2 show how the book itself, an objectified form of cultural capital, worked to mediate languages and authority, and how multiple Psalters and languages were integrated into a complex whole that at once drew the community together, but also established hierarchical relationships that shaped the reading of the book and the relationship between laity and Priory.
CHAPTER TWO


2.0 Introduction and Outline

Roger Chartier, in *The Order of Books*, states that “The book always aims at installing an order” and so “keen attention should be paid to the technical, visual, and physical devices that organize the reading of...a book.”¹ In this chapter I will first consider those aspects of the manuscript that are not the texts themselves, but which nevertheless have a significant influence on how its community of readers engaged with it. The manuscript’s language choices, layout, codicology and bibliographic coding are all what Gérard Genette has broadly identified as paratext, “the means by which a text makes a book of itself and proposes itself to its readers.” He further specifies that “the paratext is always the bearer of an authorial commentary” and “constitutes...a zone not just of transition, but of transaction”.² Paratext is therefore a ‘rhetoric of the page’ that surrounds and influences the text and “in reality, controls the whole reading.”³

From Genette and Chartier we understand that there is intention behind those aspects of a book that are not the text itself, and that paratext constitutes a transitional function that enables a reader to make their way through the book in a particular way—for instance, the transition between the languages of a trilingual manuscript or between the liturgical divisions of a Psalter. This ‘way of reading’, or *ordinatio*, that paratext engenders is, according to

¹ Chartier, *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, viii-ix.
³ Ibid.
Genette and Chartier, not simply a set of helpful guideposts for readers, but also constitutes a form of authorial control as it engenders a specific and intended reception on the part of the reader. In the case of the Psalters of CCC 278, the ‘author’ must be understood as the Priory, and so it is an institutional authority that is woven into the book, whose overall design, incorporating language choice, bibliographic coding and layout, was innovative and purposeful.4

This chapter will consider how this manuscript’s paratext creates and organizes the manuscript’s communities of languages and texts—that is, how it arranges and constructs relationships between textual entities, thereby mediating the textual exchange between the institutional author and the readers. Mediation is the act of interceding or brokering a relationship between parties;5 it involves exchange and transaction, and calls to mind the themes of community formation and neighboring because it requires collaboration between participants. The Priory’s innovative approach to vernacular scripture and liturgical texts, as revealed in the paratext, constitutes not just an ordering, but a re-ordering of traditional linguistic hierarchies to which people and institutions were attached. The impact of the Priory’s configuring of the manuscript therefore goes beyond language relationships on the page in an attempt to reorient the linguistic, social, religious and textual sub-communities of Norwich. An examination of paratextual elements opens up new views on the relationships between languages, institutions and texts, suggesting that the monastery produced a

4 Ibid., 266. Genette makes this point clear: “The addresser of the paratextual message…is not necessarily the person who actually wrote it, whose identity matters little to us”, noting that besides a strictly authorial paratext there can also be an editorial paratext imposed, in a modern context, by a publisher. I will use the term institutional paratext in reference to the shaping of the book by the Priory so that it might achieve a specific purpose.

manuscript that was designed to mediate the Latin Psalter for non-Latinate readers or 
auditors who were part of a Priory-based reading community that brought together both lay 
and monastic readers, and both Latinate and vernacular texts.

Chapter 2 will include a brief outline of the sociolinguistic roles of the three 
languages in order to understand which communities used which language(s) and in what 
contexts, followed by an analysis of how language choice is integrated into the manuscript’s 
mise-en-page and codicology (2.1). I will then turn to the question of the Priory’s act of 
vernacular making whose paratext, in the form of mise-en-page and decoration, mediated the 
reading experience (2.2), before examining how the Latin language and the Priory both 
functioned as authorizing and authoritative elements in the reading of this ostensibly 
vernacular psalter book (2.3).

2.1 Language: Multilingualism in Late Medieval England

Perhaps the most conspicuous feature of CCC 278 is its multilingualism and 
ostentatious vernacularity. There are three Psalters in the three languages of late medieval 
England that could have brought lay and monastic communities together to read (or hear) the 
Psalter. England at this time has been described by Robert M. Stein as “a polyglot milieu”6 
and by Christopher Baswell as a “very complex and shifting linguistic situation”.7 Late-
thirteenth- and early-fourteenth-century England was a truly multilingual society in which 
English, French and Latin co-existed, performing particular cultural and social functions 
alongside each other, while also competing for importance and status. They were 
continuously interacting and influencing each other, and both manuscripts and administrative
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records from the period make it clear that multilingualism was the norm in educated society.\footnote{8 While almost all levels of late medieval English society would have been functionally bilingual or multilingual—acknowledging wide variations in competence—this thesis is concerned primarily with those who were educated, functionally literate and who would have been, roughly, social equals with the monks of the Priory.}

Thorlac Turville-Peter, in his study of trilingual miscellanies from western England, states that in the early fourteenth century the reality was a “symbiotic relationship” between the languages of England, concluding that there were “not three cultures [according to language division], but one culture in three voices.”\footnote{9 Thorlac Turville-Peter, \textit{England the Nation: Language, Literature, and National Identity, 1290-1340} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 181.} Similarly, Laura Wright notes that “it is easier…to find macaronic documents from the late medieval period in the Records Offices than it is to find monolingual texts.”\footnote{10 Quoted in William Rothwell, "The Trilingual England of Geoffrey Chaucer," \textit{Studies in the Age of Chaucer} 16 (1994): 50.}

2.1.1 Sociolinguistics and Status

In late medieval England, Latin signified authority, learning and theological tradition, and possessed a symbolic identity as the linguistic “common ground” of the Christian community.\footnote{11 Oliva, \textit{The Convent and the Community in Late Medieval England: Female Monasteries in the Diocese of Norwich, 1350-1540}.} It was the language of the church, monasticism, and scholastic discourse, and it had a near-monopoly as the biblical language in western Christendom, with many examples of medieval commentators expressing grave doubts as to whether any language besides Latin could be ritually or spiritually efficacious. Susan Crane observes that a “symbolic bifurcation” existed that aligned male political élites with Latin whether they could understand it or not, while female élites were aligned with Anglo-Norman.\footnote{12 Susan Crane, "Social Aspects of Bilingualism in the Thirteenth Century," in \textit{Thirteenth Century England}, ed. Michael Prestwich, R. H. Britnell, and Robin Frame (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1997), 106.} Anglo-
Norman was considered the language of aristocratic authenticity, literary prestige, and a language of legal and commercial record, though it was increasingly seen as an artificial ‘learned’ language, similar to Latin. However, as scholars such as Nicholas Watson and Christopher Cannon have observed, Anglo-Norman was the “birth-tongue for only a few people” even by the early thirteenth century. This combination of high status and low popular usage created a form of “social closure or exclusion”, a “hierarchizing” force in medieval English culture. Its status as both a literary and ‘prestige’ language situated between Latin and English is illustrated by the description of French as “nun’s Latin”, so-called because it was the textual language of élite, educated religious women in England who may not have been educated in Latin, but who preferred texts in French. Anglo-Norman was a social and literary marker to such a degree that Susan Crane has posited that “it is less a linguistic than a political and geographic designation” which created “distinction between rulers and ruled” through its hierarchizing function.

Cannon’s and others’ assertions that French was spoken by only the most rarified level of society is not to say that French was not in use in other ways throughout fourteenth century England. William Rothwell reminds us that “The enduring importance of French in England was not as a spoken dialect but as a written language of record…The literate classes
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used it right up to Chaucer’s time and beyond to preserve masses of important documents for posterity”, adding that it “was one of the languages of England available for use as need dictated.” This reinforces the idea that languages had particular functions and that French continued to be used as a written language up to and beyond the time of CCC 278’s compilation.

Of specific interest to this thesis, Anglo-Norman was the language of vernacular biblical paraphrase in England starting in the twelfth century and continuing through the thirteenth- and early-fourteenth centuries, and the *Oxford Psalter* is a perfect example of this. French was therefore a language that could span religious and educated lay readerships, and the networks of textual exchange described in Chapter 1 show this to be the case: manuscripts from Norwich Priory library contemporary with CCC 278 that contain Anglo-Norman texts (identified here in brackets) include Cambridge University Library MS. Ee.6.11 (*St. Patrick’s Purgatory, Life of St. Margaret*), Cambridge Trinity College MS. R.14.7 (*Rule for Nuns*) and BL Arundel MS. 292 (*Distichs of Cato*).

The English language, in all its dialects, was almost every English person’s mother tongue and the language that, to many vernacular authors of the fourteenth century, represented the principal of universal access to scripture and clarity of understanding for English people. While English had been a language of literature and even biblical translation in the Anglo-Saxon era, the Norman Conquest had systematically suppressed and dismantled English literary culture, relegating it to the language of the peasant, the
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conquered and the uneducated. The relative lack of historiated English-language manuscripts from the turn of the fourteenth century is an especially telling indicator. Where English-language text and image are directly paired, as in the *Holkham Bible Picture Book*, the effect is to highlight not the emergence of English’s growing status, but the ongoing prestige of Latin and French, as the illustrations paired with English texts are reserved for pictures of rustic shepherds, or for the obscene speech of beggars. In his analysis of the relationship of English text to manuscript illustration, Richard K. Emmerson writes, “To borrow Pierre Bourdieu’s terms, the outlay of economic capital necessary to illustrate an English text required the language to gain enough cultural capital that owning such a manuscript would add appreciably to the patron’s symbolic capital,” which at the beginning of the fourteenth century it did not.

Apart from the realm of luxury or illustrated manuscripts, the period around 1300, the time of CCC 278’s production, saw English religious texts beginning to be produced more regularly and “the position of English writing within this trilingual literary culture became much more important.” This view is supported by M. T. Clanchy’s observation that around this time the hegemony of French as the preferred literary vernacular of England was beginning to erode, and there appears to have been a renewed confidence in English as a literary and religious language. Susan Crane also notes “the ascendancy of English [as a
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literary language] around 1300" and argues that “English and French each have some claim to be the dominant language in the thirteenth century”.

Works like *Cursor Mundi, Ancrene Wisse, The Prik of Conscience* and *The Northern Homily Cycle*, all dating from this time and all surviving in multiple manuscripts, demonstrate not only that English-language works of religious literature had become popular, but more specifically that English society was once again accepting and encouraging of religious texts being presented in English. Several works of Middle English religious literature that fall into the broad category of biblical paraphrase begin with prefaces that explain the need for instructional or edifying texts in the native tongue of England so more people can achieve a basic understanding of God and His creation. These texts constitute a challenge to French as the predominant language of biblical paraphrase in England. *Cursor Mundi*, like other similar works of the early- to mid-fourteenth century, explains that “Gif we ilkane thaire langage / Me thik then we do nane outrage” (If we give everyone [the text] in their own language, it seems to me we do them no harm); and, “Þis ilk bok es translate into Inglis tong …for the commun at understand”. Thus the *Cursor*’s Prologue (another paratextual element which shapes the reading of the text) allays any concerns the reader might have had with reading biblical paraphrase in the vernacular, and encourages them to read for understanding in their mother tongue. The growing popularity of English as a textual, and specifically religious, language bases its
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validity on understanding and universal access instead of Anglo-Norman’s claim of
distinction and exclusion. In this sense, English was an appropriate vehicle for creating a
broader cultural and religious community—one of openness vs. closure, access vs. status.

However, a more difficult question remained: could English be liturgical or
scriptural? Annie Sutherland cites the author of the late-fourteenth-century *Chastising of
God’s Children*, a Carthusian who is accepting of religious texts composed in English for
understanding, but who does not accept that penance in any other language than Latin is
spiritually efficacious. None other than Thomas Aquinas also argued for the religious
hegemony of Latin, not caring whether a priest understood the Latin he recited—the spiritual
power was in the language and correctness of the recitation and performance, which amounts
to pure ritual with no requirement for comprehension.

These issues related to the status of languages within the multilingual culture of late
medieval England, and the efficacy of language in the ecclesiastical and liturgical context,
need to be further examined in order to understand how the three Psalters of CCC 278
worked together—and competed against one another. If, as Turville-Petre and Machan have
argued, England was a truly multilingual culture where languages were read as much in
combination with each other as individually, then the linguistic program of CCC 278 should
be examined from the perspective of the relationships between languages which create
meaning in new ways—the deliberate structuring and ordering of linguistic relationships
within the manuscript are a powerful element of its paratext.
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2.1.2 Henry III’s English Letters

Tim-William Machan has observed that “language serves as one of the mediations of larger spiritual or social differences” within a community, and language choice in the context of the *MEMP* has clearly been identified in this chapter as a key paratextual element that shapes an audience’s reception of, and response to, a text. In the first chapter of Machan’s book, *Middle English*, he examines two English letters drafted by Henry III’s chancery in 1258, which were copied and sent out to every county in England, announcing his intention to uphold the Provisions of Oxford.\textsuperscript{34} If the *MEMP*s of the early fourteenth century were innovative deployments of English in the scriptural realm, then Henry III’s English letters were an even earlier and more surprising emergence of English into a different domain of power from which it had hitherto been excluded. Henry’s letters also responded to some of the same issues as early English scripture did, most notably the idea that English allows for universal understanding of, and access to, an important text. A brief examination of these early Middle English political letters and their institutional origins can help us to understand the inclusion of an English Psalter in CCC 278, and illuminate the *political* power of early English texts, separate from their theological implications.

For Machan, the letters are particularly interesting as an early and largely unexplained use of English as a language of power and authority: “no other general legal and administrative proclamations in English are extant until Henry’s letters, and no such proclamations survive again until early in the fifteenth century.”\textsuperscript{35} Machan argues that the emergence of English as a documentary language in the context of thirteenth-century English
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\textsuperscript{34} The Provisions of Oxford of 1258 were a constitution-like agreement between Henry III and a powerful group of English barons, which placed Henry under the authority of a council and had other wide-ranging implications for the power of the king and governance of England.

kingship must be interpreted not according to any grand arc of English’s ineluctable rise, or of a burgeoning English national consciousness, but in a much more pragmatic, local, and historicized way. Through a meticulous process of contextualizing and historicizing, he reinterprets these “aberrations in medieval English documentary practice” as instruments by which Henry III reached out to and influenced not the ‘nation of England’, but a particular coalition of barons that he needed to win over at a particular moment in time. In a textual act strikingly similar, I would argue, to the Priory’s production of the MEMP, Henry appropriated and integrated the English language into his official symbolic repertoire—into his institutional toolkit of symbolic resources—for the purpose of communicating with a key constituency, in order to bring it into community.

What makes Henry’s English letters even more interesting for our understanding of the MEMP of CCC 278, is that they emerged out of, and remained integrated with, a multilingual and conservative institutional context. First, as Machan states, “the original documents were quite clearly composed in French”, the language of aristocratic, court, and documentary culture, and then translated into English, the barons’ mother tongue, as well as Latin. Thus, English could represent or stand in for an authoritative text from another, higher-status language.

The English letters worked closely with French in another way that was key to Henry’s success: the use of English by Henry not only created a connection with the English-speaking barons, but created difference between Henry and those who were contesting his leadership on their platform of eliminating undue foreign (i.e. French)
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influence in the affairs of England. In one shrewd linguistic gesture, however, Henry III repositioned himself in a hostile political field as one who was ‘more English’ than his nativist adversaries. Machan argues that because English in the mid-thirteenth century “lacked connection with dominant institutions” and had such low status in the political realm, it “linguistically mediated the dislocation of itself and its speakers”, making a deep and immediate connection with those barons who had felt alienated due the perceived dominance of French language and culture in English political life.\(^{39}\)

Henry’s letters were effective because they mediated the grievances and cultural aspirations of disaffected magnates by literally and symbolically exchanging French for English in an act of bureaucratic and cultural *translatio*. In the minds of the target audience, King Henry III spoke to them in English, and the public proclamation (i.e., reading) of the English letters in every shire by the sheriffs would have made a significant impression not just on the barons, but on all those who would support them over the coming months and years of struggle. Machan notes that Henry’s letters made use of Anglo-Saxonisms, much like the *MEMP*, mediating not only contemporary frustrations with the place of English in society, but also mediating the historically much higher status of English language and culture from the pre-Norman past. Thus language choice accomplished much more through its mediating and symbolic power than simply translating a message from one language to another. Language as paratext opened up new rhetorical possibilities for Henry, which contributed to his retention of power. There are many parallels between Henry’s deployment of the English letters to the barony and the Priory’s inclusion of an English Psalter in CCC 278: both are early and surprising inclusions of English texts in realms of discourse dominated by Latin or French, in which English could only stand in for another language as

\(^{39}\) Ibid., 36.
a translation closely-tied to its authoritative and authorizing original. Furthermore, English, far from being the language of rebellion or revolution, was shrewdly deployed by conservative and powerful institutions for the maintenance of their status within their respective fields.

2.1.3 Language Relationships

The relationships between the languages within this codex are the clearest illustration of neighboring, innovation and the embodiment of community. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, among others, has urged that “we [ought to] start exploring the ways in which the French of England and the English of England, as well as the Latin of England, affect each other…so that the interrelations and not just the co-presence of language and texts are addressed.”

Tim-William Machan echoes this by stating that what is at stake in the study of the sociolinguistic significance of languages is not only social status and the discursive traditions they supported, but also the recognition that “languages and speakers co-exist not randomly but in a structured repertoire of learned relationships.”

Over the course of the last century the scholarship on late-medieval English multilingualism has evolved from seeing Latin as an exclusively clerical purview with English and Anglo-Norman locked in a mortal struggle for supremacy amongst the laity, to
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42 Tim William Machan, "French, English, and the Late Medieval Linguistic Repertoire," in *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England C.1100-C.1500*, ed. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2009), 363. Also, linguistic transference happened between generations of people, not just between languages. Marilyn Oliva cites William Rothwell’s observations that French was very quickly assimilated into English; they not only coexisted, but merged to a large degree: “the assimilation of Anglo-Norman into English meant that what was French to one generation may have seemed English to the next.” See Marilyn Oliva, "The
a more nuanced and fluid model of exchange and transference. Machan and others have discussed how macaronic texts are evidence of these ‘structured repertoire of learned relationships’: languages ‘fit’ together in meaningful ways within specific discursive contexts (such as the preaching of sermons or gospel paraphrases), and compliment each other to create new modes of mediating sacred truths. In this structured, strategic linguistic milieu, Latin did not lose prestige, but its collocation with, and authorization of, vernacular languages highlighted its elevated status.

Since Latin was the official and divinely-sanctioned language of scripture and liturgy, it carried an authority that no vernacular could attain to in the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries. As a result, there are numerous examples of vernacular literary and religious texts incorporating Latin into their designs because it served an authorizing function, bestowing legitimacy and authority on the vernacular. Kathryn Kerby-Fulton has pointed to the Latin annotations in Chaucer manuscripts which simply repeat in Latin what Chaucer’s narrator says in Middle English, which she argues “casts it [Chaucer’s text] in a sober tone…in a more authoritative language.”

Similarly, Christopher Baswell argues that in the Ellesmere manuscript (c. 1400) the scribe uses Latin in the mise-en-page “as a form of authenticating language that lays implicit claims for the prestige and canonicity of the English text it accompanies.” A. J. Fletcher’s study of macaronic sermons from late medieval England concludes that macaronic multilingualism constitutes “a strategic spoken register” in which the preacher communicates his message in the language of his audience (e.g. English), but
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peppers his message with Latin to imbue both his message and himself with clerkly authority, like Chaucer’s pardoner. Finally, even the East Anglian manuscript Bodleian MS Laud Misc. 108, which is often held up as the first unilingual Middle English manuscript of the post-Conquest era, has several instances of Anglo-Norman incipits and Latin headers to authorize texts and guide readers, betraying the fact that consciously English manuscripts still expected multilingual readers in order for its authorizing apparatus to function properly. This reveals a fascinating tension within the book’s order: the ambitious and innovative prominence of English is both assisted and undermined by the very languages which English seeks to overcome. These are examples of how languages that are sometimes interpreted as being in contest were instead consciously collocated by a book’s compilers into cooperative relationships, complimenting and highlighting each other to achieve a desired effect.

It is this inter-lingual cooperation that is one of the most interesting and innovative features of CCC 278—like the paired texts in so many multilingual miscellanies that do not collocate word-by-word translations side-by-side, but juxtapose different versions of the same text in different languages. An examination of late medieval miscellanies reveals many examples of the pairing of Latin and vernacular texts, establishing dynamic and transactional relationships between similar texts in different languages.

46 Bell and Couch, "Introduction: Reading Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms Laud Misc 108 as a "Whole Book"," 4.
47 The phrase “the contested status of Latin” is used widely in scholarship on Middle English literature, including by Sutherland in her “English Psalms in the Middle Ages”, p. 76.
48 Scahill, "Trilingualism in Early Middle English Miscellanies: Languages and Literature," passim.
2.1.4 English and Latin in Community

Languages in collaborative relationships could authorize and even stand in for each other only under specific circumstances. In her study of Middle English Psalters, Annie Sutherland observes that there are no complete English Psalters from the fourteenth century that are not accompanied by the Vulgate text in some form. In CCC 278, both the English and French Psalters are accompanied by Latin *incipits* and headers which mark the beginning of each Psalm and verse. They are fragments of the Vulgate Psalter closely aligned to the vernacular text, functioning as source text, gloss and guidepost for the monastic reader, authorizing the vernacular, and allowing multilingual readers to work in two languages at once (vernacular and Latin), if they had the facility to do so.

In the realm of scriptural texts, and religious texts more broadly, a number of scholars have observed that vernacular languages are “in constant and critical dialogue” with Latin theological culture, and that “vernacular literature can only properly be understood within the wider context of Latin literature.” John Scahill echoes this, noting that in multilingual miscellanies of the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, English is “frequently attached to Latin in some way” and that “in some cases at least the primary aim was not the provision of an actual translation but the validating of a vernacular text with a Latin one.” While some scholars like Ralph Hanna have described the relationship
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49 Sutherland, "English Psalms in the Middle Ages," 78.
50 These headers are also *incipits*, but are longer and generally less abbreviated, and are incorporated into the body of the *MEMP*.
53 Scahill, "Trilingualism in Early Middle English Miscellanies: Languages and Literature," 22.
between English and Latin as “imitative” and generally derivative, others like Bernard McGinn have taken a much more positive view, suggesting that “the explosion of religious writing in the vernacular…was a complex and still inadequately studied creation of new theological possibilities.” Even though to many medieval theologians the multiplicity of extant languages was a reminder of humanity’s fallen state and the subsequent confusio linguarum associated with the Tower of Babel, multilingualism nevertheless “provided sociolinguistic opportunities for exegesis, literary composition, and cultural practice”—“activities that make social interaction possible in any society.”

An extreme example of this phenomenon of multilingual pairings in the same manuscript may be Cambridge Trinity College MS. B.14.39, which contains 21 pairs of corresponding texts, many in English and Latin, according to Scahill. While many are only “brief sententiae”, they are nevertheless discreet religious texts arranged in structured pairs, likely for use by a clerical owner for the teaching of laity. Another example is Arundel 292 from Norwich Priory, in which a thirteenth-century English Bestiary is collocated and juxtaposed with Odo of Cheriton’s Animal Fables in Latin, which were also intended for lay teaching by clergy, a pedagogical dynamic that I will posit as the most likely scenario for CCC 278’s pairings of vernacular and Latin Psalters. We can look at CCC 278 through this lens of pairing—of intentional neighboring of texts; identical, abbreviated Latin Psalters are paired with each vernacular Psalter, each pair running through the entire cursus of
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57 Scahill, "Trilingualism in Early Middle English Miscellanies: Languages and Literature," 19.
Psalms in lockstep. It is only through an examination of the manuscript’s layout, structure and decoration that we can further understand how the languages of this trilingual book worked together in three potential pairings (English-French; English-Latin; French-Latin), as a community of Psalters that both reinforced and challenged notions of the English language’s status at the beginning of the fourteenth century.\footnote{It may be possible to conceive of CCC278 is a very narrowly-focused miscellany—a multilingual collection of psalters. However, the unique relationship between the three languages and texts formed by its layout, decoration and \textit{mise-en-page} suggest that it goes beyond the category of miscellany.}

### 2.2 Form

In addition to the paratextual elements of language choice and arrangement, the manuscript’s unique collection of formal elements also shapes the reading. It is the texts’ structures and decorative programs that guide the reader through the text in a specific way. Eyal Poleg, discussing paratext directly in relation to medieval manuscript culture, echoes the views of Chartier and Genette when he states that “Subtle modifications of ink and script, titles and rubrics, reflected specific books’ origins or use, and presented readers with subtle means of interpretation.”\footnote{Poleg, \textit{Approaching the Bible in Medieval England}, 129.} These aspects of the manuscript’s paratext are what Machan refers to as “bibliographic codes”, and they mediated the reading experience as much as language choice and language combination did.\footnote{Machan, "The Visual Pragmatics of Code-Switching in Late Middle English Literature," 305.} The dynamic sense of mediation—of moving back and forth between things—indicates that paratextual elements like bibliographic coding are not just inert guideposts for readers, but enable a more lively experience for readers and explicators in the context of private or multilingual group reading scenarios.
Scahill, discussing the changing place of English in trilingual miscellanies of the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, observes that much about these manuscripts “can be explained by the position of written English”. The most striking feature of CCC 278’s contents is the presence, in a monastic production of the early fourteenth century, of two complete vernacular Psalters, and the primary position of the English text. In almost all respects the Middle English and Anglo-Norman texts are ‘uncanny doubles’ of each other, the complete English text occupying folia 1r to 90r and the French text 91r to 147r (Figs. 3 and 4). The result is that the two vernacular Psalters are kept completely separate from each other, neighbors within the codex—collocated but with no direct contact. CCC 278’s idiosyncratic layout is in stark contrast with the more common practices of placing biblical source texts and related translations or versions in a side-by-side arrangement (i.e. facing columns) for direct comparison, or providing the primary biblical text (usually in Latin) with a running interlinear translation, often in a smaller script, below. Instead, CCC 278’s English and French Psalters are separated by the completely blank f. 90v, what Elizabeth Solopova has described in the context of other late medieval Psalters as a meaningful and intentional “codicological boundar[y]”.

This element of the manuscript’s design has several important implications for our understanding of the relationships between these linguistic, textual and codicological neighbors, and for what this conveys about the attitudes of the Norwich monks to their engagement with the broader community. First, because the English and French texts are essentially mirror images of each other, we can conclude that the Priory saw vernacular languages as interchangeable in terms of their capacities as biblical languages and
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understood them to be on the same level. While order should not be interpreted as a sign of importance in all manuscripts due to the possibility of texts added at later dates, CCC 278’s two Psalters were produced at the same time for the same book—their nearly identical script, layout and decoration show that they were intentionally collocated in their present order. However, in contrast with so much of the received wisdom regarding the elevated socio-linguistic and literary status of Anglo-Norman French in the early fourteenth century, the Priory appears to have privileged the English over the French by positioning it first in the codex.

Another unusual aspect of CCC278’s design is that while most medieval Psalters were accompanied by ancillary texts such as calendars, lectionaries, creeds and canticles, this manuscript has none; this is what makes it so obviously different from the other five extant MEMPs and from the vast majority of medieval Psalter manuscripts. Each of CCC 278’s vernacular Psalters stands alone, save for its Latin apparatus, consisting of abbreviated incipits of between two and four words for the beginning of each verse, and a Latin header consisting of the first phrase of the text at the beginning of each Psalm. What does such an unusual layout tell us about the relative status of English and French, and vernacular and Latin, in this manuscript?

Annie Sutherland’s 2015 monograph English Psalms in the Middle Ages, 1300-1450, provides the most recent discussion of the MEMP in the context of CCC 278. Sutherland notes the unusual layout of the manuscript, and concludes that “readers are being encouraged to compare the Anglo-Norman and English with each other as well as with the Latin: they are both of inherent interest, as vernacular responses to the Vulgate psalms and neither is
privileged, in terms of ornament or decoration, over the other." It is true that both vernacular Psalters are in communication with the Vulgate via their identical Latin apparatus, and the mostly uniform decoration across both the English and French texts is intended to bring an overall coherence and unity to the contents. However, I would argue that the stark separation of English and French texts does not facilitate comparison between vernaculars at all. How would they be compared? While their similarities of script, decoration and layout may seem to facilitate ease of comparison, there are no aids to navigate the two texts in such a way as to promote a convenient flipping back and forth. This was not a reference volume. Further, the higher quality of decoration, parchment and script in the English text suggests that it had a higher status in the very particular context of Norwich and CCC 278’s community of texts.

Sutherland suggests that the reason the two vernacular Psalters are completely separate is that it would have been impractical to match the verse Metrical Psalter and the prose Oxford Psalter on the same page, arguing that other layouts such as facing columns or interlinear texts would not have been viable. I would argue that the relationship between the two vernacular Psalters in CCC 278 tilts more toward competition and hierarchy (separation) than cooperation (comparison) for two reasons, which may not reflect Turville-Peters’ ‘one culture in three voices’ assessment of English multilingualism, but instead indicates a more local and particular sociolinguistic situation.

First, separation encourages readers to choose which vernacular they wished to read or hear, which would have depended on the nature of the audience or occasion, or simply on linguistic competency. For instance, a visit to Norwich Priory by members of the royal court
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64 Sutherland, *English Psalms in the Middle Ages, 1300-1450*, 255.
may have pressed the French text into service, while monks might have made use of the English Psalter in confessing local, English-speaking magnates. Second, this strict separation of the two vernaculars, each paired with its own identical Latin apparatus, asks readers to consider each vernacular primarily in relation to Latin, and not in relation to the other vernacular Psalter. If the primary comparative relationship was vernacular to vernacular, as Sutherland suggests, then why is the Latin Psalter duplicated in both the Middle English and Anglo-Norman texts, making each an independent vernacular-Latin unit? Finally, the English Psalter is in the primary position in the manuscript and is a complete text taking up the centre of each page, in contrast with the Latin’s abbreviated incipits running alongside the English. From this we can conclude that the Priory intended English to be the text of primary display, which, as a book produced by a monastery, is one of CCC 278’s most innovative and surprising features. If, as Genette proposes, paratext is “the means by which a book proposes itself to its readers” and constitutes a mode of “transaction” between author and audience, what does this English-first arrangement suggest to the reader, and what transaction does it propose? In contrast to Sutherland’s interpretation, I would suggest that this Benedictine-produced manuscript’s intentional featuring of an English biblical text was meant to break out of the prevailing language hierarchy in an effort to engage local, English-speaking citizens.

This is in contrast to another trilingual Psalter, British Library MS. Harley 1770 (CCC 278’s closest comparator), in which the Metrical Psalter with Latin incipits is the final segment of the book and the complete Oxford Psalter and Vulgate Latin Psalters in a facing-

66 We know that Norwich Priory monks confessed lay people who were able to pay. See Greatrex, The English Benedictine Cathedral Priories: Rule and Practice 1270-1420, 277.
column arrangement begin the book. In this layout, Latin and French are the first texts a reader would encounter upon opening the codex, and they share equal space on the page—neither the vernacular nor the Latin can be said to be the ‘feature language’ in this arrangement. In addition, the matching decoration of the French-Latin pairing in Harley 1770 is more elaborate than the decoration of that manuscript’s *MEMP*—which is the reverse of CCC 278. Despite the overall similarity in contents to CCC 278, Harley 1770 shows a very different approach to the status of English: full French and Latin Psalters are directly paired, for optimal comparison, at the beginning of the manuscript, an arrangement that I would argue privileges French over English. CCC 278, on the other hand, appears to be a monastic production that elevates English above French at a surprisingly early stage in the development of Middle English as a literary and biblical language, and conspicuously displays the English text. Norwich Priory’s manuscript design therefore demonstrates an intention to elevate community-building within the religious and literary milieu of late medieval Norwich above prevailing notions of linguistic status by promoting English above French in an overturning of the prevailing linguistic hierarchy. The decision to place the English Psalter first is thus a social decision, with community formation via a common mother tongue taking precedence over prevailing notions of vernacular language prestige.

2.2.1 Codicology and Decoration

In addition to the position of the English Psalter in relation to the French, as well as the codicology and decoration of the manuscript, there are other elements suggesting that the Priory monks considered CCC 278’s English Psalter more important. First, there is the state
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of the parchments on which the texts are written. While a few of the MEMP’s leaves have a number of small holes and rounded corners (due to imperfect parchments, not from use), they are of a noticeably higher quality than the French Psalter’s leaves\textsuperscript{68}, suggesting that the monks of the Priory used the better writing supports for the English text.\textsuperscript{69} A second indicator is the manuscript’s script and decoration. As with the parchment, the English hand is clearer and more consistent than the French. Both texts are written in the same gothic textura, but the English Psalter’s is more careful and crisp than the French’s.\textsuperscript{70} A comparison of the English and French Psalters at folia 44v. and 118v. (Figs. 6 and 7), demonstrate this point. The several lines of text before and after the beginning of Psalm 73 (‘Ut quid, deus’), clearly show an English text that is more clearly and precisely inscribed and ordered, and a French that is at times compressed, unsure and bordering on sloppy; these two examples of script are not atypical.

As with script, both Psalters at first glance share an identical program of decorated capitals that divide the text into the eight major sections of the liturgical Psalter, and subdivide Psalm 118 into eleven subsections. These divisions are an aspect of the paratext, in that they mark the text as liturgical and monastic—if not in practice, then certainly in ‘feel’ and ‘authority’—reminding the reader of the mass, confession and the central mediating role of the church in the act of reading the Psalter. Just as with the script, there

\textsuperscript{68} For instance, there are many leaves in the Anglo-Norman Psalter that are sufficiently misshapen as to significantly disturb the text’s mise-en-page, whereas there are only two in the MEMP. For example, see Fig. 4.

\textsuperscript{69} Even if the monks of Norwich Priory commissioned this manuscript from a local librarius or workshop, and did not copy and bind CCC278 themselves, it is likely that they provided specific instructions to the contractor as to the order of texts and therefore also the prioritization of materials. Sutherland, ”English Psalms in the Middle Ages,” 92 n.44. Sutherland agrees that the French text is inferior to the English. While the letter forms remain the same, “It may be that the fact the scribe is now recording Anglo-Norman rather than English material has some effect on the style of his writing.”
are subtle differences that betray the compiler’s attitudes toward the status of the English vs. the French text. Both Psalters use five-line decorated capitals to begin the eight liturgical divisions (Pss. 1, 26, 38, 52, 68, 80, 97, 109). However, each Psalter also has smaller decorated capitals, which begin each Psalms as well the subdivisions of Psalm 118. The difference is that the English text is furnished with a ‘standard’ decorated capital spanning three ruled lines, whereas the standard height in the French text is only two lines.\textsuperscript{71} We can also see the larger Latin header in the English text (Fig. 6), establishing a hierarchy of script, a feature not developed in the French text (Fig. 7). This is a clear example of the institutional author choosing to expend more resources on the English text for the purposes of enhanced display.

\textit{2.2.2 Mise-en-Page}

The Psalms are different from other parts of scripture in that they were a series of discreet literary units and are poetic—unlike most other books that were composed in prose and constituted a continuous narrative. Poleg argues that the Psalms had a place of “prominence in biblical mediation” and that due to their unique and central place in Christian worship they were “subjected to a distinct layout” in late medieval manuscripts, further noting that Psalters often “incorporated different means of exploring and mediating the bible.”\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{71} There are a few two-line capitals which begin psalms in the MEMP, but this was a practical decision based on limited space at the bottom of a page did not allow for a three-line capital. See fol. 57v. for an example.
\textsuperscript{72} Poleg, \textit{Approaching the Bible in Medieval England}, 131-36.
As Poleg suggests, medieval texts of the Psalms were subject to several methods of division, depending on function and readership.\textsuperscript{73} In the liturgical context, there were three main structures imposed on the Psalter.\textsuperscript{74} Most simply, there was the ‘threefold’ division, which separated the Psalter into three sections of fifty Psalms each. This arrangement has an early medieval origin, and by the later medieval period was almost always used in combination with other methods of subdivision. An example of a Psalter divided this way survives from the Norwich Priory library (now BL MS. Harley 3950, a Latin Psalter with Anglo-Norman prayers). Another common arrangement focused the reader’s attention on the Penitential Psalms, often paraphrasing and elaborating them to amplify their effect.\textsuperscript{75} For devotional purposes, however, the eightfold Benedictine division was the most popular, and appears in both monastic and secular contexts, which is consistent with the idea that liturgy was “one of the master organizing categories of medieval culture”,\textsuperscript{76} permeating all aspects of medieval society, and demonstrating that Psalters could be ‘culturally liturgical’ if not functionally so. It was the Benedictine Psalter structure that was originally established to guide monks and clerics alike (and later, imitative lay readers) in their chanting of the Psalms and in the performance of the Divine Office, in cycles of one or two weeks during the eight canonical hours of the day.

There were also more scholastically-oriented Psalters whose layouts and apparatus facilitated study, reference and comparison in a way that liturgical Psalters were never meant

\textsuperscript{75} There was also a ten-fold division, a combination of the ‘three fifties’ and the eightfold (Psalm 1 being a duplicate). For a description of these various devotional layouts of the psalter see \textit{Latin Liturgical Psalters in the Bodleian Library: A Select Catalogue}, 641-42.
\textsuperscript{76} Holsinger, "Liturgy," 295.
to. However, monks and secular clerics who prayed the Divine Office and constantly repeated the words of the Psalms in the liturgy internalized them to such an extent that no new reference system, as in scholastic texts, was required in liturgical contexts: “clergy came to retain them [the Psalms] in their memory as liturgical texts, identified by incipit rather than numerical value” (i.e. by the Langtonian chapter and verse numbering system). This is born out in liturgical manuscripts, exegetical works, model sermon collections and *ars praedicandi*, in which incipits to Psalms are the only reference system. 77 This means that for a monk or priest the Latin incipits of CCC 278 constituted a complete third Psalter, despite being partial and highly abbreviated. The ostensibly slight notations on the page represented the entire Psalter, which existed in the mind of the monk or priest, and the daily masses and Offices. 78

CCC 278 explores new ways of organizing and presenting the Psalms in vernacular-Latin pairings. The English and French Psalters share an identical *mise-en-page*, which combines the Benedictine eightfold Psalter division and an identical Latin apparatus consisting of incipits and headers. The Latin incipits are always placed near the outside margins of the page, though a careful examination of the ruling reveals that the incipits are not marginal glosses, but are arranged in a second column facing the vernacular text. This reinforces the argument that the manuscript’s layout asks the reader not to compare the two completely separate vernacular Psalters, but to compare one vernacular Psalter with the abbreviated Latin Psalter which accompanies it in a double-column arrangement—a layout which most efficiently facilitates comparison between two texts. With this arrangement, the
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78 Perhaps the most famous example is the author of *Piers Plowman*: “William Langland likely a Psalter clerk…claimed to have committed the Psalter to memory, though he could not read or write them.” See Susan Gillingham, *A Journey of Two Psalms: The Reception of Psalms 1 and 2 in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 242.
Priory has created two pairings (English-Latin and French-Latin). These two sets of neighboring vernacular and Latin texts simultaneously cooperate in comparison and the bestowal of authority, but also compete as one is subordinated to the other according to a mutually acknowledged hierarchy. It is intriguing to imagine the single pairing, within a codex comprised of a ‘pair of pairings’, which existed within a library that held several other Psalters, and all these physical books located within a space that continually echoed with the chanting, recitation and reading of the Psalms. All of these Psalters existed in continual relation to each other, separate but integrated, as a complex community of texts.

While the Latin incipits were native to the MEMP—all six extant manuscripts have Latin incipits in some form—they were imposed upon the Anglo-Norman Oxford Psalter, and as a prose Psalter the fit is not ideal: in the French Psalter many incipits collide with and intrude into the French prose text as there is not the same space available on the page. Alternating blue and red paraphs tie each vernacular verse to its associated Latin incipit, again leading the reader to never forget that the English (or French) is indissolubly bound to the Latin, but also aid comparison for interpretive purposes for those with the memory and Latinity to recall the Vulgate in its entirety. This is surely further evidence of the primacy of the English text—that the MEMP’s structure was imposed onto the older and more established Oxford Psalter, in what is a unique example of liturgically-inspired vernacular making local to Norwich Priory. The English verse text with its couplets and short lines is ideal for a matching second column of Latin incipits in a way the French is clearly not.

79 All MEMP’s are structured this way, though some have shorter or longer incipits. However, other Oxford Psalters are not structured this way. For example, see the Oxford Psalters of Oxford Bodleian MS. Douce 320 (also a from a monastic context), BL MS. Harley 1770 or British Library Cotton MS. Nero C.IV (the Winchester Psalter). However, Tony Hunt notes that the Oxford Psalter found in British Library MS. Arundel 230 “is intertwined with Latin source text”. See Hunt, "Vernacular Literature and Its Readership: The Anglo-Norman Book," 372.

80 For example, see folia 114r, 130r, and 98r.
paraphs are especially important reference marks as French verses end and new ones begin again mid-line, and so the paraphs are the only way to quickly and accurately match vernacular and Latin texts.

In addition to the incipits, which correspond to each verse, there are also Latin headers that begin or preface each vernacular Psalm. Headers were a basic method of organizing a text, and were visually emphasized by use of colours that differentiated them from the rest of the text—in this case rubricated, in contrast with the black/brown ink of the rest of the Psalter’s text. At the same time, headers were “integral parts of the text, since they are found within planned spaces within the composition of the page.”81 Not only do the Latin headers of CCC 278’s MEMP come first in the context of each Psalm, but the font of the Latin header is noticeably larger than the font of the following English text, creating a noticeable hierarchy of script. In contrast to the ostensible desire to display and feature the vernacular texts, especially the MEMP, it is also indicative of Latin’s elevated status that the modest decoration of these Psalters corresponds to and ornaments not the vernacular texts, but the Latin headers, which include decorated capitals and larger-font headers. This design suggests that the Latin headers are meant to convey to readers—even those who could not necessarily read the words of Latin but could only see it on the page—that Latin held a higher status than the vernacular, as it had both a preeminent position at the beginning of the Psalm, a larger font in the hierarchy of scripts and incorporated the use of colour. This was another paratextual indicator to the reader as to which language was most important and authoritative on the page, and in the book’s institutional context. This transactional dynamic between English and Latin texts, and the signifying power embedded in both of them,

extended outwards to the mixed community of lay and monastic readers, who would have had to continually re-negotiate their respective roles in the course of reading the MEMP, according to the social positions, linguistic competencies and spiritual authority they held in the Norwich community.

Another roughly contemporary comparator to the MEMP, which includes Latin incipits authorizing an English Psalter paraphrase, is Dauid pe King, a text from the Auchinleck manuscript (National Library of Scotland Advocates’ MS. 19.2.1). This 98-line verse paraphrase of Psalm 50 (‘Miserere mei’), contains Latin incipits at the beginning of the poem and then every five lines after that. Again, the English para-biblical text is punctuated with, and authorized by, Latin. The importance of the Latin is clear from the rubrication of the incipits, but what is more interesting is that each of these incipits ends with an “&c”, encouraging readers who know the Latin Psalter to continue from the incipit on the page into the fullness of Psalm 50 which is assumed to exist in the reader’s mind. Interestingly, the Auchinleck manuscript’s contents are almost entirely English, consisting largely of romances, saints’ lives, doctrinal texts and poems of satire and complaint. The importance of the Auchinleck manuscript, like Bodleian MS Laud Misc. 108, is its very Englishness: so many Middle English texts of the early-to-mid-fourteenth century have been collected into one repository. It is remarkable in the multilingual context of the time that Dauid pe King contains one of only three instances in the manuscript of languages other than English—in this case, Latin—which at once supports the English text and supersedes it in its authorizing role.  

Despite the vernaculars of English and French occupying most of the surface area of the book’s leaves, and English’s growing role as a religious language that could be understood by all English people, Latin is the language (and associated religious culture) that the Priory’s lay supporters likely wanted to be associated with—just as the vernacular text on the page needed to be in a continual and subordinated relationship to the Latin incipits in the second ruled column. It is within this systematic pairing regime, which both includes and subordinates, that Latin authorized English while exercising authority over it, and the Priory both called the English-speaking laity into community but also exerted authority over it. This ‘double action’ of the Latin text reflects and embodies the relationship of the monastic and lay constituencies within the textual community: the Latinate monks control the text, and therefore the community, but they also raise up the English lay participants through the status and authority of their institution and the spiritual caché desired by lay participants. This is a model of dynamic community in which elements in hierarchy work together through a process of transaction and exchange, very similar to what I have posited for the linguistic relationships in CCC 278 in which Latin is mediated through English via the manuscript’s paratext, while remaining the language of authority.

2.3 Conclusion

The Psalms were perhaps the most read, most versatile biblical text in medieval culture, used for a myriad of religious and cultural (even legal) functions. It is likely no coincidence that a psalterium triplex like CCC 278, designed by a monastery to engage a wider community—potentially including cloistered monks, secular priests from the Cathedral, nuns in local female houses and local laypeople—would include texts that offered
multiple literary and linguistic approaches. Robert M. Stein has observed that “A very large number of twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts produced in England cross linguistic boundaries in their contents while also crossing boundaries separating literary from non-literary, sacred from secular…popular from learned—to name only a few”. 83

Certainly, the manuscript’s contents and layout offer some variety in form (verse vs. prose), asks readers to choose between English and French, and the paratextual elements encourage a process of transaction and mediation between texts and languages that Genette has described as the primary function of paratext. However, the Psalters’ highly structured texts, bibliographic coding and careful ordering and pairing of languages present these choices, and possibilities for transaction, within carefully circumscribed conditions (e.g. within one linguistic pairing in which Latin holds sway), and suggests more control over the reading than freedom. The paratext directs readers through the texts in a particular way, leads them into established hierarchies and situates their reading within the deeply engrained monastic liturgical traditions of medieval England. In addition, while CCC 278 was a manuscript that formed of a community of Psalters, multilingual and multigeneric, an examination of its mise-en-page has shown that the vernacular and Latin pairings are in a hierarchical system which belie the overwhelming display of vernacularity in CCC 278, with Latin remaining the primary and authoritative language.

Genette concludes “Introduction to the Paratext” by positing that paratext always involves “endless phenomena of sliding, of substitutions, of compensation, and of innovation”, which have been described throughout this chapter. 84 This cultural context—encompassing East Anglian literary culture and a Priory that values the vernacular—in

84 Genette and Maclean, "Introduction to the Paratext," 271.
which boundaries can be crossed under the auspices of authority, is an ideal site for the
transition and transaction that paratext generates. It is a site of mediation; a borderland and a
negotiated linguistic, social, political and religious space. English is allowed to stand-in for
Latin as long as Latin continues to provide an authorizing function through its physical and
liturgical ‘presence’. Latin (and the church and churchmen it represents) and English (and
the rising magnatial culture who prefer it) stand together on the page in a compelling
example of the neighbour relationship described by Freud and Edmondson—in community
and contest—that allows both English and French Psalters to stand in as alternatives to
Latin, but which are also in a relationship of reliance and hierarchy as the Latin text
overshadows them and bestows authority upon them, ‘installing an order’, as Chartier puts it,
upon the innovative and early Middle English Psalms.
Figs. 3 & 4: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS. 278, ff. 1r and 91v. Psalm 1 ('\textit{Beatus vir}') in the \textit{Middle English Metrical Psalter} and the Anglo-Norman \textit{Oxford Psalter}: ‘Uncanny doubles’. Early fourteenth century. (With permission of the Master and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge)
Fig. 5. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS. 278, f. 98v. Example of ‘disturbed text’ resulting from misshapen page in the Anglo-Norman Oxford Psalter. Early fourteenth century. (With permission of the Master and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge)
Fig. 7. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS. 278, f.118v. Psalm 73 (‘Ut quid deus’). Middle English Metrical Psalter. (With permission of the Master and Fellows, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge). Early fourteenth century.

Fig. 6. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS. 278, f.44v. Psalm 73 (‘Ut quid deus’). Middle English Metrical Psalter. (With permission of the Master and Fellows, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge). Early fourteenth century.
CHAPTER THREE

Text: Reading the Metrical Psalter in Late-Medieval Norwich

3.0 Introduction and Outline

Having situated CCC 278 in its social, religious, linguistic, and literary contexts, and examined its codicological and paleographical elements, Chapter 3 will proceed to discuss how the Middle English Metrical Psalter of CCC 278 is an example of a manuscript which has been ‘customized’ according the particular needs of its local context (3.1), and how it nevertheless retained its intertextual connection to the extant corpus of the other five extant MEMPs (3.2) despite variations in layout, decoration and script. Next, this chapter will consider how the MEMP was read, first establishing that English could be read in place of Latin (3.3) and then moving on to a number of potential reading scenarios for the MEMP (3.4-3.6). This chapter will conclude by arguing that while the Norwich MEMP was a text that facilitated lay/monastic engagement through mixed public reading and explication, it was also a text in which the Priory’s desire for ongoing control of the community can be discerned (3.7).

3.1 CCC 278 and Localization in Manuscript Studies

Johnston and Van Dussen, in the “Introduction” to The Medieval Manuscript Book: Cultural Approaches, describe the uniqueness of each medieval manuscript, not only in terms of each book’s individual design or contents, but also in terms of how that book functioned and was received in its particular cultural context. These are the two aspects that make every manuscript uniquely ‘local’: the combination of being a handmade object and
particular context together distinguish a book from all others that are seemingly like it. The scholar’s goal is to identify the particular forces driving this process of localization within a given community of textual production and consumption.1

Bruce Holsinger has noted that that liturgy and its productions are so universal, yet also so particular to a place, that it can bring our analysis to a radically local level, “particularized, decentralized and miniaturized”.2 He further notes that “liturgy functions as a constant incentive to more localized creative gestures” of “vernacular making”.3 While Holsinger asks that we move from the universal to the local in our understanding of liturgy, Johnston and Van Dussen caution that we “attend to local topographies …without succumbing to their particularity.”4 This quote speaks to the need to be continually working on at least two levels of analysis when interpreting manuscripts: while it is necessary to examine the physical object in detail to understand its paleographical, philological or literary aspects, it is equally important to make connections between that very particular local expression and the manuscript’s broader context. These complimentary views ask that manuscript studies be able to move between local and universal.

While the Norwich MEMP was a local, vernacular creation particular to its time and place, it also informs our understanding of the broader context of religious, political and socio-linguistic changes in late medieval England of which it was a manifestation. It mediated, at the local level, those broader dynamics described in Chapter 1, such as lay-monastic engagement and lay-ecclesiastical conflicts that were the most frequent category of

---

3 Ibid., 298, 300.
4 Johnston and Van Dussen, "Introduction: Manuscripts and Cultural History," 12.
urban protest in England in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The MEMP is also a local example and mediation of the early fourteenth-century socio-linguistic issues described in Chapter 2, which included the emergence of English as a biblical and para-liturgical language and the questions of textual authority that it raised. In Chapter 3’s description of mixed monastic-lay reading practices, all of these mediations converge. The mixed reading groups that I will posit are the mostly likely contexts in which the MEMP was used are on one level a monastic accommodation of lay linguistic preferences and lay desire to more deeply access the Psalms, but they are also fraught with contest over language, authority and leadership within the community of late medieval Norwich.

3.2 The Community of Middle English Psalters: Form and Language

All MEMP s are liturgically-structured, versified renderings of the full Vulgate Psalter, largely in rhyming couplets with occasional quatrains. Evelyn Birge-Vitz observes that the Psalms in particular were paraphrased in rhymed couplets in late medieval vernacular versions so they were more suitable for responsorial reading in small groups, public recitation, as well as memorization, arguing that metrical Psalters were “meant to evoke strong emotional responses and to be lodged in audiences’ memories.” Versification is therefore apt for aural group reading situations in which readers could achieve a “heightened intensity of communicative interaction”. Like several other early Middle English works from Northern England, such as Cursor Mundi, the Northern Homily Cycle

---

5 Samuel K. Cohn, Popular Protest in Late Medieval English Towns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 203. Cohn notes that the 1272 attack on Norwich Priory is recorded in more chronicles than any other late medieval urban revolts.
(NHC) and The Prick of Conscience, the MEMP was composed in octosyllabic couplets, a meter Robert Mannyng refers to as ‘light ryme’, in contrast with “elaborate verse forms that are too difficult for an audience to hear or a reciter to remember”; ‘light ryme’ “seems to have been the meter of choice for instructive and historical writing in the period.” The MEMP therefore likely shares in the wider community of these summary works of biblical history in early Middle English which were composed to communicate scripture to the laity in the language they could understand and in a meter they could more readily memorize. Michael Lapidge notes that even in the rarefied environs of the schools of Paris or Oxford, versified mediations of scripture were commonly used: “it is surprising to learn that the curriculum of medieval schools consisted not in the study of the Bible per se, nor in meditation on patristic commentary, but in the meticulous word-by-word parsing and interpretation of various poetic versions of the Bible (paraphrases, as they are often called).” Form therefore begins to suggest that the MEMP would likely have been heard in small, para-liturgical reading scenarios involving lay readers, or in pedagogical situations in which a monk leads lay readers into a deeper understanding of the Psalter.

3.2.1 Language, Dialect and Circulation

The language of the MEMP has proven an object of distain and difficulty for scholars. First, its word choices are sometimes nativist to the point of obscurity, and its dialect highly unusual. Annie Sutherland characterizes the MEMP as “rather monotonous”, and “somewhat inaccessible” by virtue of its peculiar Yorkshire dialect, convoluted syntax.

---

8 Wogan-Browne et al., The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory, 1280-1520, 267.
9 Lapidge, "Versifying the Bible in the Middle Ages," 11.
and sometimes archaic vocabulary, including some almost Anglo-Saxon word choices.\textsuperscript{10} Muir and Hargreaves have both noted its judicious inclusion of Latin calques and studious avoidance of French-derived vocabulary. It was a self-consciously ‘English’ text that chose to stretch the semantic range of native English words as far as possible in rendering the source text.\textsuperscript{11} The clear linguistic preferences of the \textit{MEMP}—that it privileges English, uses Latin as necessary, and studiously avoids French—are reflected in the CCC 278 codex as a whole: English is featured at the beginning of the manuscript (in tandem with fragments of Latin), while French is relegated to second place—not only in its position within the manuscript, but also in the quality of the French text’s script and parchment, and awkward modification of the \textit{Oxford Psalter} to conform to the structure of the \textit{MEMP}. This avoidance of French terms should be interpreted as another aspect of sociolinguistic competition within society being played out at the textual and paratextual levels of this manuscript, echoing the broader societal concerns of the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century that the English people should take precedence over foreigners (i.e., the French) in their own country.\textsuperscript{12}

While the \textit{MEMP} relies on Latin to ‘underwrite’ its emerging authority as a biblical language, Latin does not permeate the English text to the same degree as in Rolle’s \textit{Prose Psalter} (c. 1330) or the later \textit{Midland Prose Psalter} (MPP; c. 1350).\textsuperscript{13} Both of these incorporate a full Vulgate Psalter into the body of their Middle English text, making them fully dependant on Latin to authorize and inform the reading of the English Psalter, verse-

\textsuperscript{10} Sutherland, "English Psalms in the Middle Ages," 76.
\textsuperscript{11} Muir, "Some Observations on the Early English Psalters and the English Vocabulary," 275. See also Henry Hargreaves, "The Vocabulary of the \textit{Surtees Psalter}," ibid.17, no. 4 (1956): 327-34. Both authors speculate the source text may have been a lost Old English Psalter rather than the Vulgate.
\textsuperscript{12} The concern that foreign—specifically, French—influences had an unduly strong influence on English government and society was central to the crisis of the mid-thirteenth century during which Henry III sent his English letters. See Machan, \textit{English in the Middle Ages}, chapter 1 passim.
by-verse, even word-by-word. By contrast, the Latin incipits that accompany the MEMP result in much less Latin on the page than either Rolle’s Psalter or the MPP. As previously argued, the Latin incipits of the MEMP constitute a third Psalter, but not a fully visible one. Instead, readers with an intimate familiarity with the Psalms could access the Latin Psalter memorialistically, the incipits acting as three- or four-word cues that stood for, and incented the recollection of, the rest of the Latin verse. Hargreaves notes Rolle’s Psalter has many more Latinate words in its English translation in the same positions where the MEMP has intentionally used English, owing to the fact that Rolle intended for his Psalter to be a tool for teaching Latin and following Latin services. Rolle’s English translation was therefore careful to match the Latin as closely as possible in both syntax and vocabulary. For example, the Latin noun vertue, which Rolle always translates as ‘vertu’, is translated in the MEMP as ‘might’, a conspicuously English word.15

Dialect

One problematic element of trying to understand who read the MEMP of CCC 278 is dialect. So localized could the problems of English dialects be, that difficulties of mutual understanding arose even between people in the abutting counties of Norfolk and Suffolk.16 Simply put, it is not clear whether East Anglians would have been able to understand the MEMP’s obscure West Yorkshire dialect. In 1385 John of Trevisa commented on the

14 Readers who could recall Psalm verses based on the first few words would most likely be monks, who recited the entire Psalter on a weekly basis. However, there would also likely be pious laypeople who had also memorized the Psalter and developed similar capacity to recollect the Psalms verse by verse.
16 Roger Ellis, "Preface," in The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English, ed. Roger Ellis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 3. On this topic, Richard Beadle has noted that Norfolk had a “distinctive”, “local”, and “idiosyncratic” spelling system, and that readers outside Norwich would have had difficulty reading it.
difference in speech (and presumably also writing) between the north and south of England, stating that:

“All the language of the Northumbrians, and specially at York, is so sharp, piercing, rasping, and unshapely that we Southern men can hardly understand that language. I suppose this is because they are nigh to foreign men [i.e., Scots] and aliens who speak strangely, and also because the kings of England dwell always far from that country.”

It is apropos that John of Trevisa should refer to the difficulties of the northern dialects, because many early and popular works in English, like *Cursor Mundi*, the *Northern Homily Cycle* and the *Prick of Conscience*, as well as the *MEMP*, were composed in various Yorkshire dialects. According to Nicholas Watson, so many early Middle English religious texts were produced in the north because “the influence of Anglo-Norman was less strong, and…the potential of written English for religious instruction seems to have been recognized earlier than in the South.” Ralph Hanna agrees, and has described the prolific production of versified religious texts in late thirteenth-century Yorkshire as the result of “a local religious culture” which turned out to have “great success as an export commodity.” However, exports such as *Cursor Mundi* or the *Northern Homily Cycle* would seem to be the exceptions to the rule. English was highly localized around the turn of the thirteenth century and, as a result, translations from one dialect into another were common. Beadle notes that many of the most popular English texts, especially northern ones, were translated into the Norfolk dialect, including the *Prick of Conscience, Speculum Vitae, South English*
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17 L. D. Benson, "The Chaucer Page," The President and Fellows of Harvard College, http://sites.fas.harvard.edu/~chaucer/language.htm. See also the *Myroure of Oure Ladye* (c. 1430) which complains that “Oure language [English] is also so dyuerse in yt selfe tha the commen maner of spekying in Englysshe of some contre [region] can skant be ynderstonded in some other contre of the same londe.”

18 Watson, “The Politics of Middle English Writing”, 337.


20 Wogan-Brown et al., 11.
Legendary and “various writings of Richard Rolle”, to name just a few contemporaries of the *MEMP*.\(^{21}\) There are, however, no known dialect translations of the *Metrical Psalter*.\(^{22}\)

Despite the statements of Sutherland and Hanna that the obscure northern dialect of the *MEMP* made it nearly impossible to find an audience beyond Yorkshire, they both pass over the singular example of the Norwich *MEMP*, one of the earliest extant copies of this text, and the most formal and innovative in its *mise-en-page*. That the book as a whole was so carefully planned, the French Psalter forced to conform to the general layout of the six extant *MEMP*s, and the English text was set at the beginning of the book, suggests that Norwich sought out the *MEMP* for inclusion in this manuscript *despite* its obscure dialect. Despite this intentional and thoughtful manuscript design in which the English Psalter was the feature text, the question remains: why would the Priory go through this process of innovation and modification only to showcase an English Psalter text that may have been a very difficult, perhaps even unreadable, dialect for its imagined community of readers? The most pragmatic explanation is that the *MEMP* was the sole Middle English version of the Psalms available at the turn of the fourteenth century and the monks chose not to expend the time and resources required either to undertake a dialect translation or to commission and wait for the completion of a new English Psalter translation from the Vulgate, or some other non-English source text, into the Norfolk dialect.

---


\(^{22}\) The very limiting factor of regional dialect was later recognized by the Wycliffites, who “produced and copied [scriptural texts] systematically in a dialect chosen to be as widely comprehensible as possible,” thereby seeking to escape the local in favour of the universal. See Watson, "The Politics of Middle English Writing," 342.
Circulation

In her work on the contents of monastic libraries, Theresa Webber has observed that “The close textual relationship between copies of the same work made at different places indicates communication and co-operation between communities, as they sought to acquire desired texts.”23 The circulation of texts from one institution to another happened through both personal and institutional networks,24 with monasteries regularly seeking out new religious texts that could help them “to assimilate the value and meanings of the Bible”, which might include paraphrases, translations, biblical histories or commentaries.25 However, scholars discussing the unique dialect of the MEMP seem to avoid discussing how or why this obscure Yorkshire text ended up in Norwich. For instance, Ralph Hanna has intriguingly speculated on the existence of a seventh MEMP, noting that the earliest London will to mention an English book (c. 1349) makes reference to “a psalter written in Latin and English”, before dismissing it, stating that the Surtees Psalter (i.e., the MEMP) “circulated only in Yorkshire.”26

While it is impossible to know exactly how the text of the MEMP circulated to Norwich, there are several intriguing connections to BL MS. Harley 1770 on which to begin to build an argument. It has already been observed that CCC 278 and Harley 1770 form a unique pair amongst the extant MEMP manuscripts—by dint of their three Psalters in the same three languages and versions, and MEMPs in very similar scripts. Both have monastic provenances, and both the Augustinian canons of Kirkham and the Benedictine monks of

25 Ibid., 156.
26 Hanna, "English Biblical Texts before Lollardy and Their Fate," 144.
Norwich Priory were deeply engaged in the lives of the town and its citizens outside the precinct walls and were engaged in networks of exchange between the monastery and the local élite. Kirkham’s gates betray this fact, emblazoned as they were with the arms of a prominent local patron. But there is a second, more concrete connection that may show that these institutions were in direct communication with one another on matters other than books. It is known that Norwich and Kirkham priories were in contact in 1289 when the prior of Kirkham requested that his counterpart in Norwich be on the lookout for a fugitive monk from Kirkham Priory who was thought to be fleeing to Norwich. Like this fugitive, it is possible that the text moved south from Yorkshire to Norwich, along lines of institutional communication, where it was out of place due its obscure dialect. The similarity in texts (the same three Psalters in one manuscript) and the direct communication between Kirkham and Norwich suggests that the two Priories may have been part of an institutional network of communication and exchange that facilitated the circulation of texts.

3.2.2 Similarity, Variance and Analysis

Annie Sutherland has observed that the one common element amongst all the MEMP texts is that they “rely in different ways on the authenticating voice of the Vulgate.” However, within this community of Psalters, there are other interesting relationships that suggest commonalities of use or even of common ways of thinking about the text—as well as significant variations. These ways of texts to relating to each other span several

---

29 Sutherland, "English Psalms in the Middle Ages," 87.
categories of comparison, namely vocabulary, script, the nature of the incipits, manuscript size, and ‘neighboring texts’.

Across the six texts there is significant variation in vocabulary and rhyme words, decoration and script, suggesting scribal intention and customization as it was copied for new audiences in particular contexts. For example, a comparison of two *MEMP* manuscripts held in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, shows that even amongst such a small corpus of extant manuscripts there can be simultaneously great similarity and variation. Annie Sutherland’s analysis reveals that Bodleian Library MSS. 921 and 425 share the closest agreement on vocabulary and rhyme words amongst all six *MEMP*s. While this similarity shows they were likely both either copied from the same exemplar or are part of the same *stemma*, it does not mean they were used for the same purpose, as they have very different incipit structures. Bodl. MS. 425 has very similar incipits to CCC 278—carefully matched to the English verse structure in separate, ruled second column (Fig. 8)—while Bodl. MS. 921 incorporates very short Latin incipits (sometimes just one word) for each verse into the body of the Middle English text at the beginning of the line—not in a second column, which would have them very difficult to pick out in the midst of public reading. In addition, Bodl. MS. 425 is significantly larger than MS. 921, making the former much more likely to be a lectern volume suited to public reading and the latter a candidate for private devotional reading.

Another significant difference between the setting of these two *MEMP*s is what could be called their textual neighborhoods—the other texts with which they are collocated within their respective manuscripts. Bodl. MS. 425’s *Metrical Psalter* seems right at home within a highly variegated collection of biblical paraphrases and vernacular liturgical texts, including
what Sutherland has identified as a unique versified Athanasian Creed. Bodl. 921, on the other hand, includes only two texts: the *MEMP* followed by a one-page Anglo-Norman translation of an obscure Latin prognostication relating to events in the year 1357, a sure add-on to what must originally have been a free-standing *Metrical Psalter.*

### 3.3 Reading the Vulgate in English

Christopher Cannon, discussing the role languages play in mediating religious culture, states that monastic productions in English, which did not replace the Latin originals but maintained a close textual relationship with them, “highlight the general tendency for languages to function as alternatives…for each other.” This idea of one language being able to ‘stand-in’ for another language, especially in the scriptural context, is extremely important as it suggests that English could be a *bona fide* biblical language—as long as it continued to be in association with Latin, and not alienated from that Elizabeth Salter has coined a “wealthy cultural context”, a richly multilingual and textual environment in which monks could read vernacular texts and laity had varying capacities to read vernaculars and sometimes Latin. In this manifestation of Salter’s ‘wealthy cultural context’, these two sub-communities of readers in late medieval Norwich mixed regularly, interacting in English, French and Latin, depending on the participants and the situation. The use of various languages depending on the purpose, audience and situation is what Machan has described as the “structured repertoire of learned relationships” between the languages of
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30 Ibid., 80-86. While some details are taken from Sutherland’s descriptions of these two manuscripts, some is taken from my own analysis of images; the conclusion is my own.
late medieval England, a dynamic linguistic environment that he identified as being at work in the creation of Henry III’s English letters and their proclamation in every English county.  

There are a number of authors who make reference to the idea that vernacular languages could stand in for each other as well as Latin. Rita Copeland uses the term ‘substitution’ and ‘transference’, and Alistair Minnis ‘continuation’ or ‘language transfer’, to describe the dynamic whereby reading in one language could move into another language and back again, just as multilingual readers and/or explicators likely moved back and forth between the MEMP and the Vulgate Psalter that was present in the incipits. This movement back and forth evokes a sense of authority that is less interested in imposing one language or reading style on its community, but instead has the capacity to negotiate multiple languages and reading scenarios based on that community’s educational, theological and institutional credentials. Vincent Gillespie gives this sense of reciprocal movement when he characterizes clerics who preach on or teach vernacular texts as “two-way valves”—mediating vehicles that allow orthodox truths of the universal Church to move outward and be delivered locally to the laity in their mother tongue in a flexible arrangement of linguistic and theological give-and-take. This action of language transference and conveyance that accommodates non-Latinate readers and listeners suggests mediation and ‘movement across’: a true translatio.
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33 Machan, *English in the Middle Ages*, 34, 36.
36 Gillespie, "Vernacular Theology," 414.
This situates CCC 278 within a complex cultural and institutional matrix. We are no longer just talking about a language’s intrinsic spiritual efficacy or ability to convey meaning, but also about how authority is mediated. David Lawton’s theorization of biblical language and textuality addresses the issue of how not just semantic meaning moves between languages, but also the authority inherent in the Word of God. It also addresses the question of who has the delegated authority to translate and explicate holy writ. Discussing the nature of authority in relation to medieval scriptures in English, Lawton states that when people or institutions contest vernacular translations, “what they are really contesting is authority”…“what is at stake here...is ecclesiastical hierarchy.” While discussions of vernacular theology and biblical translation in England often fixate on the relative status of Latin, Middle English and Anglo-Norman, Lawson has elucidated another key aspect of vernacular biblical authority—that textual authority rests with the institution that authorizes the text—and not solely with the language it was originally written in, or translated into. Wogan-Browne et al. agree, stating that the authority of the church could be applied to both “prevent as well as further the emergence of vernacular traditions of writing.” Ultimately, we should recognize the Priory’s creation of a manuscript with not one, but two, full vernacular Psalters as an affirmation of its authority, and in no way a derogation of it. Thus, the Norwich MEMP can be understood as an authorized and authorizing ‘mediation’ of the Latin Psalter into English, and the book, CCC 278, a material manifestation of the complex linguistic, textual and religious culture that existed in late medieval Norwich. We can also see at work on its pages the fluid (though directed by the paratext) movement between

38 Wogan-Browne et al., The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory, 1280-1520, 19.
languages and genres, and the mediation of authority described by Cannon, Salter and Lawton. This brings us back to the provenance of the CCC 278 MEMP: Norwich Priory, the site of a richly multilingual context and strong ecclesiastical authority, coupled with the desire to reach out to the wider community. The result was a multilingual Psalter in which the English text was considered legitimate, authoritative scripture—so long as the English and Latin Psalters were in ongoing and dynamic communication with each other—and the layout of the manuscript clearly shows that they were.

While we see this process of ecclesiastical authors or institutions mediating Latin scripture for English audiences locally at Norwich and acknowledge its innovative and bold nature, it is but one example of a broader process at work that was just beginning to gather momentum in the early fourteenth century. English language religious texts clearly had a significant role throughout late medieval English society. Biblical translations and paraphrases, such as the corpus of MEMPs or the Middle English Genesis and Exodus (late thirteenth century), lead the way, and other early English religious texts, like the Northern Homily Cycle and Prick of Conscience (both biblical paraphrases) were read throughout medieval society, from laity to secular priests and monks.39

Other examples of ecclesiastically-sanctioned English religious productions included the Injunctions of John Thoresby, Archbishop of York (1357) translated into English at Thoresby’s own orders, and the Speculum Vitae (mid-fourteenth century) by William of Nassington, an ecclesiastical administrator from York.40 Interestingly, both of these examples are authored and authorized by Yorkshire churchmen who promoted the vernacular. Also, like so many examples from Chapter 2, and also similar to the English

39 Ibid., 241.
40 Ibid., 336.
letters of Henry III which were first composed in French, these works were first composed in Latin and then translated into English, and were thus in that well-attested relationship of dynamic dependence on the source text. These works show that “English [was] accepted as an important language even by clerics (the “lered”), and as the only language in which a “mixed” audience can be addressed.” The Speculum Vitae’s prologue explicitly provides for English as language of inclusion:

But Englisch, that men vse mast,
That can ech man vnderstonde,
That is born in Ingelante.
For that langage is most chewyd,
Os wel among lered as lewyd…
Bothe lered and lewed, olde and yonge,
Alle vnderstonden english tonge. (Speculum Vitae, ll. 64-68, 77-78)

That is, English can be a religious language where accommodation and inclusion, what could be called a ‘communal spirit’, are the authorizing institution’s goals. If this chapter has so far established the primacy of English in the this trilingual manuscript of the Psalms, and demonstrated that a monastery and other ecclesiastical institutions, authored, compiled and promoted the reading of vernacular religious texts, what remains is to answer the question of how the Norwich MEMP might actually have been read.

3.4 Reading Scenarios 1: Paratext and Reading

While Chapter 2’s discussion of the paratextual elements of CCC 278 included some discussion of its codicology and palaeography, it is necessary to further contextualize these aspects of CCC 278 in an attempt to understand how the book functioned in late medieval Norwich, specifically. As a book, CCC 278 was produced first and foremost to be read, but
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‘reading’ is a very broad category of cultural practice that can be ocular or aural, private or public. A symbolic reading of the book was also possible, with the viewer only needing to see the material object (without opening it and reading the text) to be affected by its power to signify authority, prestige, and the presence of the divine. Johnston and Van Dussel conceive of manuscripts as objects within the cultural world, where people “interact with them in meaningful, readable, ways” and where “encounters of readers with books were mediated by the materiality of manuscripts”, referring both to the book as an object, but also to their physical attributes, such as size, script, decoration or layout.

Theresa Webber suggests that an examination of a book’s physical attributes can help narrow the possibilities related to a book’s function or reception, stating “It is not easy… to determine with any precision from surviving volumes or from booklists how the books were read, publicly or privately, and if the latter, as part of the individual devotional reading required of each monk or canon, or for reference purposes with an intellectual or practical application in mind.” However, there are a few attributes of CCC 278—script, punctuation, size, and its library (vice church) storage location which suggest that occasional public or oral reading was more likely than private or formal liturgical reading, or use of the book for reference purposes. In addition to what its versified form suggests, the analysis of further physical attributes will assist in narrowing the possible use(s) of CCC 278 and its Metrical Psalter.

Each of its relatively large pages of CCC 278’s Psalters were inscribed with only 36 verse lines of clear gothic textura, leaving a substantial amount of blank space around the text. The alternating red and blue paraphs provided markers that guided the eye to the
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beginning of each verse, helped prevent readers from repeating the same verse twice in a row, and linked the corresponding English verses and Latin incipits, aiding a Latinate monk’s interpretation or explication of the texts. In her study of monastic and cathedral book collections at Durham Cathedral Priory, Webber notes that several copies of works by the Church Fathers were written in large script, likely for the purpose of being read publicly within the monastery. Larger scripts on less-cluttered and well-organized pages “enabled them to be read from a lectern.”

A notable absence from this manuscript is tonic accents or lection marks. These marks were inscribed above a word to ensure that the stress was placed on the correct syllable by the reader or cantor performing the text. Neither of CCC 278’s Psalters have such markings. While this may not have been necessary for some readers of the MEMP (as the text was in English, the native language of most if not all readers), it may still have been required for others to read a versified text in an unfamiliar dialect. However, the Norwich MEMP does include some other punctuation intended to aid reading. At the end of each line of verse is a single punctus (‘.’), indicating a minor pause before continuing on to the next line. By contrast, the Anglo-Norman prose Psalter of CCC 278 requires more paratextual intervention to aid the reader, with both punctus and colons (‘:’; indicating a full pause) when a substantial break was required mid-line. The prose Psalter needed this extra punctuation to help the reader render the text poetically, but also because of the sometimes confused mise-en-page that resulted from trying squeeze the prose Psalter into the Metrical Psalter’s form. We can conclude that the differences in punctuation of these differently
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formatted texts (verse vs. prose) indicate the scribe’s, and therefore the commissioner of the manuscript’s, intention for the texts to be read aloud.

A codex’s size is another indicator of its potential use. CCC 278 is 170mm x 266mm, about the mid-point between the standard octavo and quarto volume sizes. Nigel Morgan cites several examples of larger liturgical manuscripts, including a Sarum gradual that is almost exactly the same size as CCC 278, which Morgan states was “intended for use on a lectern by a group of people”. Elizabeth Solopova similarly concludes “that portable service books were generally 200mm or less in height, whereas books of around 300mm or more are considered to be intended for a lectern use”.

This brief contextual analysis of some of CCC 278’s physical attributes indicates the following: the codex was intended for public—likely lectern—use. Although it bears no lection marks to guide a highly performative reading, it does have punctuation specifically designed to accommodate the different requirements of reading verse and prose texts. Also, it was likely not intended for regular liturgical services, indicated by its storage location in the library. There are several reading scenarios that are suggested by the paratext, described above, all of which incorporate some combination of the themes of community, authority and mediation.

3.5 Reading Scenarios 2: Liturgical and Para-Liturgical Reading

Bruce Holsinger has argued that the vast and variegated genre of para-liturgical texts, not intended for use in the conduct of the mass or Divine Office, was nevertheless remained
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“service-oriented”.

The most common explanation for vernacular Psalters in the late middle ages is that they were used by the non-*literatus* to ‘follow along’ during the mass or Office. Eamon Duffy has argued that “The likeliest use of the Psalter by lay people…must have been to follow the Office as it was recited or sung…as a crib…to understand what was being said.”

Annie Sutherland follows Duffy’s lead in both her 2008 “English Psalms in the Middle Ages” and her 2015 *English Psalms in the Middle Ages, 1300-1450*, but without ever explaining the mechanics of how such a reading process might have taken place. In one instance, Sutherland states that “In the case of British Library MS. Vespasian D. vii, by far the smallest of the manuscripts containing the *Metrical Psalter*, private reading in tandem with auditory participation in the Latin liturgy seems likely”;

in another, she claims that the *MEMPs* were used in place of the Vulgate Psalms “for the purpose of public liturgical recitation.”

However, the format of all *MEMPs*—small like Vespasian D. vii, or larger like CCC 278 and Harley 1770—does not lend itself to following along during a Latin liturgical service, which would involve having to continually switch back and forth between Latin and English ‘on-the-fly’ without either becoming lost or falling behind. The very short and highly abbreviated Latin incipits, I would suggest, preclude a layperson with even rudimentary Latin from easily situating him- or herself in the Psalter and making the transition between Latin prose and English verse. As Duffy himself has argued, “The Psalter must always have been a difficult book for lay people to find their way around, there is a
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good deal of obscurity about the ways in which lay people might have used it”, as it “presented unique problems of navigation for the lay (and clerical) user”.

Evelyn Birge-Vitz’ discussions of vernacular versified Psalters also argue that their function was related to participation in liturgical events (though not following along), since they were ideal for reading aloud and responsorial chanting. However, like Duffy and Sutherland, who have proposed an official liturgical function or para-liturgical reading practice, Birge-Vitz does not elaborate on how the text and the reader would have engaged in an ongoing Latin or English ritual reading practice, responsorial or otherwise.

If any English or other vernacular Psalter was intended for following along during the mass, “the favoured apparatus is interlinear gloss”, according to David Lawton, not a versified English text with very limited Latin incipits, which would have not been particularly useful to lay readers for reference or navigation in the midst of a service. British Library MS. Harley 1896 was a Wycliffite prose interlinear Latin-English Psalter from the mid-fifteenth century, which we know was specifically designed for English speakers who wanted a service book. As such, its design is more conducive to ongoing comparison and ‘on-the-fly’ translation (Fig. 10). Even a facing column arrangement of prose texts would facilitate the ongoing and close comparison of texts that a reader would require in the midst of a liturgical service. An excellent example of this design is Harley 1770’s facing Latin and Anglo-Norman columns.

One intriguing possibility for the MEMP (and its French companion), which may help explain why it has no annotations or other marks of reading, is that it was what was known in France as a ‘brevaires en cage’, a Psalter set on a stone or wooden desk and
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covered with a metal cage or grill with spaces large enough so a reader could slip their hand through in order to turn the page, but not large enough to remove the book. According to André Masson, most cathedral churches in France (including Senlis, Notre Dame and Laon) all had such ‘brevaires en cage’ in the nave or a chapel, and Christopher de Hamel also makes a passing reference to them in his description of lay access to books in late medieval England. While CCC 278’s size and large, clear script would have made it an ideal candidate for such a setting, the fact that it was a library book and not a service book (according to its Norwich Priory library letter class) suggests that it likely did not remain in the church for long periods of time, as brevaires en cage must have.

To discount the likelihood of the ‘following along’ and brevaires en cage scenarios is not to say that a versified English rendering of the Psalter couldn’t have been used to enhance a layperson’s experience of liturgical services. A versified English rendition of the Vulgate with the MEMP’s mise-en-page would have been a very poor design choice if the intended purpose was to follow along. However, Christopher de Hamel notes that Psalters owned by the laity in late medieval England were often used in liturgical settings not for following along, but for reading prior to, and likely during, the services in order to enter into and remain in the right frame of mind for “penance and pious contemplation”. In this scenario, the English text and the understanding it facilitated, would have allowed the reader to more deeply inhabit the Psalms without requiring a direct connection between the Latin of the service and the English of the psalter book.
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Another model that may inform our understanding of how the MEMP was used in a liturgical context, relates to the public reading of the Northern Homily Cycle. The NHC was an early-fourteenth-century paraphrase of the cycle of gospel lessons from the mass, the relevant portions of which were probably read out to the congregation after the mass was over, so non-Latinate lay people could understand the lessons for that day. This text enabled para-liturgical reading in English at an early date, as the MEMP might have done. The Northern Homily Cycle performs a very similar function as the earliest of all Middle English biblical paraphrases, the Orrmulum, a late-twelfth-century collection of sermon-like commentaries on the gospel lessons from the mass, which Orrm wrote to “let English folk win Salvation” and which were likely read out loud, like the NHC, on the day of the mass so English-speakers understood the gospel passage for that day. This connection is very clear in James Morey’s Book and Verse, in which he groups the NHC and the Orrmulum together under the heading ‘Lectionaries.’ The examples of reading to enter into the right frame of mind before or during the service (as in de Hamel’s example, above) or having the English versions of the lessons read after the service are both examples of a liturgically-related reading practice that, while not integral to the church’s performance of the mass or Office, are directly adjacent to the liturgical service proper, augmenting it for the non-Latinate laity.

Birge-Vitz’ discussions of the powerful emotional effects of versified Psalters does not make a distinction between official liturgical events and para-liturgical reading

---

60 Wogan-Browne et al., The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory, 1280-1520, 125.
62 Wogan-Browne et al., The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory, 1280-1520, 125.
64 Lawton, "Englishing the Bible, 1066-1549," 465.
situations. Her descriptions of responsorial chanting in English and the strong emotional responses that versified scripture evoke a public devotional use, not confined to or perhaps even suitable for following along during the mass or Offices.\textsuperscript{65} The ‘emotional response’ elicited by the versified Psalter is in keeping with de Hamel’s proposed reading scenario for a vernacular Psalter of entering into the right frame of mind for worship and contrition, and for helping non-Latinate lay people to memorize the text while receiving it either orally or aurally. This potential ‘spilling-over’ of liturgically-structured vernacular texts into para-liturgical reading situations is characteristic of Holsinger’s contention that liturgical texts “imbued with institutional prestige” were nevertheless “various, poetic, literary, rhetorical, unstable”, escaping the immediate environment of the Latin liturgy to inhabit many other personal and public, Latin and vernacular, monastic and lay reading scenarios.\textsuperscript{66}

Finally, the liturgy provided opportunities to display the codex and its English Psalter in a public setting, symbolically. Such display in the midst of the liturgy or other ritual event would require only the sort of reading “that allows the systematic manipulation of the symbolic capital associated with clerical letters”.\textsuperscript{67} In this scenario the readers or congregation would be able to ‘read’ the holy-text-as-object as the presence of authority, ecclesiastical power, and the sacred, even if they couldn’t read the English, French or Latin text itself. De Hamel notes that books were precious, sacred, remote and almost magical objects in the medieval period, and to much of English society their transcendental, symbolic value was even more important than the texts they contained. This is one reason books were regarded as essential components of monasteries—religious houses required books in order
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to demonstrate their solid and tangible link with truth, though not necessarily for any reason beyond that.\textsuperscript{68} This is not to suggest that the _MEMP_ held only symbolic value, although that is possible, but only that CCC 278 potentially had a powerful symbolic presence in addition to its value as a collection of texts for readers of varying literacies and linguistic profiles. In addition, the English language of the _MEMP_ also would have had a notable signifying power if displayed or vocalized within a Benedictine church. In this sense, not only the book (CCC 278) and the text (the _MEMP_) had symbolic power, but the English language itself, as seen—though not necessarily read—in the midst of the Latinate Priory.

### 3.6 Reading Scenarios 3: Non-Liturgical Reading

While this thesis has focused on the potential for lay-monastic interaction in the context of Psalter reading, it is possible that this manuscript could have been read in a solely monastic context. The monks of the Priory had several other books in vernacular languages in their library, and could have used this book at several sites of public, oral/aural reading amongst themselves: “In communities that followed the Rule of Benedict, public reading took place in the chapter house, at mealtimes in the refectory, and at the evening collation...This public reading comprised largely biblical texts, homilies, saints lives and texts on the conduct of the religious life.”\textsuperscript{69} Annie Sutherland suggests this possibility for Harley 1770, which was larger than CCC 278: “The manuscript’s size would appear to preclude its use as a private book but it is perfectly possible that it might have had some
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function in the communal setting of the monastery." If Latin was invariably the language of monastic liturgy, leisure and mealtime reading in vernacular languages for mixed monastic-lay audiences are suspected uses for some vernacular saints lives owned by monastic or conventual houses.  

Another possibility for reading vernacular Psalms at Norwich Priory relates to penance. We know that local Norwich elites, who would have spoken, and perhaps read, both English and French, did penance at the Priory in the fourteenth century, and the Psalms were an important part of the penitential process, with recitation of some or all of the Psalter being prescribed, depending on the transgression. According to Joan Greatrex, “There are numerous examples of monks of the cathedral priories taking their turn as penitentiaries or confessors, both within the monastery for their brethren and in the city and diocese for the .” In the same visitation report in which he had upbraided the monks for allowing too many lay people into the nave (see Chapter 1), he also noted that monks were charging lay penitents for confessions, when the service should have been provided gratis as part of their pastoral duties. The lay penitent could have used the MEMP to recite his Psalms in English, being a language he could both read and understand, thereby enhancing the inward efficacy of Psalter recitation. In this scenario, the Latin incipits would have allowed the monk-confessor to follow the penitent’s progress as he read his Psalms from a lectern in the nave  
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or one the Priory’s side chapels. The Lincolnshire monk Robert Mannyng’s *Handling Sin* and the anonymous *Speculum Vitae* were also ecclesiastically-sanctioned English productions, based on Latin or French antecedents, that were employed in penitential reading scenarios, likely in a mixed group of clerical and lay readers.

3.6.1 Élite Mixed Reading Groups

In the context of romance literature, the late middle ages saw a shift away from the sociabilities of the hall and toward reading aloud in smaller groups within the chamber. Acknowledging that the devotional literary context differs in many ways from the secular, there is no reason to suppose that preferences for smaller reading groups in the secular realm would not be replicated in the religious. There are several potential reading scenarios in which monks and literate laity could engage the *MEMP* in a small mixed reading community. Wendy Scase gives the examples of libraries founded by the bishop of Worcester at both Worcester Priory and Bristol Cathedral to which the bishop appointed chaplains to “run the library and take responsibility for explaining scripture or preaching.”

This model of ‘reading with an explicator’ would seem to be a variation on the master-student relationship that had been practiced from late antiquity through the medieval period, and would have provided the student instruction on how to use and understand the text, in addition to provision of the text itself.
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Other slightly later works like Robert Mannyng’s *Handlyng Sin* (1303) and *Chronicle* (1338), composed in the “native” tongue (i.e., English) for those who did not understand French or Latin, were intended for lay audiences or readers “dependent on reciters”—likely upper peasantry or lower gentry.\(^77\) This model of textual production and deployment is instructive for thinking about how the *MEMP* could have been read, as most reading situations, from the middle ages through the Renaissance and beyond, were group reading scenarios in which a text was read aloud to a group of listeners, or ‘aural’ readers.\(^78\) This model describes not just a text and an audience, but also a chain of transmission and interpretation: a text is prepared for an imagined audience and an intended purpose, but requires a skilled *lector* to transmit (read) the text, mediating it for the community not just with voice or gesture, but possibly also through explication during the course of the reading.

An intriguing visual depiction of this dynamic of transmission and mediation is the frontispiece to Bibliotheque Royale MS. Albert 1\(^{er}\) 9015-9016, a fifteenth-century, dual French-Latin version of Augustine’s *Civitate Dei* (Fig. 11). In this image an angel provides inspiration to Augustine, who reads aloud from a lectern. To the right, a Benedictine monk holds the bilingual text and in turn reads aloud to a small audience seated on a bench, while another larger, separate group of learned listeners and scholars sit holding books of their own listening to Augustine. This image of aural reading practice contains all the elements being posited for the Norwich *MEMP*: a divinely inspired text originally in Latin, rendered into a multilingual manuscript for public reading, along with the mediating presence of the monk who could move between the French and Latin texts and explicate the text based on the
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commentaries of previous scholars. In Coleman’s analysis of this image’s, she remarks on the authorizing and mediating functions of the monk within a chain of transmission whose final link is the French version of the text: “Chevrot here gives us an extended exposition of authority and its transmission…Augustine’s aural publication of his *Civitas* echoes down the ages in the work—read aloud and disputed in turn—by scholarly commentators and thinkers…Vernacularity picks up the chain in a…legitimate and legitimizing format that carries Augustine’s voice forward into the present day, in the person of the two men listening to ‘Raoul’ [the monk] read the *Cité*.”\(^\text{79}\)

Joyce Coleman describes several scenarios in which texts are mediated by a skilled reader for a listening audience, not because the audience was illiterate or because they did not have access to books, but because the skills of the reader significantly enhanced the reception and experience of the text and offered opportunities for displays of literacy and piety. In other words, the listeners *chose* to be read to. She gives the examples of a gentry family who had a priest read and comment on devotional texts at their home, and of lay readers of devotional texts who were accompanied by a “spiritual guide” who explicated texts to them.\(^\text{80}\) Even as devotional texts for the laity became more and more widely available, enabling private reading, public reading “was embraced by members of the highest social classes well into the late fifteenth century.”\(^\text{81}\)

Coleman notes that amongst the earliest lecture styles at Oxford University was a process of mediated reading, wherein the *lector* reads and interprets the text in a process of
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praeelectio that not only transmits the text but also shapes the audience’s understanding of it, noting “the superior pedagogic force of a performed text.”82 This process of mediation and transmission can be extended even further into society, as “Once a text was read, contemplated, and internalized, it could be repeated to the less educated listener. Such was the case with the reading of devotional texts through spiritual direction.”83 A versified, rhymed text like the MEMP would have facilitated such a process of transmission.

Coleman notes that group reading was not only an opportunity for communal activity, but was intended as a social occasion in which bonds were created between participants “by an active process of textual and social interaction that continued throughout the reading”.84 Roger Chartier agrees, stating that “reading aloud…cements “the interlocking forms of sociability” at work in private, family, social, literary and scholarly circles.”85 That is, public reading creates and reinforces community.

However, just as in so many other communal situations, hierarchy enters into the dynamic, and Coleman observes that it was normal for the reader to be of the same or lower social status than the listeners—but not higher. In the examples of devotional or schoolroom reading noted above, the lay ‘clients’ are social superiors who possess the economic and political capital that can be exchanged for religious capital (reading and explication of religious texts) offered by the masters of the text—monks, priests, family chaplains or university lecturers. As Coleman has summarized, “Even men renowned as founders of libraries, as commissioners of translations, as patrons of literature, and powerful people whose literacy could not be in doubt, preferred to employ someone to read their books to
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them”—for medieval readers, “status was invested in the audience, not the praelectors.”

In the case of a text like the MEMP, being read within the confines—physical and spiritual—of the monastery, mixed reading would almost certainly have been guided by a monk, acting as both praelector (or as one overseeing the reading of the text out loud by a lay person) and interpreter to local magnates, his authority and learning encompassing the reading event, mediating and guiding it.

The stakes for proper interpretation were especially high with a biblical text like the Psalter which, Augustine cautioned, contained dark passages that required explication, as erroneous understanding could have serious—even eternal—consequences. Rolle, in the prologue to his Prose Psalter provided a similar caveat:

Bot for the psalmes bene ful derke, in many a place whos wol take hede,
And the sentence is ful merke, euer y row who so wol rede,
Hit nedeth exposicyon…the bettur vndurstonde. (ll. 17-20)

This prologue provides another example of the exercise of authority over reading and vernacular language by an institution (or institutional figure) that offers an English biblical text, but with the requirement to control the reading. This dynamic is also present in the MEMP, borne out by the bibliographic coding discussed in Chapter 2, and is an intriguing parallel to paratext, which also guides and controls the reading. For instance, the incipits of the MEMP which accompany the English verse text were likely only useful to a monastic reader, not only situating him within the Vulgate, but calling to mind the many Psalter glosses and commentaries the monk had read and studied in the past, as well as liturgical
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events and *exempla*, all of which he could continually draw on to explicate the text for the audience or reader.  

The classic model for the mediated reading process described above is ‘the grammarian-expositor’, requiring an audience and a teacher who uses the texts of the *auctores* and their glosses to teach grammar and expound the meaning and intention of the author. This is the model depicted in the frontispiece of the *Cité de Dieu*. While the classical educational model of reading with an explicator was based on, and continued in, the Latin tradition, it was also applied in the vernacular context, where languages could be compared and vernacular languages provided access to Latin grammar and textuality. This raises very interesting questions about the multilingual dynamic when a reader/explicator is introduced into an already complex textual situation. Coleman imagines the vernacular text of the *Confessio Amantis*, for instance, being explicated differently according to the *praelection*’s linguistic capabilities or knowledge of Ovid commentaries, and the preferences and linguistic capabilities of his audience, as he paused his vernacular reading to dwell on the moralizations inspired by Ovid’s Latin verses embedded in the English text (Fig. 12). Coleman concludes that this variable and context-specific multilingual reading practice is embodied in the *Confessio Amantis*’ manuscript tradition, which Coleman argues “show[s] a continuous struggle to accommodate the Latin elements” within shifting reading contexts.
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Clearly, the same can be said for the extant corpus of MEMPs, based on the significant variability in the their respective mise-en-page and accommodations of the Latin apparatus.

We can imagine the MEMP of CCC 278, like the Confessio Amantis, being read differently according to context, the reading depending on purpose (penitential, devotional, liturgical, ceremonial), on the degree of control the audience is allowed to exert over the reading, and the competence—linguistic and expository—of the reader. The fact that the book was a Psalter would have made it an ideal text not just for liturgical, para-liturgical or devotional reading situations, but also for moral instruction. It was a text that both monk and layperson would have been intimately familiar with, heightening the level of discourse and exchange, and range of possible allusion, interpretation and application. The group reading situations were intended to foster bonds between participants, and the Psalms were “always potentially communal”, “interpersonal”, “reconciliatory” and the ideal text for “heal[ing] a wound in the Church’s corporate self.”

It is intriguing to imagine the mixed monastic-lay reading of this multilingual Psalter in the context of reconciliation—rebuilding of community—in wake of the events of 1272 and public ceremony of renewed friendship between Priory and town in 1306.

In her discussion of the practice of reading with an explicator, Suzanne Reynolds sums up the dynamic that I am positing was at work in the MEMP of CCC 278 and the reading community built around it at Norwich Priory. She remarks on the motives of translation from Latin to vernacular, suggesting that, “Translation is a project in the service
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of Latinity, not in the service of the vernacular.” What this really brings to the fore is that in many cases, including, I would argue, in the case of Norwich Priory producing an English text of the Psalter, the intention was not to champion English culture or to displace Latin, but to draw English speakers, readers and listeners back into the bosom of the Benedictine Priory and its Latinate tradition via the vernacular. Michelle Warren argues, in agreement with Lawton, Cannon and Salter, that within the context of an authorizing text and institution, and correct reading and interpretation, the “supposed hierarchy” of languages is destabilized and “English operates as a functional equivalent to Latin.” However, at this stage of the emergence of English and the institutional setting of the manuscript’s production and use, it is unlikely that English was being afforded true equivalency, but was deployed as a functional equivalent only in a specific, highly controlled, reading scenario—and for other purposes in addition to inclusion and understanding.

As described in Chapter 2, the rise of English as a literary and biblical language was a reality that the monks not only had to contend with, but could turn to their advantage. Hanna has suggested that the magnatial culture of the fourteenth century expressed its power and sophistication in religious and social display, and that their linguistic preferences were focused on English, not Anglo-Norman or Latin, noting that “the demand for English books was certainly closely tied to social prestige”; “reading English books was also a mark of gentility.” Just as in Chapter 1, where a strong and early preference for English literary production and consumption was demonstrated, Norwich and its environs were in the vanguard of the adoption of English as a language of power, administration and religion.

The Priory, however, was a highly conservative institution whose struggles against competing religious houses and parish churches forced innovation in the name of retaining primacy in the religious field with the prestige and monetary capital that came with it, echoing the motives and strategy of Henry III.

3.7 Conclusion: Innovative Textuality and Institutional Control

D.H. Green’s work on medieval cultures of reading sees monastic vernacularity less as an embracing of local linguistic preferences at the expense of Latin, and more as a pragmatic communications strategy, similar to that of Henry III’s use of English in his letters to the barons in 1258. Green states that “occasions such as pilgrimage, saints days, processions or festivals (mostly public liturgical events) “provided an opportunity for monastic propaganda, for attaching laymen more firmly to the local monastery.” He goes on to say that the “pastoral obligations towards the variegated familia of monasteries could not but impel them [monks] towards vernacular literature.” These acts of lay engagement often included sermons and hymns in the vernacular, but could also include a mixed reading scenario like the one I have proposed for the Norwich MEMP. However, Green’s reference to pastoral obligations could be expanded to include the Priory’s interests in political influence and authority. There were multiple motives for monks to engage the laity in the vernacular, and the idea that a conservative institution could appropriate what was previously the lowest-status language, unsuitable for liturgical or biblical purposes, for symbolic communication with the rising, English-speaking, urban élite is entirely plausible.
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The *MEMP* of CCC 278 was an English text sought out by the Priory and innovatively built into a trilingual manuscript of the Psalms for a specific purpose, informed by local social, political and religious currents. I have argued that the *MEMP*, as a publicly-read psalter book in a mixed lay-monastic setting, was a tool for community (re-)formation and the renewal of social bonds. As such, the book (with its English text) was an embodiment of both the community in conflict and the reconciled community—just as the Eucharistic host, like the Psalms at the centre of liturgical life, was another material manifestation of reconciliation, signifying both brokenness and reunification. However, this embodiment of the renewed community brings a new dynamic—English has been placed first in the text and is in several demonstrable ways the primary vernacular text, superseding French, just as late medieval magnatial culture, more comfortable in English, was challenging the traditional aristocracy’s preference for French. These new linguistic and political realities had to be recognized and accommodated by the Priory in the wake of a century of conflict and the need to bring the city’s notables back into community. In fact, this remarkable example of monastic vernacularity and liturgical making for the purpose of engaging local laity could be mis-interpreted as a capitulation: the Priory coming to an awareness that it must bow to the desires of its patrons and abandon Lanfranc’s “aggressive Latinity”. However, as with Henry III’s letters, there is an impetus for the deployment of English text to a key constituency that goes beyond simple linguistic accommodation or capitulation. Regarding Henry’s letters, Machan concluded the following, which I believe can be applied equally to the Priory’s English Psalter: while they “gave the appearance of acquiescence to baronial demands”...the language of the letters was “a calculated
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100 Lawton, "Englishing the Bible, 1066-1549," 458. Lawton observes that after 1066 “The new clerical leaders are also Anglo-Norman, but they bring with them not Wulfstan’s commitment to vernacularity, but Lanfranc’s aggressive Latinity.”
action”…“The language [English] thus served as a rhetorical mask to cover what Henry truly sought to defend: his own power.”

The institutional context of the Benedictine Priory, and monastic leadership in reading, both authorized the English Psalter and allowed for monastic explication of its ‘derke sentence’ to lay readers. The literate laity valued and sought access to the monks’ deep understanding of the text—this was the Priory’s cultural capital, the spiritual legitimacy that it possessed, that others sought access to. Pierre Bourdieu discusses the idea that institutions can conceal their intentions as they seek to reproduce their authority within a social, political or cultural hierarchy, especially via pedagogical means, and at several levels of CCC 278’s content and structure we can discern the continued inscribing of the Priory’s institutional concerns and control mechanisms. First, the manuscript’s design (paratext) shows that Latin, the preserve of monastic readers which carried the weight of church authority, continued to inform and control English on the page. The result is that while English was the language featured and displayed, Latin continued to be the language of authority in both the English and French Psalters.

Second, in the proposed mixed reading scenario in which ostensibly equal or lower status lectors read to their betters or explicated the reading of others, it might appear that the Priory monks were acknowledging a shifting power dynamic within the community. But again, the control over all the moral, social, theological discourses that can possibly be drawn out of the Psalm text is, in this scenario, reserved to the Priory monk who reads and explicates the text—choosing to emphasize key emotions or actions of King David, or highlighting certain aspects of the text which lead the audience back to liturgical and

101 Machan, English in the Middle Ages, 55, 64.
penitential themes of interest to the explicator. This would surely have provided the opportunity for the monks to reinforce the church’s central mediating role in the individual and collective religious lives of the laity whom they ‘served’.

Third, the book, which I have argued embodies and symbolizes a new relationship between the Priory and town, is stored within the Priory, which therefore controls access to, and display of, the book and its English text. The English that I am arguing would have been a powerful symbol of a new social, political and literary dynamic at work in early-fourteenth-century England was firmly under the Latinate monks’ physical control and stewardship.

These relationships and mechanisms of exchange for the purpose of institutional control (intended or not) evoke another concept discussed by Pierre Bourdieu: the tendency of institutions to reproduce their own power, even through seemingly innovative cultural gestures and exchanges of cultural capital. CCC 278, with the MEMP as its feature text, was a tool of outreach and accommodation, but simultaneously a mechanism for ongoing Priory control in a turbulent, changing religious and social field—a field of struggle in the midst of community. It was, in Bourdieu’s words, “an instrument of reproduction capable of disguising its own function”. 103
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Fig. 8. Bodleian Library MS. 425, f.92v. Psalms 149 and 150 (‘Cantate domino’ and ‘Laudate dominum in sanctuario ejus’) from the Middle English Metrical Psalter. Mid-fourteenth century. (Image in the public domain)
Fig. 9. British Library MS. Harley 1770, f. 158r. Psalm 1 (‘Beatus vir’) with four-line decorated ‘B’. Also, the Psalterium Marianum, a poem to the Virgin, runs below. Early fourteenth century. (Image in the public domain)
Fig. 10. London, British Library Harley MS. 1896, f. 16r. Beginning of Psalm 26 (‘Dominus illumination mea’) of Latin Wycliffite Psalter with English interlinear translation. Mid-fifteenth century. (Image in the public domain)
Fig. 11. Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale MS. Albert 1er 9015-9016, f. 1r.
Augustine reading the Civitate Dei (far left) while a Benedictine monk (in black, lower left) reads and explicates La Cité de Dieu to two seated figures. Ca. 1445.
(Image in the public domain)
Fig. 12. Washington, Folger Library MS. V.b.29, f. 47r. Leaf from Gower's *Confessio Amantis* showing English text of the *Confessio* in black with texts of Ovid inserted into the body of the text in red. Mid-fifteenth century. (Image in the public domain)
CONCLUSION

The Text Embodying Community and Authority

Since the time of King John in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, there had been long-running disputes between the Priory monks and citizens of Norwich. In 1232 violence erupted with townsmen robbing and burning part of the Priory, and in 1239 King Henry III travelled to Norwich to intervene in further violent disputes.\(^1\) Just over thirty years later, in August 1272, the most widely chronicled example of lay-monastic violence in late medieval England erupted, resulting in the burning of the Priory and its library, and the murder of several lay employees. As a result, in September 1272, King Henry III once again travelled to Norwich to personally intervene. Local lay notables were excommunicated by the bishop in the king’s presence, an exorbitant fine was levied on the city, 29 citizens involved in the assault on the Priory were hanged, and the city’s liberties were suspended by the king. But Henry III’s ire was not reserved just for the citizens of the town.\(^2\) He placed the Cathedral Priory under custodianship until the trouble was resolved and deposed the prior altogether.\(^3\)

Six years later—Advent Sunday, 1278—the Cathedral Priory, following extensive repairs, was rededicated in the presence of King Edward I and Queen Eleanor, three other bishops, and “a great concourse of nobles”, signalling the inauguration of a new era in relations between the city’s élite and the monks of the Priory. In 1306, in the same approximate timeframe that the Priory commissioned and likely began to use CCC 278, there was another major public ritual celebration of reconciliation between the Priory and the
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\(^1\) Page, *The Victoria History of the County of Norfolk*, 2, 319.
\(^2\) Ibid., 476.
\(^3\) Campbell, "Norwich before 1300," 34.
town. Tombland—that liminal parcel of land outside the Priory gates that had been the object of the conflagration of 1272—officially became a shared space between the town and the Cathedral Priory. At this public ceremony, again presided over by King Edward I, it was decreed that “all parties should try to be real friends” and that a delegation of Norwich’s chief citizens should go to Rome to witness to the truth of the reconciliation between the town and the Priory.⁴

The use of the word ‘friendship’ in the context of this reconstitution of community is conspicuous, as it had very specific and powerful connotations in the monastic context. Monastic discourse is full of references to friendship—a bond that creates community, and restores those in a state of alienation to the original state of unity between man and God in Eden.⁵ However, there is another connotation when ‘friendship’ is used to describe the relationship between monks and laity: “Outside the cloister, amicitia can be named in various contexts, usually as a bond between men of power in the church or in lay life. The word rarely has religious overtones. It is mainly a secular practice, a way of lubricating the relationships of the world.”⁶ This description of monastic-lay friendship, and the motives which underlie it, recall the complex networks of exchange and capital that run through the social and cultural history of medieval Norwich, and have been discussed throughout this thesis. This description also recalls the posited desire of the Priory to bring lay élites into community for the purpose of maintaining status within the highly competitive social and religious field of Norwich.

⁴ Page, The Victoria History of the County of Norfolk, 2, 320.
⁵ Haseldine, “Monastic Friendship”, 352.
Henry III’s two direct interventions into the conflicts in Norwich are remarkable for several reasons. First, Henry travelled to Norwich twice following the August 1272 riots—once in September and again in October, before dying in November 1272, spending a significant amount of time before his death mediating and resolving this “nationally traumatic” situation.\(^7\) He was clearly deeply interested in the conflict in Norwich and how to resolve it. But perhaps more germane to this thesis, these visits provide a tantalizing link between his remarkable English letters to the barony in 1258 and the *Middle English Metrical Psalter* of CCC 278. English was not a language of government in the thirteenth century, but Henry’s authority—derived from the institution of kingship—was an authenticating force that legitimized English in the political context. It allowed English to become, at that particular time and within that multilingual context, an authoritative documentary language and a powerful symbol of his connection to the English people. Henry used a very pragmatic and targeted deployment of English—as a language that every baron could understand (semantic level) and a language that marked him as ‘native’ and ‘not French’ (symbolic level)—to win over key magnates to his side in the lead-up to the Barons War. His instrumentalization of the English language was therefore not part of a rising national ‘English’ consciousness, but a shrewd communications strategy for the purpose of retaining power. Henry added English to his communications repertoire as a symbol of affinity (with the English) and of separation and distinction (from French culture and influence).

As I have argued here, the Priory, less than fifty years later, deployed English in a similar fashion in the context of the unique ‘double-vernacular’ Psalter that is CCC 278. This time, instead of a proclamation that sets out a royal position—a document appropriate

\(^7\) Campbell, "Norwich before 1300," 34.
to the political field—the Priory used English in a textual device appropriate to its field, a liturgically-structured psalter book, to create a connection with a lay constituency that was key to its retention of prominence within the religious field of late medieval Norwich.

The connection was not just made through displays of language, but also through a communal reading process that allowed laity to participate in a monastic textual practice, and to display their literacy and association with the acknowledged spiritual leaders of Norwich, the Benedictine monks, within the biggest church in Norwich, the Cathedral Priory. It also allowed the monks to control the reading and interpretation of the text, shaping the laity’s understanding and experience of it. While the educated citizens of Norwich likely had some facility in languages other than English—particularly Anglo-Norman, but even some Latin—the English text of the Psalms seems designed to offer the freedom to read and interpret scripture in English, standing in for Latin and putting the mother tongue of the English people front and centre. Both of these operations (reading and interpreting) were nevertheless controlled and informed by Priory monks, who in their vocations and identities had been reborn into a Latinate culture.

CCC 278’s MEMP is an example of Stephen G. Nichols’ assertion that manuscripts from urban environments reflect their urban influences, that is, manuscripts embody their contexts. I have argued that the order and separation of languages (English first, French second) and the quality of decoration, parchment and script (English superior to French) are material manifestations of a socio-linguistic environment in which French’s dominance as the textual vernacular of England was beginning to slip and English was being embraced by a rising élite who preferred English. CCC 278 is also an example of the embodiment of
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context within codex and text in that it reflects the monastic desire to control and guide the laity, represented in the manuscript by the relationship between the vernacular languages and the Latin apparatus which surrounds and informs them. The Latin incipits and headers authorize the English text, just as the monks sought to guide the laity’s reading of the book and understanding of the text. There is an analogous relationship between the relationships of Latin to vernacular in the codex and monk to laity in the mixed reading community.

There is one other way CCC 278 embodies its culture and can be viewed as a local manifestation of much broader cultural forces. While this manuscript is a liturgically-structured Psalter, it is impossible to know how it fit into the daily or weekly liturgical cycles of Norwich Cathedral Priory. However, on a much broader temporal scale, the “liturgy forms one of the strongest threads of cultural continuity linking the pre- and post-Conquest eras” and CCC 278 is a textual artefact that carries within it all the languages of the medieval English Psalter tradition. It contains a Middle English Psalter with conspicuously Anglo-Saxon word choices, an Anglo-Norman Psalter, and a Latin apparatus that conveys the full weight of the entire Vulgate Psalter. All of these elements together span and embody the entire medieval English Psalter tradition. More specifically, the MEMP, this woefully understudied and sometimes denigrated text, is a critical link in the long history of English biblical textuality. The MEMP is the medial, bridging text that joins—perhaps mediates in an as yet undiscovered way—the Anglo-Saxon and early modern Psalter traditions. It stands between the much-studied Anglo-Saxon metrical Psalters of the tenth and eleventh centuries, and the Middle English Psalters that would be produced in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and ultimately the metrical Psalters which played such a transformative role in the English Reformation. England has a long and continuous history of English metrical
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Psalters at the centre of the community’s literary and religious culture, and the *Middle English Metrical Psalter*, with further study of its reading communities and institutional provenances, may one day take a more prominent place in the literary history of England.

Wendy Scase, discussing future directions in the study of medieval reading communities states that “our knowledge is at the level of the case study rather than the synthesis. Much remains to be done before it will be possible to write a comprehensive history medieval reading and its place in communities.”¹⁰ This thesis has attempted such a case study, and just as Scase asks that scholars consider as many types of information as possible to contextualize and illuminate medieval reading practices, this thesis has contextualized and historicized the manuscript and its *Middle English Metrical Psalter*. In the process, this thesis has discerned in the manuscript’s contents, layout, language choices and provenance an embodiment of the community of late medieval Norwich, and its desire for both cooperation and friendship, as well as the underlying contest for control and authority within the community.
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¹⁰ Scase, "Reading Communities," 570.
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