1

Introduction

What page, what word in that divine authority, the Old and the New Testament, is not a most proper standard of human life?

Rule of Benedict, ch. lxxiii

Bibles laid open, millions of surprises

George Herbert, *Sinne*

In letters sent from the spiritual battleground of northern Germany to his friends back home, the Anglo-Saxon missionary and saint, Boniface, made two regular demands: for prayers and for books. He could be quite specific about the latter. Writing at some time between 742 and 746 to Daniel, bishop of Winchester, he asked for a *liber prophetarum*, which he said had belonged to his late master, Abbot Winbert of Nursling, Hampshire. It was the one, he explained, 'in which six prophets are to be found together in a single volume, written out in full with clear letters'.[1] Nothing in Boniface's surviving correspondence proves conclusively that he received this part-Bible, but the fact that he was able to cite from Isaiah, Ezekiel and two of the Minor Prophets in a letter to Archbishop Cuthbert of Canterbury, in 747, may be significant.[2] We know that other requested books reached him safely.[3] Whatever the case, Boniface's letter highlights the part played by codices of the Old Testament in the life of the Anglo-Saxon monastery and mission. This study will confirm that the

[1] *Ep.* lxiii: 'ubi sex prophete in uno corpore claris et absolutis litteris scripti repperientur' (MGH, Epp. select. I, 131). On the identity of the six prophets, see below, pp. 45–6 and, on Boniface and his letters, pp. 68–72.

[2] *Ep.* lxxviii (MGH, Epp. select. I, 161–70). In the case of one of the Minor Prophets, however (Habakkuk), Boniface cites from a canticle version, which he will have known by heart; see below, pp. 69–70.

[3] In a letter (*Ep.* lxxv) written in 746–7 to Archbishop Egbert of York (*c.* 732–66), Boniface acknowledges receipt of 'gifts and books' ('muneribus et libris susceptis') and asks for more of the latter, namely 'some of Bede's treatises' ('de opusculis Bedan lectoris aliquos tractatus') (MGH, Epp. select. I, 156–8).

books of the Old Testament circulated most commonly throughout the Anglo-Saxon period, alongside gospelbooks, epistles and psalters, in just the sort of handy part-Bible requested by Boniface. Complete Bibles were known at least as early as the end of the seventh century but were doubtless always something of a rarity. Only at the end of the period, according to the manuscript evidence, may their numbers have increased significantly. The legibility of Winbert's book of prophets was important to Boniface, whose eyesight was failing,[4] and a carefully produced manuscript in half-uncial or hybrid minuscule is indicated. There are several surviving analogous examples from English scriptoria of the eighth or early ninth centuries, although it is conceivable that the part-Bible in question was an Italian import, written in uncials. The English Vulgate tradition, as we shall see, was based largely on such exemplars.

No investigation of the text or texts of the Vulgate Old Testament known to the Anglo-Saxons – circulating in their complete Bibles, part-Bibles and other manuscripts, and turned into Old English by the earliest translators – has ever been made. It is true that the manuscript evidence for the Old Testament is sparse in comparison with the number of gospelbooks and psalters which survives, but it is not negligible. Seventeen manuscripts, dating from the second half of the sixth to the middle of the eleventh centuries, comprise the raw material for this study.[5] The seventeen are defined by their library shelf-marks. In fact, two trios of manuscripts consist of the dispersed fragments of single codices (or, in one case, possibly two codices) and one pair represents the components of a two-volume Bible. Conversely, one manuscript is a conflation of the remains of two originally separate codices. Thus the evidence for the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England encompasses at least thirteen original books. Two are complete, or almost complete, large-format Bibles, and one is a small-format part-Bible. The other manuscripts consist of isolated leaves or fragments, but their codicological origins can be established by the criterion of page size, which can be estimated with some confidence. This indicates that four more of the books, with comparatively large pages, were complete Bibles, and that the six others, with smaller pages, were further part-Bibles, such as Heptateuchs and collec-

[4] *Ep.* lxiii: 'caligantibus oculis' (MGH, Epp. select. I, 131).

[5] I list them below, pp. 40–41. Bogaert, 'La Bible latine', p. 304, notes a general neglect of the history of the Latin text of the Old Testament, a history of great complexity, in comparison with that of the New Testament.

tions of the 'wisdom' books or, as in the case of Abbot Winbert's volume, the prophets.[6] The count, then, is at least eight small Old Testament volumes and six complete Bibles.

Chance will have played an important part in producing the detail of the survival pattern of these biblical manuscripts, but its outline reflects the familiar Anglo-Saxon history of intellectual endeavour, with its two apparent peaks of achievement – the first in Bede's Northumbria, at the turn of the seventh century, and the second in the wake of Benedictine monastic revival of the later tenth. From the former comes the complete 'Codex Amiatinus', from the latter the almost-complete Royal 1. E. VII + VIII – both of them books of high textual and codicological quality. Associated with Amiatinus are leaves from a second, similar pandect; more or less contemporary with Royal 1. E. VII + VIII are fragments from three other complete Bibles. In between, the evidence is of part-Bibles, of variable – and sometimes very poor – quality. Vulgate history is inseparable from monastic and church history. In the Anglo-Saxon context, this encompasses the arrival of Christianity from Italy, directly or via Ireland, in the sixth and seventh centuries; the dispatch of Anglo-Saxon missions back to the Continent in the eighth century; and later a return movement of men, ideas and manuscripts from the Continent in the post-Carolingian period – a movement that was sporadic in the time of King Alfred and his immediate successors, but continuous from the mid-tenth century onwards, when the spirit of continental reform transformed Anglo-Saxon monasticism, at least in the south. The Anglo-Saxon texts of the Old Testament cannot therefore be studied in isolation from the wider history of the Vulgate Bible. Their idiosyncrasies can only be identified and assessed in relation to the textual forms transmitted in other manuscripts. In view of the number of such manuscripts extant and the great length of the Old Testament, the task is an immensely complex one.

Adequate tools, in the form of comprehensive collations of at least a representative selection of the manuscripts, are a prerequisite. Historians of the text of the New Testament text have for many years had the guidance of the complete critical edition by Wordsworth and White.[7]

[6] I discuss the problems involved in making such assessments below, p. 43.

[7] *Nouum Testamentum* (1889–1954). For the history of the text, see esp. Metzger, *Early Versions* and Fischer, 'Der Vulgate-Text des Neuen Testamentes' and 'Das Neue Testament in Lateinischer Sprache', in *Beiträge*, pp. 51–73 and 156–274, respectively.

Those concerned with the Old Testament have been at a disadvantage. Only in 1994 did the large critical edition, initiated by Pope Pius X in 1907 and executed by the scholars of the Benedictine Order in Rome, reach completion with its eighteenth volume, the *Liber Maccabaeorum*.[8] The first, the *Liber Genesis*, had appeared as long ago as 1926, under the editorship of Henri Quentin. The handy two-volume edition of the whole Vulgate by Robert Weber, with minimal critical apparatus, largely reproduces the Benedictine text of the Old Testament (and Wordsworth's and White's text of the New) but introduces some modifications, resulting from further study of the manuscripts.[9] An invaluable by-product of the Rome enterprise has been a series of monographs on the transmission and textual history of biblical and liturgical manuscripts, along with numerous papers by the Benedictine scholars associated with the enterprise.[10] The more recent volumes of the Rome edition have their own extensive critical introductions. Meanwhile, however, an even more ambitious Benedictine critical project is underway at the Vetus Latina Institut at Beuron, directed by H. J. Frede, as successor to Bonifatius Fischer. Some thirty volumes, covering both Testaments, will eventually provide a collation of all known sources of the Old Latin, pre-Hieronymian texts and will thus replace, after two and a half centuries, the three-volume pioneering work of Pierre Sabatier, *Bibliorum Sacrorum latinae uersiones antiquae seu uetus Italica*.[11] The Beuron volumes also include information on the Vulgate manuscripts and their coverage in this respect is more comprehensive than that of the Rome *Biblia Sacra*. Fischer's edition of *Genesis* was published in 1949, but the other Old Testament books have been slower to appear, and only *Sapientia*

[8] On the history of the edition (directed initially by Cardinal Gasquet and housed since 1933 at the Abbazia San Girolamo), see esp. Quentin, *Essais*, pp. 22–7; Gasquet, 'Revision'; Gribomont, 'L'édition vaticane', pp. 473–9, and 'Les éditions critiques'; and below, pp. 15–18. A useful bibliographical survey of the Latin Bible is in MacNamara, 'Latin Bible', pp. 10–15. Also helpful, despite gaps, is A. Vernet, *La Bible au moyen âge: Bibliographie* (Paris, 1989).

[9] *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, 3rd ed. (Stuttgart, 1983); see p. xxii, on the 'new' text. Fischer's *Nouae concordantiae* (1977) are based on an earlier edition of this work.

[10] See the series *Collectanea Biblica Latina* (Rome, 1912–), and the publications of Henri Quentin, Donatien De Bruyne, John Chapman, Pierre Salmon, Henri de Sainte-Marie, Robert Weber and Jean Gribomont.

[11] *LVA* (1743–9).

Salomonis, edited by Walter Thiele, was complete by 1994.[12] A parallel series of volumes from Beuron provides historical surveys and patristic investigations and prints important texts.[13] In Madrid, T. Ayuso Marazuela has directed a separate project to produce a critical edition of the *Vetus Latina Hispanica*, based on the conviction that there existed a separate Spanish Old Latin translation. An introductory volume, including useful general information on the transmission of the Latin Bible, has appeared, along with editions of the Octateuch and Psalms.[14]

The textual history of the Latin Bible, including the Vulgate Old Testament, is still being written, and the survey of the Anglo-Saxon manuscripts which this study presents is a contribution to it. Before listing the manuscripts and explaining the method of my approach to their contents, I give a brief account of the history of the Vulgate text and the forms in which it circulated, and of the continental background against which the Anglo-Saxon witnesses must be considered.

THE VULGATE

Beginnings and early transmission

The vernacular of early Christianity, and consequently the 'vulgate' language of both the Old Testament (the Septuagint translation from the Hebrew) and the New Testament, was Greek,[15] but as the church prospered and spread during the second and third centuries, and the influence of Greek declined, a demand for Latin translations had to be met.[16] The first were probably made in north Africa and may have been

[12] *VL* XI/1. Sirach (*VL* XI/2), Song of Songs (*VL* X/3) and Isaiah (*VL* XII) are near completion; see Bibliography. Several volumes of New Testament epistles are already available from Beuron, to complement the earlier edition of the gospels, *Itala. Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung nach den Handschriften herausgegeben*, ed. A. Jülicher, 4 vols., (Berlin, 1938–63).

[13] Vetus Latina: Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel (Freiburg, 1957–). Fifteen volumes have appeared. Important work on old biblical and liturgical texts was presented in an earlier series, *Texte und Arbeite* 1–54 (Beuron, 1917–64). An annual *Bericht* from Beuron describes the Institut's work.

[14] *VLH* (1953–).

[15] Kenyon, *Greek Bible;* E. Tov, 'The Septuagint', in *Mikra*, ed. Mulder, pp. 161–88; W. F. Howard, 'The Greek Bible', in *Versions*, ed. Robinson, pp. 39–82.

[16] On the earliest Latin versions, see esp. Kedar, 'Latin Translations', pp. 299–313; Gribomont, 'Les plus anciennes', pp. 43–65; and Bogaert, 'La Bible latine', pp. 143–56.

known to Tertullian (*c.* 130–230), but the earliest firm evidence comes in long passages cited by Cyprian of Carthage in the mid-third century, which narrowly predate the first European evidence.[17] We should probably envisage the translations being made locally and piecemeal, as demand dictated, and it is unlikely that there was ever a single, received 'Old Latin' version.[18] The picture is one of variation and confusion and Augustine was driven to complain that Latin translators were 'out of all number', compared with those who translated from Hebrew to Greek.[19] Evidence for the preparation of complete Bibles is scanty, although Bonifatius Fischer has drawn attention to the intriguing report of the seizure of biblical codices, including one described as 'very large', during a raid by the imperial authorities on a north African sect in 303.[20] Our most reliable record is the late-sixth-century account in the *Institutiones* of Cassiodorus of his own monastery of Vivarium, which he says possessed a nine-volume Old Latin Bible and also a large pandect, which he called the *Codex grandior*.[21] This was probably the volume reported by Bede as having reached Wearmouth-Jarrow in 686,[22] but it has not survived. The seventh-century 'Lyon Heptateuch' is the only substantial extant Bible manuscript with the old text, although it has lost much of Genesis and Exodus.[23] There is, however, a large number of fragments.[24]

Conscious of the uncontrolled proliferation of varying and often inac-

Also useful are Billen, *Old Latin Texts* and Sparks, 'Latin Bible', pp. 100–10. On the classification of Old Latin texts, see Fischer in *VL* II, 14*–22*; and Marsden, 'Intervention', p. 235

17 Bogaert, 'La Bible latine', pp. 143–4; Gribomont, 'Les plus anciennes', pp. 47–51; Metzger, *Early Versions*, pp. 285–93; Kedar, 'Latin Translations', pp. 299–300.

18 *Ibid.*, pp. 300–1.

19 *Doctr. christ.* II.xi: 'Qui enim Scripturas ex hebraea in graecam uerterunt, numerari possunt, latini autem interpretes nullo modo' (CCSL 32, 42). It is to Augustine that we owe the identification of one Old Latin version as the 'Itala', but the term is confusing and, although used by Jülicher (above, n. 12), is usually avoided today; see Metzger, *Early Versions*, pp. 290–3.

20 Fischer, *LB*, p. 38; McGurk, 'Oldest Manuscripts', p. 1.

21 *Instit.* I.v.2 and xiv.2. On the Bibles of Vivarium, see below, pp. 130–9.

22 *HA*, ch. 15; below, p. 86 and n. 52.

23 Lyon, Bibliothèque de la Ville, 403 + 1964 (*VL* I, no. 100; *CLA* VI, no. 771). See *VL* II, 5*–6*; and Fischer, *LB*, p. 121. The codex is ed. Robert, *Pentateuchi Versio* (1881) and *Heptateuchi Partis Posterioris Versio* (1900), with extensive critical material.

24 The list in *VL* I, 11–34 includes about two hundred. For a comprehensive catalogue of manuscripts, presented book by book for both Testaments, see *VLH* I, 205–27.

curate Latin texts and the need for a single, authoritative one, Pope Damasus commissioned the scholar Jerome, in 382, to make a revision of the gospels from the Greek. These were finished by 383 and Jerome seems to have followed them with a more cursory revision of some, at least, of the rest of the New Testament. Thereafter, between about 390 and 405, he worked on a revision of the books of the Old Testament.[25] He had settled by now in Bethlehem and was able to make use of Origen's compendious *Hexapla* Bible (available at Caesarea), and in particular the heavily annotated Septuagint version in the fifth column of that work.[26] Before long, however, Jerome became dissatisfied with the Greek and decided to begin the task anew, this time going direct to the Hebrew for his authority, although it is clear that he continued to refer also to both Greek and Old Latin texts. How far his initial 'hexaplaric' revision had extended is a matter of dispute.[27] Certainly the book of Psalms was completed, for it became the received 'Gallican' psalter, and also Job and Song of Songs, which survive in large part, and Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, whose texts are partially recoverable, and a surviving prologue to Chronicles shows that this book should be included also.[28] Whatever the case, Jerome thoroughly reworked all the Old Testament books,[29] except those rejected from the Hebrew canon, the six so-called deuterocanonical books; he did, reluctantly and rapidly, make fairly free versions of Tobit and Judith,

[25] The literature on Jerome's translations and revisions is extensive. Useful are Kedar, 'Latin Translations', pp. 313–34; Metzger, *Early Versions*, pp. 330–4; Semple, 'Biblical Translator'; Sparks, *CHB* 1, 517–26; and Condamin, 'Les caractères'.

[26] On Origen's *Hexapla*, see Kenyon, *Greek Bible*, pp. 22–4, and Roberts, *Old Testament*, pp. 18–20. Origen used a system of asterisks and obeloi to indicate, respectively, elements of the Hebrew missing from the Septuagint version and additions in the latter not authorized by the Hebrew.

[27] Sparks, *CHB* 1, 515 and 531; A. Vaccari, 'Recupero d'un lavoro critico di S. Girolamo', in *Scritti di erudizione e di filologia II: Per la storia del testo e dell' esegesi biblica*, Storia e letteratura raccolta di studi e testi 67 (Rome, 1958), 83–146, at 94–9.

[28] Much of Job, and extracts from Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Song, survive in St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, 11 (before 781; *CLA* VII, no. 896); Fischer, *LB*, pp. 180–1. De Bruyne, 'Une nouvelle préface de la traduction hexaplaire de saint Jérôme', *RB* 31 (1914–19), 229–36, identified a frequently occurring addition to a preface to Esther as 'hexaplaric'.

[29] In translating from the Hebrew, Jerome probably made use of the literal Greek translations of Aquila and Symmachus in Origen's *Hexapla*: Bogaert, 'La Bible latine', p. 158 and n. 76.

but left untouched Wisdom, Sirach, Baruch and Maccabees.[30] These were thus to reach what would eventually be known as 'the Vulgate' in the old textual forms.[31] The habit of using 'Vulgate' and 'Hieronymian' as synonymous terms is therefore not historically accurate, although convenient.[32] In today's Vulgate, the Old Testament books revised from the Hebrew, along with Tobit, Judith and the gospels are Hieronymian; the other deuterocanonical books and the rest of the New Testament are not, but are based on revisions of old texts by others. Nevertheless, in this study I use the term 'Hieronymian' (abbreviated to Hier.) to designate all the Old Testament texts established in the volumes of the Rome *Biblia Sacra*.

In retrospect, the eventual success of the new texts seems to have been inevitable, not least because they were demonstrably more reliable than the old. The Council of Trent made them official in 1546 and the Bible used today by the Roman church is thus substantially Jerome's. Yet the general acceptance of the Vulgate and its replacement of the old texts were by no means immediate.[33] Jerome's translations had appeared as individual books or as small groups of books over a period of many years, and after the death of Damasus (in 384) they enjoyed no official endorsement. The old versions continued to be used and copied alongside the new, and inevitably there was interaction and mutual contamination. 'Mixed' texts became common, some involving merely the sporadic use of readings from one version in the other, others the interpolation of long passages. Sometimes whole books in the Old Latin tradition were included in Bibles which otherwise transmitted a Vulgate text.[34] The Old Latin traditions were to assert their influence on Vulgate transmission throughout the Middle Ages and as late as the thirteenth century, not only on the

[30] In his *prologus* to the three 'books of Solomon', Jerome wrote that Wisdom and Sirach, like Judith, Tobit and Maccabees, might be read in the churches *ad aedificationem plebis*, although they were not canonical (*BS* XI, 3–5, at 5).

[31] The use of the term can be traced back to the thirteenth century, but not before, according to Sparks, *CHB* 1, 518; cf. the sixteenth-century date given by Sutcliffe, *CHB* 2, 99, and see his 'The Name "Vulgate"', *Biblica* 29 (1948), 345–52.

[32] Cf. Bogaert, 'La Bible latine', pp. 139–40 and *Biblia Sacra*, ed. Weber, p. xx.

[33] Gribomont, 'L'église', pp. 51–60, gives a useful account of the early spread of the Vulgate, and Fischer, *LB*, pp. 405–7, summarizes the processes of Old Latin survival.

[34] For example, Salzburg, St Peter, Stiftsbibliothek, a. IX. 16 (Salzburg, before 798; siglum T_1) has Song of Songs in an Old Latin form, and Paris, BN, 11504 + 11505 (N. France, 822; siglum P) has Old Latin texts of Tobit and Judith. On P, see below, p. 27.

Continent but in the Insular area, too.[35] Small-scale contamination of Vulgate texts occurred in a number of ways. At the simplest level, during the period before which the new version had become 'canonized', copyists probably retained readings which sounded familiar and clearer to them, especially in frequently cited texts,[36] but Old Latin readings were sometimes added deliberately as marginal variants or glosses, which were then a prime source for subsequent variation in copying. The earliest surviving manuscripts of the gospels, which may date from Jerome's time, have such marginal variants.[37] A small group of Spanish manuscripts, including the tenth-century 'Codex Gothicus', preserves almost three thousand Old Latin readings from the Old Testament, 778 of them in the Heptateuch, in the form of marginal notes.[38] The accessibility of good Vulgate texts for copying purposes could be an important factor in determining the quality of transmission from a particular scriptorium and would itself depend on the wealth of the monastery in question. The more impoverished houses might have to make do with fewer and poorer exemplars. In connection with gospelbooks in Ireland, it has been shown that the purer texts tend to be found at, and in the vicinity of, the larger houses.[39]

We cannot always be certain whether mixing was deliberate or accidental. An interesting example from sixth-century Britain is the version of Malachi used by Gildas for citations in his *De excidio Britanniae*. It seems to have been copied from an Old Latin exemplar, in which a leaf had been lost and subsequently replaced by one which contained the appropriate text in the new version, but we can only guess whether this was the only text by now available to the supplier or whether it was chosen because it was considered a better text.[40] A damaged Vulgate text, and the availability only of an old text for repairs, may explain the case of the northern Italian 'Codex Ottobonianus', an Octateuch copied around 700, in which

[35] Fischer, *LB*, pp. 418–20. I discuss evidence for the influence of Old Latin texts in England below, pp. 49–54. On Irish mixed texts of the seventh and eighth centuries, see Cordoliani, 'Irlande', pp. 13–15.

[36] Gribomont, 'La transmission', p. 740; Chapman, 'Families', p. 29.

[37] Fischer, *Beiträge*, pp. 57–63.

[38] Ayuso Marazuela, 'La Biblia Visigótica', pp. 18–32; *VLH* I, 409–36. The 'Codex Gothicus' is León, Real Colegiata de San Isidoro, 2 (Castille, 960); see *VLH* I, 368 and Fischer, *LB*, pp. 72–3. The other manuscripts are of later date. Old Latin addition or substitution was especially prevalent among Spanish manuscripts, including the 'Codex Toletanus'; see *VLH* I, 402–6, and below, p. 436.

[39] Doyle, 'Bible in Ireland', p. 34.

[40] Burkitt, 'Bible of Gildas', pp. 208–9.

Old Latin material has replaced the Vulgate in over two hundred verses in Genesis and Exodus.[41]

Even when there were no practical obstacles to the efficient spread of the Vulgate, the wilful conservatism of those in authority, or humble copyists, must not be underestimated. At one extreme there was Augustine, who never fully accepted Jerome's new version, although he was himself quoting from the revised gospels by 404. He acknowledged the need for revision of the old texts but was scandalized by Jerome's by-passing of both these and the Septuagint in favour of the Hebrew for his Old Testament translations.[42] At the other, there were the scribes in the monasteries, who reacted unfavourably against the new version and clung to long-cherished readings.[43] The very idea of the monastic life was born out of scripture, and its regulation and practice were closely bound up with specific citations from it.[44] The liturgy, above all, suffused as it was with biblical lections and canticles and a natural conservator of their forms, was an important and often inadvertent source of old readings.[45] This was a problem of which Bede was acutely aware in his work at Jarrow.[46] The canticles, circulating as they did appended to the psalter, were particularly influential. A series of nine was common but their number, and their arrangement, varied widely. They were known in both Vulgate and Old Latin forms, and the latter featured most notably in the series associated with the 'Roman' psalter, which was dominant in England during most of the Anglo-Saxon period.[47] Familiarity with the writings of the Latin

[41] Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 66 (*CLA* I, no. 66; *VL*, no. 102). See *VL* II, 10*; *VLH* I, 401–2; and Gribomont, 'Les plus anciennes', p. 55. The Old Latin readings from the codex are printed in *Variae lectiones*, ed. Vercellone I, 183–4 and 307–10 (siglum E). Ottobonianus is an important Vulgate witness in *BS* I–IV (siglum O).

[42] Loewe, *CHB* 2, 110; Sutcliffe, 'Jerome', p. 96.

[43] Gribomont, 'Aux origines', p. 19.

[44] Biarne, 'La vie monastique', p. 416 and *passim*.

[45] On the Bible and the liturgy, see Saxer, 'Bible et liturgie', esp. pp. 170–5; and on the liturgy as preserver of old texts, Salmon, 'Le texte biblique', pp. 501 and 504–5; and Gribomont, 'L'église'. For the manuscript evidence relating to Spain, see *VLH* I, 437–60.

[46] Meyvaert, 'Bede the Scholar', p. 49.

[47] On the origin and complex transmission of the canticles, Schneider, *Cantica*, is indispensable. See also *DACL* II, 2; Mearns, *Canticles* (useful, but unreliable in manuscript dating); Fischer, *LB*, pp. 414–15; and below, pp. 51–2. On the Roman psalter in England, see also pp. 28 and 69–70.