Научная статья
УДК 811.111'01

CC BY

Трилингвизм Псалтири Эдвина

С. В. Мухин[1], Е. Б. Морозова[2]

[1,2]*МГИМО МИД России, Москва, Россия*
[1]*s.muhin@inno.mgimo.ru*
[2]*morel@mail.ru*

Аннотация. На материале Псалтири Эдвина – памятника письменности XII века – рассматривается типологический сдвиг европейских языков в ситуации трилингвизма средневековой Англии. В отличие от буквальности и консерватизма древнеанглийских глосс, англо-нормандский подстрочный перевод с латинского оригинала демонстрирует переход от синтетического морфосинтаксиса к аналитизму. Посредством сравнительного анализа ряда языковых явлений установлено, что старофранцузский язык демонстрировал инновационность в обеспечении и распространении аналитических тенденций, что особенно значимо с учетом высокого социолингвистического статуса англо-нормандского диалекта как средства коммуникации высших слоев средневекового английского общества.

Ключевые слова: Псалтирь Эдвина, синтетико-аналитический сдвиг, средневековый перевод, морфосинтаксис, грамматикализация, детерминативные системы, предложный синтаксис

Для цитирования: Мухин С. В., Морозова Е. Б. Трилингвизм Псалтири Эдвина // Вестник Московского государственного лингвистического университета. Гуманитарные науки. 2025. Вып. 7 (901). С. 84–91.

Original article

Trilingualism of the Eadwine Psalter

Sergey V. Mukhin[1], Elena B. Morozova[2]

[1,2]*MGIMO University, Moscow, Russia*
[1]*s.muhin@inno.mgimo.ru*
[2]*morel@mail.ru*

Abstract. Drawing on the 12th century Eadwine Psalter, the present research examines the typological shift of European languages within the context of medieval England's trilingualism. In contrast to the literal approach and conservatism of the Old English interlinear gloss, the Anglo-Norman translation demonstrates a departure from the synthetic morphosyntactic structure of the source text to certify a typological shift to analytic alignment. By putting a number of linguistic phenomena to comparative analysis the study establishes that Old French demonstrated innovation in advancing the transition to an analytic typology. This observation is especially relevant, given Anglo-Norman's high sociolinguistic status as the dominant language of Medieval England's elite.

Keywords: Eadwine Psalter, synthetic-analytic shift, medieval translation, morphosyntax, grammaticalization, determiner systems, prepositional syntax

For citation: Mukhin, S. V., Morozova, E. B. (2025). Trilingualism of the Eadwine Psalter. Vestnik of Moscow State Linguistic University. Humanities, 7(901), 84–91.

INTRODUCTION

The 12th century in the history of English is notable for linguistic diversity and transitory character of the linguistic situation. The academic vision is largely unanimous in interpreting that linguistic landscape as complex and dynamic [Crystal, 2019; Machan, 2003]. Marginalized in written records, Old English (OE) continued to be spoken by the majority and was undergoing changes that shortly afterwards were to result in the emergence of Middle English. At the same time, the Anglo-Norman (AN) dialect of Old French (OF) had taken deep root as the language of the ruling elite. More complexity was ensured by medieval Latin, which catered for the religious, scholarly and administrative spheres of communication.

Such intricate situation, in which English saw itself heavily influenced, with AN and Latin acting as powerful impactors, could not pass without a trace. The most convincing evidence thereof is provided by a written source of major value – the Eadwine Psalter [Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter, 1889]. Its trilingual composition, the essential semantic identity of the texts in its three languages and the cultural and linguistic importance of medieval psalters [Pulsiano, 1995] offers a unique opportunity of comparison and deduction.

The present research aims to trace and analyze the typological evolution of European languages in contact by examining how original synthetic structures were adapted (or resisted) in translations in the particular historical and linguistic context of trilingualism. A number of tasks are addressed: to select a fragment of the Eadwine Psalter, arrange its texts in three languages for comparison by means of textual analysis, and put to scrutiny the correlative texts with a resort to systematic comparison, morphosyntactic analysis, diachronic analysis, contrastive method and code-switching analysis to establish the principal points of convergence and divergence between the versions. The theoretical inventory of the research suggests relying on the basic assumptions of the theory of grammaticalization.

The linguistic evidence is provided by the sizeable, generously illuminated 286-leaf manuscript presumably produced around 1155–1160 in Canterbury [Crépin, 2008]. It received its name after the principal scribe, whose guidance over a group of his colleagues is recorded in an inscription around Eadwine's portrait on one of the final pages, thus crowning the hard labor of the scribal team: *S(c)riptorum princeps ego* (*I am the chief of scribes*) [The Eadwine Psalter, 1992]. Presently the manuscript (MS R.17.1) is kept in the Wren Library of the Trinity College, Cambridge.

Leaving aside the Psalter's paleographic and artistic value as a cultural artifact and a piece of art, the present research is focused on the importance of the linguistic content, reflecting the continuity and change that shaped the history of the English language. Moreover, not only is it English that has profited on the Eadwine Psalter, but French also enjoys a share of its own. The AN text [Cambridge Psalter, 1876] of this *psalterium triplex* is in fact the second earliest complete translation of the psalms in the history of the French language, with the first one also emerging on the British soil [Howlett, 1996].

The format of the article does not allow for detailed consideration of all the psalms. At the same time, the observations made here touch upon the linguistic phenomena of general character, and therefore they can apply to the entire Psalter, which is uniform in a variety of aspects: style, vocabulary and grammar. Therefore, it suffices to provide the results of analyzing only a fragment of the whole collection. Psalm 22, which is among the shorter ones, appears suitable to ensure reliable linguistic evidence. The overall size of the text slightly varies in different versions and is about 90–115 words.

The combination of texts and glosses makes the layout of the manuscript look complicated enough, though its structure is rather logical. The book contains six texts, and five of them are, in essence, identical. The broadly spaced and larger Latin text on the outer edges of the left- and right-hand pages is the Gallican version of the Psalter (marked in red *Gall.* on the bottom of the left page and on the top of the right one), with explanatory Latin glosses between the lines and in both margins. The second, narrower column marked *Rom.* is the Romanum version of the Latin Psalter, with OE interlinear glosses. The column closest to the bound edge of the book (rightmost on the left page and leftmost on the right one), marked *Hebr.*, presents the Hebraicum version of the Latin Psalter, with AN interlinear gloss.

The Latin texts of the psalms, especially those of the Gallican and Romanum versions, diverge but little. The Hebraicum version features some minor differences of lexical and syntactic nature due to the fact that it is a 4th century Latin translation by Saint Jerome, made directly from the Hebrew original, unlike the Gallican and Romanum versions, whose immediate source of translation was Greek Septuaginta.

The language of the OE gloss has to be understandably identified as the late Wessex dialect at the verge of its demise, but in translating sacred books, glossators were supposed to strictly follow the tradition, which resulted in some artificial archaicity of the text. The language of the AN gloss is recognizably the dialect of OF spoken in Normandy and Britain.

Fig. 1. The layout of the Eadwine Psalter, fols. 40v–41 r.

COMPARISON OF THE TEXTS

The Table below shows Psalm 22 verse by verse in the three languages. A New English translation in the version of the Douay-Rheims Bible is also provided. The Gallican version, never translated here, is omitted. The versions differ in versification: the Latin Hebraicum version and its AN gloss have verses 6 and 7 for what the other versions count as a single verse.

Let us proceed to the comparison of how the most significant linguistic phenomena are realized in different versions.

SUBSTANTIVE FIXED WORD-COMBINATIONS

Latin two-component attributive complexes of the N + N^{gen} structural type, which are quite common in biblical texts, give evidence of phraseologization, as they are recurrently used and show fixed and restricted combinability of components. In the psalm under analysis there are several phrases of the kind: *locum pasquæ* (lit.: *place of pasture*), *aqua refectionis* (lit.: *water of refreshment*), *semitæ iustitiæ* (lit.: *paths of justice*), *umbra mortis* (lit.: *shadow of death*) and *longitudo dierum* (lit.: *length of days*). The idiomatic meanings of these are as follows: "favorable conditions", "spiritual revival", "righteous behaviour", "lethal danger" and "long peaceful existence".

The OE gloss echoes the Latin structural pattern N + N^{gen} in reproducing these set expressions: *stowe fosternoðes, weter ȝereordunȝe, stiȝe rihtwisnesse, deæþes sceaduwe, lanȝnesse dæȝæ*. In OE all the word-combinations listed here were essentially phraseological calques, both sense- and structure-wise, with the genitive form of the attributive component. The only little digression from the Latin original is the reverse word order of the phrase *shadow of death* and the insertion of *minræ (my)* in *on lanȝnesse minræ dæȝæ*.

The AN equivalents are identical to the Latin prototypes only semantically, as far as they all convey the same idiomatic meaning: *paisture de erbes; ewe de refectiun; sentes de justise; val de umbre de mort; lungur de jurz*. However, the structural type these idiomatic bibleisms belong to is dramatically different – the analytic prepositional pattern ***N + prep + N***. With a decline of the category of case, prepositions play the key role in taking over the functions that had been performed by inflections, thus establishing the syntactic relations of prepositional regime. This is true not only about the fixed expressions. The AN glossators' approach is freer all through the text, as is attested by the following example, in which they chose some original OF means to express concession

at the expense of literality of translation: e.g.: *sed et si ambulavero* > *mais **ja seit iceo** que jeo irai* (*for if it so happens that I will walk*).

Substantive fixed units in OE are replicated as structural calques, preserving both the semantic content and the genitive case morphology of the original, albeit with minor deviations in word order or lexical additions. Conversely, AN adaptations, though semantically faithful, abandon the synthetic genitive construction in favor of analytic prepositional phrases, reflecting the decline of case inflection in favor of prepositional syntactic relations. This divergence underscores a fundamental shift from morphological to syntactic encoding of attributive relationships in AN, with the latter prioritizing idiomatic fluency over structural fidelity.

Table

PSALM 22 IN THE EADWINE PSALTER WITH A NEW ENGLISH TRANSLATION

Latin Romanum	Old English	Latin Hebraicum	Anglo-Norman	New English
Dominus regit me, et nichil michi deerit.	Drihten me ȝerecht, & nawuht me wane bið.	Dominus pastor meus, et nichil mihi deerit.	Li Sires mes pastres, e nule chose ne desiert a mei.	The Lord ruleth me, and I shall want nothing.
In loco pascuæ ibi me collocavit. Super aquam refectionis educavit me.	On þæræ stowe fosternoðes ðer he me ȝestæþelede. Ofer weteræs ȝereordunȝe he ȝefedde me.	In pascuis herbarum acclinavit me, super aquas refectionis enutrivit me.	En paistures de erbes aclinad mei, sur ewes de refectiun nurrid mei.	He hath set me in a place of pasture. He hath brought me up, on the water of refreshment.
Animam meam convertit. Deduxit me super semitam iustitiæ propter nomen suum.	Sæwle mine he ȝecyrde. He ledde me ofer siðfet / stiȝe rihtwisnesse for his nomæn.	Animam meam refecit, duxit me per semitas justitiæ propter nomen suum.	La meie aneme refist, menad mei par les sentes de justise pur le suen num.	He hath converted my soul. He hath led me on the paths of justice, for his own name's sake.
Nam etsi ambulem in medio umbræ mortis, non timebo mala, quoniam tu mecum es. Virga tua et baculus tuus, ipsa me consolata sunt.	Witotlice & ȝef ic ȝanȝe on myddæn deæþes sceaduwe, ne ondræde ic yfæle, forþæn þu mid me bist / ært. Þin ȝierd & stef þin, hy me frefrodon.	Sed et si ambulavero in valle umbræ mortis, non timebo malum, quoniam tu mecum es. Virga tua et baculus tuus, ipsa consolabuntur me.	Mais ja seit iceo que jeo irai el val de umbre de mort, ne criendrai mal, kar tu ies od mei. La tue verge e li tuens bastuns, il me cunforterent.	For though I should walk in the midst of the shadow of death, I will fear no evils, for thou art with me. Thy rod and thy staff, they have comforted me.
Parasti in conspectu meo mensam adversus eos qui tribulant me. Impinguasti in oleo caput meum, et poculum tuum inebrians quam præclarum est.	Þu ȝeærwodest beod on minre ȝesihþe onȝean þa þe eærfoþiȝæþ / swencton me. Þu onbryddæs /mestest min heæfod on ele & þin dryncefæt drunȝniende hu bryht / mere is.	Pones coram me mensam ex adverso hostium meorum; impinguasti in oleo caput meum, et calix meus inebrians.	Tu poseras devant mei table e devers l'encuntre de mes enemis; tu encressas en oile mun chief, e li miens chalices enivranz.	Thou hast prepared a table before me against them that afflict me. Thou hast anointed my head with oil; and my chalice which inebriateth me, how goodly is it!
Et misericordia tua subsequitur me omnibus diebus vitæ meæ. Ut inhabitem in domo domini in longitudinem dierum.	& þin mildheortnesse me efterfylȝend eællum dæȝum mines lifes. Þet ic eærdiȝe on drihtnes huse on lanȝnesse minræ dæȝæ.	Sed et benignitas et misericordia subsequetur me omnibus diebus vitæ meæ.	Mais e benignited e misericorde suzsiwerad mei tuz les sentes de justise.	And thy mercy will follow me all the days of my life. And that I may dwell in the house of the Lord unto length of days.
		Et habitabo in domo Domini in longitudine dierum.	E jeo abiterai en la maisun del Seignur en lungur de jurz.	

VERB MORPHOLOGY

The verb forms of the OE version are typologically diverse and follow the rules of conjugation, with the flexible endings and roots which are gramatically charged a lot to express the categories of tense, mood, person, and number: *ȝestæþelede* (*set*), *ȝefedde* (*raised*), *ledde* (*led*), *ȝecyrde* (*converted*), *ȝanȝe* (*go*), *ondræde* (*fear*), *bist / eært* (*art*), *ȝeærwodest* (*prepared*), *onbryddæs / mestest* (*smeared*), *efterfylȝend* (*following*), *eærdiȝe* (*may dwell*), etc. All of these are highly synthetic, rich in morphology and clearly dissectible, e.g. *ȝe-ærwo-d-est*, *on-dræd-e*, *efter-fylȝ-end*, etc.

In this respect, even Latin sometimes turns out to be ahead in terms of analytism because it may occasionally offer a discrete perfect form which the glossator had to reproduce by synthetic means, for lack of verbal discreteness in OE, e.g. *hy me* ***frefrodon*** < *ipsa me* ***consolata sunt*** (*they have comforted me*). At the same time, OE may also feature a two-word form for a Latin indiscrete morphological entity, e.g.: *nawuht me* ***wane bið*** < *nichil michi* ***deerit*** (*I shall lack nothing*). Here the word-combination *wane bið* (lit.: *to be wanted*) betrays an analytic tendency in OE, but unlike in the previous case of the Latin grammaticalized form, this word-combination is a free complex ***V*** + ***Adj***.

Indeed, the AN verb forms do not show more analytism than their Latin and OE counterparts. In the psalm in question there are no complex tense forms. In some regards OF verbs are even more prone to espouse synthesis, because of their ability to take synthetic future forms, either historically derived from the corresponding Latin ones or used as translational equivalence, such as *ambulavero* > *jeo* ***irai*** (*I will walk*); *non timebo malum* > *ne* ***criendrai*** *mal* (*I will not fear evil*) and suchlike. This is what the OE verb lacks, being reduced to the forms of præsens only to express future: *ic ȝanȝe; ne* ***ondræde*** *ic yfæle*.

OE verbs exhibit a highly synthetic structure, relying on inflectional endings and derivational prefixes. While OE sporadically employs analytic constructions, these remain non-grammaticalized syntactic composites rather than systematic innovations. In contrast, AN retains synthetic features. This divergence underscores OE's predominantly synthetic typology, balanced by nascent analytic tendencies, against AN's preservation of synthetic features despite broader Romance analytic trends.

WORD ORDER

The word order of the OE gloss makes almost no difference face to the Latin text, as Eadwine and his entire project rigorously observed the principle of verbatim fidelity. Such literal renditions persisted with rare exceptions as long as OE was spoken and the psalms were submitted to translation. Anglo-Saxon glossators' product was the interlinear text intended to replicate the Vulgate's syntax. Literality was interpreted as translational precision. The only difference to be noted originates from typical omission of Latin pronominal subjects on the one hand, and their common use in OE on the other, e.g.: *non timebo mala* vs *ne ondrade* ***ic*** *yfel* (*I will fear no evils*); *impinguasti in oleo caput* vs *Þu ȝesmiredest on ele heafod* (*Thou hast anointed my head*), and suchlike.

Except for this minor distinction, which, incidentally, was not strictly observed, both the Romanum Psalter's sentences and Eadwine's gloss look word-for-word twin, e.g.: *ȝelædde me ofer stiðe rihtwisnesse for naman his* < *deduxit me super semitas iustitiæ propter nomen suum* (*He hath led me on the paths of justice, for his own name's sake*). The OE gloss exhibits isomorphic correspondence to the Latin original in component quantity, linear order, and morphosyntactic realization.

The AN version is not at all devoid of the same intention to be literal in terms of translation. Many syntactic patterns do not fail to follow the word order set by Saint Jerome eight centuries earlier. For example, the verb precedes the objective pronoun often enough, just like in the Latin original: *aclinad mei* < *acclinavit me* (*set me*); *nurrid mei* < *enutrivit me* (*brought me up*); *menad mei* < *duxit me* (*led me*); *suzsiwerad mei* < *subsequetur me* (*will follow me*), etc.

It seems to be the general rule, but in Psalm 22 there is an instance of different use showing that even the most general rule does not exist without exceptions: *il* ***me*** *cunforterent* < *ipsa consolabuntur me* (*they have comforted me*). Here the prepositive place of the OF objective pronoun dissents with the rule mentioned above, a digression that was to become, in its turn, the mainstream in the French syntax. The use of personal pronouns is also obligatory, which draws the AN version closer to OE and distances it from Latin, e.g.: *e* ***jeo*** *abiterai en la maisun* = *&* ***ic*** *eærdiȝe on drihtnes huse* < *et habitabo in domo* (*I may dwell in the house*).

However, in regard to the word order, the difference between the AN text, on the one hand, and both Latin and OE, on the other, is substantial. The AN gloss does not go to such an extreme as the OE one in seeking syntactic replication. By the mid 12th century OF had already developed some consistent rules which were at odds with Saint Jerome's syntax perceived as archaic.

Among such rules there is the postpositive use of objective pronouns with prepositions as opposed to the place that the Latin dative form is expected to

take, e.g.: *nule chose ne desiert* ***a mei*** < *nichil* ***mihi*** *deerit (I shall lack nothing)*. One more syntactic peculiarity distinguishing the AN word order is the shift of the link verb from its historical sentence-final position: *tu* ***ies*** *od mei* < *tu mecum* ***es*** (*thou art with me*). Another rule rigorously prescribes that pronominal determination should take precedence in attributive groups, contrary to its former use in Latin. The examples are many: ***mes*** *pastres* < *pastor meus* (lit.: *my shepherd*); ***meie*** *aneme* < *animam meam (my soul);* ***suen*** *num* < *nomen suum* (*his name*); ***tue*** *verge e li* ***tuens*** *bastuns* < *virga tua et baculus tuus* (*thy rod and thy staff*) and more.

All of those peculiarities of syntax make the AN version of the Eadwine Psalter clearly distinct from the Latin version as much as from the OE glosses. From a broader perspective, these peculiarities are underpinned by the general tendency of OF for a fixed word order – yet another manifestation of the evolutionary trajectory from synthesis to analysis.

ARTICLES USAGE

The three languages of the trilingual Psalter are most graphically opposed on the example of articles use. The simplest and the most consistent rule commands both Latin original texts: articles are inexistant, in congruence with one of the fundamental grammar characteristics of that language.

Opting for literal rendering, the OE glosses also dispense with articles, contrary to the general tendency, which in Eadwine's time had already taken shape too considerably to be ignored in a less formal use. In fact, the Eadwine Psalter's OE text is not without articles, or, at least, protoarticles, but in Psalm 22, which is under analysis in the present research, there is only one instance of an article-like word used to determine a noun: *on* ***þæræ*** *stowe* (*in the place*). Without doubt, the glossators could not enjoy such allowance too often, as it would have been understood as improper distortion of the sacred text, which spells without any determinants: *in loco*.

The AN version, again, stands out in comparison with those in Latin and OE, because it presents an ample use of articles to determine the nouns. One remarkable peculiarity of this use is the absolute dominance of the definite article forms, with no instances of the indefinite ones: ***li*** *Sires,* ***les*** *sentes,* ***el*** *val, l'encuntre,* ***les*** *jurz,* ***la*** *mesun,* ***del*** *Seignur* and more. By and large, these high-frequency forms make up an already established system, with the exception of the definite article used alongside possessive pronouns, which makes it look excessive under the present-day norm: ***la*** *meie aneme* (*my soul*); ***le*** *suen num* (*his name*); ***la*** *tue verge e* ***li*** *tuens bastuns* (*thy rod and thy staff), etc*. For all that, there occur word-combinations of the ***pron*** + ***N*** type without articles: *mes enemis* (*my enemies*); *mun chief* (*my head*); *ma vie* (*my life*).

The treatment of articles exemplifies typological contrasts between Latin, OE, and AN. Latin imposes a determiner-free framework followed strictly in the OE gloss, which suppresses articles in favor of syntactic calquing, despite emerging proto-article tendencies in contemporaneous usage. In stark contrast, the AN version systematically employs definite articles, even redundantly, revealing an established determiner system that diverges from both Latin's austerity and OE's minimalism. The differential article usage thus epitomizes broader diachronic developments: Latin's morphological determinism, OE's syntactic literality, and AN's progression toward analytic determination.

PREPOSITIONS USAGE

It has previously been mentioned that the significance of prepositions in forming the AN variants of the substantive set phrases deserves a premium. However, this significance is not confined to phraseology alone, as prepositions are in the broad sense understood to be analytic means of syntax. Overall, the use of prepositions in all the three versions of the Psalter exhibits comparatively little dissimilarity, but some instances do occasionally take place, e.g. *tu mecum es* > *tu ies od mei* = *þu mid me bist* (*thou art with me*). Here every version has a peculiarity of its own: the Latin text features the use of a fused postposition *me****cum*** as a relic of an older word order, and in this respect, it is opposed to both translations; the AN version presents the direct word order, and the OE gloss puts the verb last. However, the glosses in both vernaculars put the preposition expectably before the pronouns in alignment with the general norm.

There appears to be general conformity in the use of locative, temporal, instrumental and other prepositions, e.g. *impinguasti* ***in*** *oleo* > *onbryddæs / mestest min heæfod* ***on*** *ele* = *encressas* ***en*** *oile* (*anointed in oil*) or ***propter*** *nomen suum* > ***for*** *his nomæn* = ***pur*** *le suen num* (*for his name's sake*). Yet, there is considerable difference on the part of the AN text. While the Latin syntactic architecture and its OE analogy prefer to express all shades of genitive relations synthetically, the OF syntax exhibits an unfailing proclivity towards prepositional constructions, e.g.: *la maisun* ***del*** *Seignur* as opposed to *domo Domini* and *drihtnes huse* (*Lord's house*). A similar case is detectable with dative relations regularly introduced by the preposition *a*, e.g.: *nule chose ne desiert* ***a*** *mei* < *nichil mihi deerit* (lit.*: nothing will lack to me*).

While all three versions show broad conformity in locative, temporal, and instrumental prepositional constructs, the AN text diverges markedly in its

reliance on analytic prepositional phrases to encode case relations expressed synthetically in Latin and OE. These distinctions epitomize the broader typological shift from synthetic to analytic encoding of grammatical relations, with prepositions in OF assuming functional roles previously governed by inflection. The findings illustrate how medieval vernacular translations negotiated between fidelity to sacred texts and the grammatical imperatives of evolving linguistic systems, with AN's prepositional proliferation signaling a decisive step toward analyticity.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the Eadwine Psalter proves a fruitful attempt to take a snapshot of England's quickly transforming linguistic terrain of the 12th century. The comparison of the Psalter's three texts, especially those that were synchronically made in OE and AN, with the Latin one being the source text for both, secures an opportunity to reveal a dynamic interplay between linguistic fidelity and typological evolution in medieval biblical translation. While OE prioritizes syntactic and morphological calquing of Latin structures, more analytically advanced AN diverges markedly through its analytic innovations, such as prepositional case encoding, fixed word order, and systematic use of definite articles. AN demonstrates far more advance in promoting and relaying the new tendencies [Trotter, 2000]. It is especially important, given the OF's particular status as an impactor in its relations with OE.

These trends reflect broader typological trajectories: Latin and OE epitomize synthetic systems reliant on inflectional morphology, whereas AN aligns with OF's progression toward analyticity. Despite shared reverence for the Vulgate's authority, OE's literality underscores a conservative adherence to sacred text preservation, while AN's grammatical and syntactic adaptations signal vernacular pragmatism amid linguistic modernization. The trilingual Psalter encapsulates the most significant drift, ultimately charting the diachronic transition from synthesis to analysis in European languages.

СПИСОК ИСТОЧНИКОВ

1. Crystal D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. 3rd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
2. Machan T. W. English in the Middle Ages. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
3. Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter. London: Trübner & Co, 1889.
4. Pulsiano Ph. Psalters // The Liturgical Books of Anglo-Saxon England / Ed. by R. W. Pfaff. Kalamazoo, 1995. P. 61–86.
5. Crépin A. Le "psautier d'Eadwine": l'Angleterre pluriculturelle. Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. 2008. No. 152-2. P. 879–891.
6. The Eadwine Psalter. Text, image, and monastic culture in twelfth-century Canterbury / Ed. by M. Gibson, T. A. Heslop, R. W. Pfaff. London: Modern Humanities Research Association ; University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.
7. Cambridge Psalter // Le Livre des Psaumes / Ed. par F. Michel. Paris, 1876. P. 35–36.
8. Howlett D. The English Origins of Old French Literature. Four Courts Press, 1996.
9. Trotter D. A. Anglo-Norman. In Languages in Britain and Ireland / Ed. by G. Price. Blackwell, 2000. P. 197–206.

REFERENCES

1. Crystal, D. (2019). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Machan, T. W. (2003). English in the Middle Ages. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter (1889). London: Trübner & Co.
4. Pulsiano, Ph. (1995). Psalters. In The Liturgical Books of Anglo-Saxon England, ed. R. W. Pfaff. Kalamazoo, 61–86.
5. Crépin, A. (2008). Le "psautier d'Eadwine": l'Angleterre pluriculturelle. Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 152-2, 879–891.
6. Gibson, M., Heslop, T. A., Pfaff, R. W. (Eds.). (1992). The Eadwine Psalter. Text, image, and monastic culture in twelfth-century Canterbury. London: Modern Humanities Research Association ; University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
7. Cambridge Psalter (1876). In Michel, F. (Ed.), Le Livre des Psaumes (pp. 35–36). Paris.
8. Howlett, D. (1996). The English Origins of Old French Literature. Four Courts Press.
9. Trotter, D. A. (2000). Anglo-Norman. In Price, G. (Ed.), Languages in Britain and Ireland (pp. 197–206). Blackwell.

ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРАХ

Мухин Сергей Владимирович
кандидат филологических наук, доцент
доцент кафедры английского языка № 1
МГИМО МИД России

Морозова Елена Борисовна
кандидат филологических наук
доцент кафедры английского языка № 1
МГИМО МИД России

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Mukhin Sergey Vladimirovich
PhD (Philology), Associate Professor
Associate Professor of the English Language Department # 1
MGIMO University

Morozova Elena Borisovna
PhD (Philology)
Associate Professor of the English Language Department # 1
MoMGIMO University

Статья поступила в редакцию	02.05.2025	The article was submitted
одобрена после рецензирования	25.05.2025	approved after reviewing
принята к публикации	12.06.2025	accepted for publication