Circulation Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I agree that the Library of the University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to copy from, or to publish, this thesis may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written when such copying or publication is solely for scholarly purposes and does not involve potential financial gain. In the absence of the professor, the dean of the Graduate School may grant permission. It is understood that any copying from, or publication of, this thesis which involves potential financial gain will not be allowed without written permission.

_____

Katherine S. Baker

THE APPENDED IMAGES OF THE EADWINE PSALTER: A NEW APPRAISAL OF THEIR COMMEMORATIVE, DOCUMENTARY, AND INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONS

By

Katherine S. Baker
Master of Arts
Department of Art History

_____

Elizabeth Pastan, Ph.D.

Adviser

_____

C. Jean Campbell, Ph.D.

Second Reader

Accepted:

_____

Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.

Dean of the Graduate School

_____

Date

THE APPENDED IMAGES OF THE EADWINE PSALTER: A NEW APPRAISAL OF THEIR COMMEMORATIVE, DOCUMENTARY, AND INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONS

By

Katherine S. Baker
B.A., Wellesley College, 2000

Adviser: Elizabeth Pastan, Ph.D.

An Abstract of
A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Department of Art History

2008

Abstract

Produced in the scriptorium at Christ Church Priory, Canterbury and now preserved at Trinity College, Cambridge, the Eadwine Psalter (c. 1155-60/c. 1170) contains two images that today rival the book itself in fame and historical importance. The first image, entitled the Scribal Painting (fol. 283v), shows the full-page figural portrait of the monk, Eadwine, who declares *Ego scriptorum princeps* ("I am the prince of scribes") in the painting's inscription. The second image, commonly known as the Waterworks Drawing (fols. 284v-285r), depicts not only the highly-sophisticated hydraulic system installed at Canterbury by the 1160s but also the monastic buildings it serviced in the cathedral precinct at the time. For unknown reasons, these two images were added to unused parchment at the back of the Psalter a decade or more after it was bound, and codicological investigations have revealed the leaves they now occupy required considerable repair beforehand.

In this thesis, I advance the notion that the Psalter's appended images may be profitably studied using a shared interpretive framework. Applying critical insights from the recent scholarship on medieval portraiture to their analysis, I demonstrate that these images operated *as a pair* to both shape and transmit communal monastic identity, and to authenticate the book and its meanings much like medieval "portrait" seals fixed to an official document. Moreover, I show that these images effectively shed light on the role of the Psalter itself in the period of their creation – a role which addressed specific concerns of the Christ Church community relating to archiepiscopal succession and to the priory's right to control its own future.

THE APPENDED IMAGES OF THE EADWINE PSALTER: A NEW APPRAISAL OF THEIR COMMEMORATIVE, DOCUMENTARY, AND INSTITUTIONAL FUNCTIONS

By

Katherine S. Baker
B.A. Wellesley College, 2000

Adviser: Elizabeth Pastan, Ph.D.

A thesis submitted to
The Faculty of the Graduate School of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts

Department of Art History

2008

CONTENTS

List of Illustrations

Introduction……. 1

I. Dating, Patronage, and Function

a. The Psalter Proper…….…… 5

b. The Appended Images…….……. 8

II. Representing the Christ Church Corporate Body…….…….. 26

III. The Eadwine Psalter c. 1170…….….. 36

IV. Conclusion...……... 47

Bibliography…….. 49

Figures……... 55

List of Illustrations

1. The *Scribal Painting* of the Eadwine Psalter, folio 283^{v}.

2. The *Waterworks Drawing* of the Eadwine Psalter, folios 284^{v} and 285^{r}.

3. Schematic representation of the layout of folio 43^{v} in the Eadwine Psalter.

4. Psalm 1 of the Eadwine Psalter, folios 5^{v}-6^{r}.

5. Illustration to the Apostles' Creed, folio 279^{r}.

6. Psalm 22 of the Utrecht Psalter, folio 13^{r}.

7. Page originally included in the prefatory picture cycle of the Eadwine Psalter (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, MS 661 recto).

8. Psalm 5 of the Eadwine Psalter, folio 10^{r}.

9. *The Visitation* of the Copenhagen Psalter.

10. Fragment of the choir screen at Canterbury Cathedral (erected in 1180).

11. The Great Cloister, detail from the *Waterworks Drawing*.

12. Modern view of the water tower in the Infirmary Cloister at Canterbury.

13. The *Aula Nova*, detail from the *Waterworks Drawing*.

14. Modern view of the *Aula Nova* at Canterbury.

15. Incised tomb of the architect Hughes Libergier (d. 1263) in Reims Cathedral.

16. Sculpted tomb slab of Pope Lucius III (d. 1185) in Verona Cathedral.

17. Model showing colored enamel tomb of Geoffrey of Anjou (d. 1151) at St. Julien's in Le Mans, France.

18. Drawing of St. Jerome (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 389, folio 4).

19. Illustrations to Psalm 2 in the Utrecht Psalter (top, folio 2^{r}); the Harley Psalter (middle, folio 2^{r}); and the Eadwine Psalter (bottom, folio 6^{v}).

20. The second seal of Christ Church Priory, Canterbury.

21. The first seal of Christ Church Priory, Canterbury.

22. Counterseal used with the second seal of Christ Church Priory, Canterbury.

23. Seal of Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury (1139-1161).

24. Frontispiece to Avrom Saltman's *Theobald: Archbishop of Canterbury* (London: University of London, The Athlone Press, 1956) showing Charter 31 bearing seals of both Archbishop Theobald and Christ Church Priory, Canterbury.

25. Illustration of the tabernacle in the wilderness from the Codex Amiatinus (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Amiatino 1, folios 2^{v}-3^{r}).

26. Portrait of "Ezra" in the Codex Amiatinus (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Amiatino 1, folio 5^{v}).

27. Verso side of the first folio of the Eadwine Psalter's prefatory picture cycle (New York, Pierpont Morgan, MS M. 724).

28. Diagram of scenes contained on the first folio of the Eadwine Psalter's prefatory picture cycle.

29. Drawing from Richard of St. Victor's *In Ezechielem* showing the façade of the eastern gatehouse (Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 14516, folio 240).

30. The Small Waterworks Drawing of the Eadwine Psalter, folio 286^{r}.

INTRODUCTION

The Eadwine Psalter (Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.17.1) looms large in the history of medieval book production at Christ Church Priory, Canterbury. Incorporating multiple Latin and vernacular versions of the biblical Psalms together with exegetical commentary and lavish illustrations, it also figures among the most celebrated illuminated manuscripts of the twelfth century.[1] However, two images in the Eadwine Psalter have merited special attention by scholars and at present rival the book itself in fame and historical importance. The first image, henceforth called the *Scribal Painting*, is the full-page figural portrait of the monk, Eadwine, who declares *Ego scriptorum princeps* ("I am the prince of scribes") in the painting's inscription (Figure 1). The second image, commonly known as the *Waterworks Drawing*, depicts not only the highly-sophisticated underground hydraulic system installed at Canterbury by the 1160s but also the monastic buildings it serviced in the cathedral precinct at the time (Figure 2). The two images were added to unused parchment at the back of the Psalter a decade or more after it was bound, and codicological investigations have revealed the leaves they now occupy required considerable repair before. While a number of studies have been devoted to both images, the reasons informing their addition to the book remain unknown today.

The Eadwine Psalter has undergone modifications over time, many of which can be attributed to its rebinding during the seventeenth century. Nevertheless, the original ordering of its appended images has been preserved. As seen today, the *Scribal Painting* and the *Waterworks Drawing* appear on successive leaves of the book. Occupying an entire bifolium (fols. 284^{v}-285^{r}), the drawing follows the painting (fol. 283^{v}), and the latter image is positioned such that Eadwine, who is shown seated before an open book with a quill pen and scraper in hand, faces left and thus

[1] Also known as the Canterbury Psalter, the Eadwine Psalter was published in full in 1935. See M. R. James, *The Canterbury Psalter* (London, 1935).

towards the body of the Psalter. However, unlike their orientation in the manuscript today, the majority of the buildings rendered in the drawing (including the cathedral) originally appeared on the right-hand page, with the direction East pointing up.[2]

That the *Scribal Painting* and the *Waterworks Drawing* were added to the end of a previously bound Psalter raises questions that have yet to be adequately addressed in the scholarship. For example, do the images, if considered together, reveal something more about the book's function and its intended audience? Does one image inform how the other should be viewed or interpreted? Questions such as these go unasked when the seemingly disparate parts of the book are treated as unrelated units. In the most comprehensive study of the English manuscript to date, The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image, and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-Century Canterbury (1992), the appended images are examined in separate chapters.[3] While each image is thoroughly examined on its own terms, the volume's contributors do little to acknowledge the connections between them. This disjunction is especially surprising given that one of the stated goals of the volume according to its publisher is, "to counteract the tendency of modern scholarship to fragment its subjects by bringing under scrutiny between two covers all the major components of the Eadwine Psalter."[4]

---

[2] Nicholas Pickwoad, "Codicology and Palaeography: Codicology," in *The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image, and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-Century Canterbury*, ed. Margaret Gibson, T. A. Heslop, and Richard W. Pfaff, Publications of the Modern Humanities Research Association 14 (London and University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 6. See also Francis Woodman, "The Waterworks Drawings of the Eadwine Psalter," in M. Gibson, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, 171. Woodman writes that when the drawing is oriented with the direction East at top, "the inscriptions 'orientalis' and 'occidentalis' can be read correctly and the water 'flows' down the page from its source, to be 'pumped' up the page again by hydraulic means."

[3] The *Scribal Painting* is the focus of T. A. Heslop's "Eadwine and his Portrait," Chapter 11 in M. Gibson, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, 178-185; and the *Waterworks Drawing* is the primary focus of Francis Woodman's "The Waterworks Drawings of the Eadwine Psalter," Chapter 10 in M. Gibson, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, 168-177.

[4] See, for example, the description of the volume on the publisher's website: <http://www.psupress.org/books/titles/0-271-00837-7.html> (16 February 2007).

The images which are the focus here have long been recognized as exceptional. The *Scribal Painting* has been called "the most famous portrait of its kind from medieval Europe,"[5] a characterization owing to its rich ornamentation and laudatory inscription, the monumentality of the monk's effigy, and the image's overall resemblance to an evangelist author portrait.[6] And the drawing, besides being our best evidence for the still unexcavated medieval waterworks at Canterbury, is often cited in modern surveys of cartography as one of the earliest examples of a birds-eye view in existence.[7] Though these images were distinct artistic productions, requiring different materials, skills, and sets of knowledge for their creation, their sites of execution were one and the same. Moreover, the images were made around the same time. Art-historical opinions have differed on this matter, but whether their respective dates fell within days or years of one another, the two images certainly came to be viewed together in the immediate context of the book by c. 1170 as I will explain below. Accordingly, the systematic analysis of this pairing of images is long overdue.

My goal in the present paper is twofold. First, I seek to examine and reassess the dating, patronage, and function of the Eadwine Psalter's appended images in light of neglected internal evidence and of previous scholarship. Secondly, beyond calling attention to the physical relationship of these images in their medieval viewing context, I will demonstrate that they may be profitably studied using a shared interpretive framework. In her review of the 1992 volume on the Eadwine

[5] Heslop, "Eadwine and his Portrait," 178. Heslop notes that the image is "frequently reproduced as an image of the monk as scribe and has helped to reinforce the notion that books in general were produced in monasteries by members of the community."

[6] C. M. Kauffmann has called the *Scribal Painting* "one of the most monumental paintings to emerge from the Canterbury scriptorium," further observing, "It is the only 12th century picture in which the scribe is depicted, in the posture, size and setting of an evangelist portrait." See C. M. Kauffmann, *Romanesque Manuscripts: 1066-1190* (London: Harvey Miller, 1975), 97.

[7] John Hayes, "Prior Wibert's Waterworks," *The Canterbury Chronicle* 71 (1977): 18.

Psalter in the journal *Speculum*, Marcia Kupfer proposed this idea as a viable avenue for future research, stating:

> Both are portraits, and both formulate—albeit in different, even contrasting, ways—the self-representation of the monastic community in relation to the achievements of its individual members.[8]

In this paper, I will apply critical insights from the recent literature on medieval portraiture to the analysis of the *Scribal Painting* and the *Waterworks Drawing*, and in so doing, I will more firmly establish their function as memorials to individual Christ Church monks and their accomplishments. By examining these images within the larger visual culture at Canterbury c. 1170, I will also show that they operated together to shape and transmit communal monastic identity. Integrated into an exceedingly learned illuminated Psalter that was most likely intended for display, these institutional portraits define Christ Church in relation to exemplary scholar-monks of the past and their deeds. As a pair, they articulate the priory's legacy of preserving ancient Christian history and of making this history relevant in the present. Given their form and immediate context, they also authenticate the book and its meanings much like medieval "portrait" seals fixed to an official document. For these reasons, the Eadwine Psalter's appended images effectively shed light on the role of the book itself in the period of their creation.

[8] Marcia Kupfer, "Review of The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image, and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-Century Canterbury," *Speculum* 69, no. 4 (Oct., 1994): 1171.

PART I: DATING, PATRONAGE, AND FUNCTION

A. The Psalter Proper

To better understand how the *Scribal Painting* and the *Waterworks Drawing* came to be viewed within their present context, we must begin our inquiry at the heart of the Eadwine Psalter with a brief outline of its most salient features. The Psalter proper contains the three textual versions of the Latin Psalms that were current in the Middle Ages: the *Gallicanum*, the *Romanum*, and the *Hebraicum*. The first of these, written in a script twice the size of the other two,[9] includes an interlinear Latin gloss taken in large part from the exegetical works of Cassiodorus and St. Augustine.[10] The *Romanum* incorporates an interlinear translation in Old English, and the *Hebraicum* incorporates an interlinear translation in Anglo-Norman. Flanked by a marginal Latin commentary (also derived from patristic exegesis), these elements are skillfully set out in columns with a prologue, collect, and *tituli* supplied for each Psalm (Figure 3). Also featured in the book's textual apparatus is a six-page Calendar, which precedes the biblical text; and a series of Canticles and Creeds, which follows it. The Psalter's decoration incorporates some five hundred illuminated initials introducing or highlighting parts of the text, as well as one hundred and sixty-six colored drawings of the Psalms, Canticles, and Creeds (Figures 4 & 5) modeled on monochrome pen drawings contained in the Utrecht Psalter—a ninth-century Carolingian manuscript that traveled to Canterbury c. 1000 (Figure 6).[11] Moreover, an eight-page series of narrative biblical scenes

[9] During the twelfth century, the Gallican text was used in the divine office at Church Church Priory. See Margaret Gibson, "The Latin Apparatus," in M. Gibson, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, 113-115.

[10] Ibid., 108-110.

[11] For general background on this celebrated manuscript of the Carolingian Renaissance, see Koert van der Horst, "The Utrecht Psalter: Picturing the Psalms of David," in *The Utrecht Psalter in Medieval Art: Picturing the Psalms of David*, ed. Koert van der Horst, et al. (Tuurdijk, The Netherlands: HES Publishers BV, 1996), 23-84; and the catalogue entry for the Utrecht Psalter on pp. 168-170 of the same volume. For a discussion of the relationship between the Utrecht Psalter's drawings and the colored illustrations of the Eadwine Psalter, see William Noel, "The Utrecht Psalter in England: Continuity and Experiment," in K. van der Horst, et al., *The Utrecht Psalter*, 120-165.

originally prefaced the Psalms (Figure 7). Comprising roughly one hundred and thirty subjects derived from the Old and New Testaments and other sources, the book's illuminated prefatory picture cycle is the largest of its kind known today.[12]

In 1992 this complex, richly-illustrated triple Psalter received the scrutiny it long deserved with The Eadwine Psalter edited by Margaret Gibson, T. A. Heslop, and Richard Pfaff, an interdisciplinary investigation of the codex as a whole by thirteen scholars calling themselves the "Friends of Eadwine." Owing to this important collection of essays, we now have a good grasp of the archaeology of the book (i.e. its pricking, sewing, binding, and so on); a clearer understanding of its early history, function, and patronage; and better insight into the questions that remain unresolved. Produced at Christ Church and kept at Canterbury through most of the Middle Ages,[13] the Eadwine Psalter was chiefly coordinated by a monastic workforce.[14] However, evidence suggests that lay laborers contributed to both the calligraphy and the illumination.[15] Also, the Psalter was commissioned for display rather than liturgical use.[16] The most convincing evidence informing the

---

[12] The cycle is contained on four leaves now detached from the Psalter. For further background, see T. A. Heslop, "Decoration and Illustration: The Four Bible Picture Leaves," in M. Gibson, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, 25-42. On the first leaf of this cycle, see p. 41 below.

[13] Our earliest documentary evidence for the presence of the Eadwine Psalter at Christ Church is an entry in the c. 1320 inventory of Henry de Eastry, prior of Christ Church from 1285 to 1331. However, paleographical analyses have concluded that the book originated in the Canterbury scriptorium. For a comparison of the scripts in the Eadwine Psalter to other books produced at Christ Church, see Teresa Webber, "Codicology and Palaeography: The Script," in M. Gibson, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, 22-24.

[14] On the workforce, which included over a dozen scribes and artists, see Webber, "The Script," in M. Gibson, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, 13-24; and T. A. Heslop, "Decoration and Illustration: The Artistic Context," in M. Gibson, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, 60-61.

[15] Heslop, "The Artistic Context," 60-61. A scribal layman is portrayed in the initial introducing the Canticle of Hezekiah on fol. 263^{r}. Shown standing with a book in hand, this non-tonsured scribe is startlingly depicted with long pointed ears. Heslop suggests that "his general form is conditioned by an error," namely that the scribe did not leave enough space for the artist to render the appropriate letter. In fact, by depicting the scribe in such a playful way, the artist of the initial ultimately corrected the error. Ibid., 55 and 61.

[16] Margaret Gibson, "Conclusions: The Eadwine Psalter in Context," in M. Gibson, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, 213.

latter conclusion is the book's Calendar. Although contemporary with the Psalter, this unadorned document was probably added at a late stage in order to complete the book. (In the words of one scholar, "The book which had everything had to have a calendar.")[17] However, it lacked the necessary entries to keep it current with the priory's mid-twelfth century record of liturgical practice, an improbable state of affairs had the book been actively used in the liturgy.[18] Not only were the Calendar's contents outdated for the time, but important feast days such as the canonization of Thomas Becket (authorized in 1173) also go unregistered, leading Richard Pfaff to posit that the book containing it passed out of the possession of Christ Church by the 1170s or was "lost, concealed or suppressed" by this time.[19]

Besides the Calendar, other factors point to a display function. The Psalter was too costly to be used in the schoolroom, and with leaves measuring 46 cm x 33 cm on average, it was also too large. Moreover, its scholarly text was essentially outdated by the time it was written.[20] Considering these circumstances, one group of scholars surprisingly concluded, "The Eadwine Psalter may have been designed to contain the 'best of everything,' but it seems almost 'good for nothing,' at least for nothing practical."[21] As regards the book's early patronage, signs point to a single benefactor closely connected to the cathedral priory and able to afford such an expensive work. According to the

---

[17] J. M. Sheppard, "The State of the Research: Piecing Medieval Books Together," *Journal of Medieval History* 19 (1993): 378.

[18] Richard Pfaff, "The Calendar," in M. Gibson, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, 65. Pfaff writes that the Calendar "seems ultimately to be based on an eleventh-century Calendar (roughly middle third) to which about a dozen entries reflecting late-eleventh or early-twelfth-century events or devotional currents have been added." Ibid., 84.

[19] Ibid., 65.

[20] Gibson, "Conclusions," 213. Gibson writes, "…by the 1150s the academic study of the Psalter was moving from the *parva glosatura* to Peter Lombard's more detailed patristic analysis, and a decade later to the 'new commentary' of Peter the Chanter."

[21] See the catalogue entry for the Eadwine Psalter in K. van der Horst, et al., *The Utrecht Psalter*, 236.

editors of the 1992 volume, Wibert—Prior of Christ Church from 1152/3 to 1167—is the most likely candidate.[22]

Except for its appended images, the Eadwine Psalter is dated today with a good amount of precision. After a thorough assessment of its diverse contents, the editors of the 1992 volume set aside the traditional date of 1147. This early date was largely based on the assumption that the comet depicted and described at the bottom of folio 10 was either Halley's Comet, which the historical record suggests appeared in the skies in the spring of 1145, or a different comet, recorded in the Annals of Christ Church for 1147 (Figure 8). However, in his inquiry into the matter in the volume, Simon Keynes concluded that the comet could have been one of any number of celestial occurrences dating to the mid-twelfth century.[23] For this reason, he urged that traditional methods of dating the Psalter be followed. Accordingly, diagnostic features such as script and illumination style replaced the comet as primary indicators of its date. In Margaret Gibson's final remarks on this issue in The Eadwine Psalter's conclusion, she states:

> In general our enquiries indicate a date of c. 1155-1160 for the Eadwine Psalter as such, the 'portrait' [of Eadwine] and the Waterworks Plans being added later, in the 1160s.[24]

B. THE APPENDED IMAGES

The editors of the 1992 volume rightly assigned later dates to the Eadwine Psalter's appended images. However, dates as late as the early 1170s for *both* images cannot entirely be dismissed. To begin with the *Scribal Painting*, in 1981 George Zarnecki dated this image to c. 1170

[22] See Gibson, "Conclusions," 211.

[23] Simon Keynes, "The Comet in the Eadwine Psalter," in M. Gibson, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, 164.

[24] Gibson, "Conclusions," 209. Gibson's statement also concerns a one-page schematic rendering of Canterbury's medieval waterworks system located at the end of the Psalter. On this image, see pp. 43-46 below.

on the basis of style, thus moving its traditional date up by some two decades.[25] In fact, while style alone is often considered an unreliable tool for dating,[26] Zarnecki's case demonstrates that style remains useful for setting up relative chronologies, especially when more "scientific" forms of evidence and documentation are lacking.[27] For instance, after establishing that the *Scribal Painting* dates on stylistic grounds to a significantly later period than the book's Psalm illustrations, Zarnecki compared several of its key features—including the arabesque designs on Eadwine's drapery and the distinctive modeling of his face in shades of green—to similar features found in the Copenhagen Psalter's prefatory picture cycle, a work securely dated to c. 1170 (Figure 9). Zarnecki also noted parallels between the drapery style of the painting and that of select monumental works at Canterbury, including the cathedral's post-1174 stained glass as well as its sculpted choir screen, erected in 1180 (Figure 10).[28]

Zarnecki built a convincing case for the *Scribal Painting*'s re-dating, and others have adopted his stance on the issue—most notably T. A. Heslop in his assessment of the image in the 1992 volume. In an essay entitled "Eadwine and his Portrait" (Chapter 11), Heslop accepted not only the later date but also the stylistic means by which Zarnecki arrived at it. (He writes, "Zarnecki suggests a date around 1170 and this is likely to be correct…")[29] However, Heslop's analysis differed from his predecessor's in that it took into account, albeit briefly, the book's *other* appended image: the

[25] George Zarnecki, "The Eadwine Portrait," in *Études d'art médiéval offertes à Louis Grodecki*, ed. Sumner McKnight Crosby, et al. (Paris: Ophrys, 1981), 93-98.

[26] For an alternative approach to stylistic dating based upon distinct modes of medieval expression, see Madeline Caviness, "Images of Divine Order and the Third Mode of Seeing," *Gesta* 22, no. 2 (1983): 99-120; and idem, "'The Simple Perception of Matter' and the Representation of Narrative, ca. 1180-1280," *Gesta* 30, no. 1 (1991): 48-64.

[27] Madeline Caviness, "Romanesque 'belle verrières' in Canterbury?," in *Romanesque & Gothic: Essays for George Zarnecki*, ed. Neil Stratford (Woodbridge, 1987), 35.

[28] Zarnecki, 96.

[29] Heslop, "Eadwine and his Portrait," 179.

Waterworks Drawing.[30] In fact, while Heslop did not push the point, his analysis gave indication that the Eadwine Psalter's appended images were deliberately paired and therefore should be considered together. For example, the painting and the drawing are said by Heslop to display a similar range of pigments and similar architectural stylizations.[31] The early stages of their making are also revealed to correspond in significant ways. Heslop's discussion of the codicological evidence is worth citing in detail here. He writes:

> Throughout the body of the book the quality of vellum is high. Skins with blemishes are intermittent. However, the leaf supporting the [scribal] portrait had defects: its outside corners were missing. The first page of the Waterworks Drawing had a very large hole in it, equivalent to a third of the area of the main cloister and its surrounding buildings. Both the corners of the [scribal] portrait and the 'cloister gap' were carefully repaired before their respective drawings were made, since in both cases the original penwork is found on the patches. Had the designers of the volume envisaged when they put together the last gathering and flyleaves that these were to carry significant embellishment, they would presumably have employed a better quality of membrane.[32]

Heslop's findings establish that neither the *Scribal Painting* nor the *Waterworks Drawing* was intended as part of the Psalter's original scheme; and that both images were added to unused parchment original to the Psalter but never intended to support decoration or text due to its poor quality.[33] But if both images were added to extra leaves of the Psalter later, it remains an open question if they were created at the same time. Analytical procedures using advanced technology may one day provide an answer. For example, the appended images share a similar palette, and

---

[30] Ibid. In his brief assessment of the *Scribal Painting*'s date on p. 180, Heslop specifically refers to Francis Woodman's dating of the *Waterworks Drawing* in Ch. 10 of *The Eadwine Psalter* (1992). Heslop writes: "The conclusions reached there support the hypothesis, which is offered here on the basis of stylistic analysis, that the portrait may be a decade or two later than the main part of the book."

[31] Ibid. Heslop's inventory of shared architectural features includes: "tall, round-headed lancet windows; arches that are smaller segments of circles than semicircles; the 'concentric U' patterns on the tegulation; fenestrated gables; hemispherical roofs with large central globes on the summits."

[32] Ibid.

[33] Ibid., 178-179. It is worth noting here that while the leaf carrying the *Scribal Painting* is pricked for text ruling, the bifolium carrying the *Waterworks Drawing* is not. See Pickwoad, "Codicology," 6; and Heslop, "Eadwine and his Portrait," 178.

spectroscopic analysis of the pigments could help to establish if they were created within days, months, or years of one another. Similarly, future analyses of the membrane might determine if the repair of the parchment occurred in a single undertaking. If so, it is likely that the images that became attached to the newly-mended leaves were envisioned as part of the same project. Until these procedures are carried out and the results published, we must proceed on the basis of other evidence that will aid our inquiry.

Of particular relevance here is the date of the *Waterworks Drawing*, which includes no note of the year it was made but provides visual clues that allow us to approximate it. This is when an unknown artist drew the two-page plan of Canterbury's cathedral precinct into the bound Psalter---a process which, according to Nicholas Pickwoad's analyses for the 1992 volume, affected the execution of lines and other details. Pickwoad writes, "…It is quite clear that the large plan on fols 284-85 was drawn on the bifolium after it had been bound into the manuscript, as all the lines which cross the fold are broken so as to avoid the fold and the sewing thread.[34] He also observes that the precinct wall at the top of the bifolium takes the shape of the spinefold, a fact which further indicates the plan was drawn on parchment previously sewn into the Psalter.[35]

Nearly every scholar who has weighed in on the issue of the drawing's date has assigned it to some time in the 1160s.[36] However, most previous assessments of this date are anchored in *a priori* assumptions about the drawing's function or patronage. For example, in Canterbury Cathedral and

[34] Pickwoad, "Codicology," 6. See also Woodman, "The Waterworks Drawings," 171.

[35] Pickwoad, "Codicology," 6. Pickwoad writes that this wall "follows the shallow curved V-shaped profile of the tail edge of this bifolium as it has been shaped in the bound volume."

[36] A slightly earlier date is suggested by William Urry in "Canterbury, Kent, *circa* 1153x1161," in *Local Maps and Plans from Medieval England*, ed. R. A. Skelton and P. D. A. Harvey (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 46. A date "around 1160" is proposed in Peter Fergusson's "Modernization and Mnemonics at Christ Church, Canterbury: The Treasury Building," *JSAH* 65, no. 1 (Mar., 2006): 51. For the dating of specific buildings depicted in the drawing, see pp. 56-57 of Fergusson's study.

its Romanesque Sculpture (1991), Deborah Kahn advocated a date of c. 1165.[37] To explain this date in her study, Kahn relied on the tenuous supposition that Prior Wibert commissioned the drawing. Because Wibert died in 1167, Kahn maintained that the drawing must have been made before this date.[38] But could not others at Christ Church have commissioned it? Given the evidence considered in Kahn's analysis, the drawing's patronage is far from clear. Also, this evidence is equally silent on whether it was produced during Wibert's lifetime.[39]

A relative chronology can be established. The drawing documents the state of the monastery before the infamous fire of 1174 that destroyed the roof of the cathedral's choir. A *terminus post quem* is more difficult to determine with certainty, but we know that the depicted water system was dependent on an official land grant by Archbishop Theobald (d. 1161) containing Canterbury's new water source: a spring located in the outskirts of the city.[40] In Peter Fergusson's forthcoming study of Canterbury's fountain houses, the date of Theobald's grant is given as between 1155 and 1157.[41] Because the drawing represents four fountain houses associated with the new water supply, each of which may have taken a few years or more to construct after the source had been secured, a *terminus*

---

[37] Deborah Kahn, *Canterbury Cathedral and Its Romanesque Sculpture* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991), 102. Kahn writes, "The date of c. 1165 has been suggested and seems plausible, allowing for the fact that some of the buildings were still incomplete when the drawings were made." This date was originally proposed by Robert Willis in "The Architectural History of the Conventual Buildings of the Monastery of Christ Church in Canterbury," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 7 (1868): 4.

[38] Kahn, 102.

[39] Another assumption which has affected this inquiry is that the drawing offers a wholly accurate view of "developments which had actually taken place" at Canterbury. Ibid., 194 n.18.

[40] Woodman, "The Waterworks Drawings," 169. On the water supply, see especially T. Tatton Brown, "The Precincts Water Supply," *The Canterbury Chronicle* 77 (1983): 45-51.

[41] Peter Fergusson, "Prior Wibert's Fountain Houses: Service and Symbolism at Christ Church, Canterbury," in *The Four Modes of Seeing: Approaches to Medieval Art in honor of Madeline Harrison Caviness*, ed. Evelyn Staudinger Lane, Elizabeth Pastan, and Ellen Shortell (forthcoming from Ashgate Publishers, Oxford), 1. Alternatively, the charter recording Theobald's gift is dated between 1154 and 1160 in Avrom Saltman's *Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London: The Athlone Press, 1956), 272.

post quem of 1157 is proposed. This date is also in keeping with the fact that the drawing was a late addition to the Psalter (c. 1155-1160).

At this juncture, a brief description of what can be seen in the drawing will be instructive. Executed in brown and red ink and various colors of wash, the drawing illustrates Canterbury's innovative system of water piping and draining using distinctly colored lines to indicate the direction of water flow and the quality of the water at different points in the cycle (Figure 2).[42] It also records in vivid detail the monastic buildings that were serviced by the system at the time. Circumscribed by a rectangular inscription in red lettering indicating orientation, some thirty structures are depicted in total, many of them flanked by names and descriptive captions.[43] Among those prominently figured are the cathedral, which occupies a good portion of the right-hand page; two cloisters, each containing a fountain house (Figures 11 & 12); the infirmary chapel, located at the top of the drawing near the big fish pond (*piscina*); the treasury (*vestiarium*), featured to the left of the cathedral's eastern towers; the lavatory (*necessarium*), the large rectangular structure depicted just right of the spinefold; and lastly, the "Prior's judicial hall" (*Aula Nova*), located at the bottom of the left-hand page with a fountain house figured at center (Figures 13 & 14).[44]

---

[42] Woodman writes, "Four basic colours are used in the Drawing to indicate the condition of the supply along its many pipes---green for fresh, orange-red for the water once it passed through the central 'depot' of the cloister, strong red for water soiled by sewage, and brown for rain drainage." Woodman, "The Waterworks Drawings," 172. For further analysis of Canterbury's medieval water system, see Klaus Grewe, "Der Wasserversorgungsplan des Klosters Christchurch in Canterbury," in *Die Wasserversorgung im Mittelalter* 4 (Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Phillip von Zabern, 1991), 229-236.

[43] A transcription of the drawing's captions and *tituli* is given in Urry, 44-45. On the architectural history of the structures represented in the *Waterworks Drawing*, see especially Robert Willis, "Conventual Buildings," 1-206; and idem, *The Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral* (London: Longman & Co., 1845). For a recent discussion of the drawing and the two cloisters it depicts, see Tim Tatton-Brown, "The Two Mid-Twelfth-Century Cloister Arcades at Canterbury Cathedral Priory," *The Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 159 (2006): 91-104.

[44] Known as the North Hall, the *Aula Nova* is also said to have been either a monastic guesthouse or pilgrims' hall. See Kahn, 98. The adjoining gateway, later called the Green Court gate, served as the principal entrance into the priory. See Tatton-Brown, "Cloister Arcades," 92.

On the whole, the drawing provides a carefully-executed visual description of Christ Church, Canterbury at some point before the fire of 1174. However, a few important points must be registered before returning to the issue at hand. First, the water system and a good portion of the buildings figured in the drawing are almost certainly products of Prior Wibert's patronage.[45] Whether these works were recently updated or entirely new at the time, they are shown, as Fergusson has noted, with "consistent prominence."[46] Secondly, the drawing entirely omits the palace complex of the archbishop.[47] This curious "silence" undermines the notion that the image was intended to provide a wholly accurate portrayal of Canterbury's cathedral precinct and reminds us that like so many plans and maps dating to later centuries, this architectural record could be manipulated to achieve certain ends.[48] Finally, Francis Woodman has observed that some of the buildings associated with Wibert's priorate are, in fact, *not* represented in the drawing.[49] These buildings include the Prior's Gate, the cathedral's transept towers, and a second, square-ended

[45] Woodman, "The Waterworks Drawings," 175. However, the buildings are sometimes attributed to a campaign sponsored by Archbishop Theobald to enlarge both church and monastery during the mid-twelfth century.

[46] Fergusson, "Prior Wibert's Fountain Houses," 4.

[47] Urry, 50. Urry notes, "The Plan purports to show the cathedral enclosure of Canterbury running from the eastern boundary wall westward as far as, but unhappily excluding, the archbishop's palace, where some of the most dramatic scenes of contemporary history were enacted in 1170 in the few minutes before Becket's death." Had it been depicted, the archbishop's palace would have appeared below the *cellarium* located at the bottom of the right-hand page.

[48] For general background on this phenomenon, see J. B. Harley, "Silences and Secrecy: the Hidden Agenda of Cartography in Early Modern Europe," *Imago Mundi* 40 (1988): 57-76; and idem, "Maps, Knowledge, and Power," in *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design, and Use of Past Environments*, ed. Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 277-312. On the cartographic strategies employed by Matthew Paris (d. 1259) for the maps of his *Chronica majora*, see Daniel K. Connolly, "Imagined Pilgrimage in the Itinerary Maps of Matthew Paris," *Art Bulletin* 81, no. 4 (Dec., 1999): 598-622; and Michael Gaudio, "Matthew Paris and the Cartography of the Margins," *Gesta* 39, no. 1 (2000): 50-57.

[49] Woodman, "The Waterworks Drawings," 175. He explains: "On the other hand we need not assume that all the building works attributed to Wibert's priorate were completed by the time of his death. When the Prior died, his successor continued his work."

chancel attached to the infirmary chapel—each of which was constructed before December's end in 1170 when Thomas Becket's murder is said to have halted all construction at Canterbury.[50]

The architectural evidence outlined above significantly facilitates our assessment of the drawing's original function. There is little doubt that the drawing served to document the monastery's underground piping system. The drawing's inscriptions, some of which are long and rather technical, may even have been intended to guide "repairs and extensions," as one scholar has suggested.[51] But to favor a strictly utilitarian purpose seems reductive when one considers the amount of careful attention the artist dedicated to rendering the architectural works of Canterbury's landscape down to their numerous small details.[52] In 1986 William Urry proposed that the drawing operated to visually record Wibert's achievements during his tenure as Christ Church's prior—in particular, his construction of a highly-efficient water system and new (or newly renovated) monastic buildings at Canterbury.[53] This assessment, which does much to explain the drawing's emphases and omissions, remains the most convincing in the scholarship. Fergusson concurs with this proposed function in his forthcoming study, which, although focused mainly on the fountain

[50] Ibid. In making the claim that all building activity at Canterbury stopped after Becket's death, Woodman does not cite his source, and I have yet to find further explanation in the scholarship.

[51] Kahn, 101.

[52] On this point, Woodman remarks, "While the main purpose of the Large Drawing was to show the workings of the new Waterworks system, its depiction of the monastic buildings reflects more than just a passing interest in architecture; it is a unique and fascinating architectural document in its own right." Woodman, "The Waterworks Drawings," 174.

[53] Urry, 50. Urry states, "We shall undoubtedly be right it we suppose that the Plan is a pictorial record specially ordered…to preserve the memory of [Wibert's] improvements upon the existing layout, in offering a spectacle of his construction programme in the state to which he had brought it..."

houses rendered at exaggerated scale within the image, also suggests that the drawing served to commemorate and even celebrate the prior's patronage.[54]

Two important questions remain. Who was the drawing's patron, and was the drawing created during or after Wibert's lifetime? A convincing case could be made that Wibert's successor, Odo of Kent, or that the monks at large commissioned the drawing after 1167 to posthumously commemorate Wibert's building achievements. This view is supported by Wibert's *obits*, which, like the image itself, remind the living of what he accomplished during his priorate. They state:

> Among the many other good works which he did for the church [Wibert] caused to be made the watercourse with its ponds, conduits and fishpools; which water he marvelously brought over 1000 paces from the town into the precinct and so through all the offices of the precinct."[55]

Certainly there were people tied to the community that understood the ins and outs of the waterworks system as well as Wibert, if not better. The drawing's artist was undoubtedly one of them. In fact, Woodman has posited the artist to be the Canterbury monk, Gervase (d. 1210), who wrote various historical tracts during his lifetime including one which famously details the rebuilding of Canterbury Cathedral after the fire of 1174. Woodman explains:

> That a house of a hundred monks should possess one as knowledgeable in architecture as Gervase was fortunate. Could there be two such men? Gervase eventually rose to the position of sacrist, an office entailing detailed work on the Cathedral fabric. His architectural writings confirm that he had the ability to understand the Waterworks system. Perhaps he had also the draughtsman's talent to record it in the Waterworks Drawing.[56]

---

[54] Fergusson, "Prior Wibert's Fountain Houses," 14. Fergusson writes: "…It can be no coincidence that the artist depicts only the conventual buildings over which Wibert had jurisdiction and omits the adjacent buildings of the archbishop. The omission affirms and celebrates the Prior's realm, and parades his work as builder and patron."

[55] Kahn, 96.

[56] Woodman, "The Waterworks Drawings," 176-177. A comparison of the descriptive strategies used by Gervase in his tract and by the drawing's artist might further clarify this connection. For additional discussion of the issue, see Woodman, *The Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral* (London, Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul), 29. On Gervase's tract, see Carol Davidson Cragoe, "Reading and Rereading Gervase of Canterbury," *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 154 (2001): 40-53; M. F. Hearn, "Canterbury Cathedral and the Cult of Becket," *The Art Bulletin* 76 (Mar., 1994): 19-52; and Peter Kidson, "Gervase, Becket, and William of Sens," *Speculum* 68, no. 4 (1993): 969-991.

Furthermore, the notion that the drawing's patron was someone other than Wibert would account for why certain structures associated with Wibert's priorate were omitted from the drawing. The patron may have requested a record of works accomplished *during* the prior's lifetime, excluding those works that were completed or in the process of being completed subsequent to his death. If the drawing was commissioned immediately following Wibert's death to document his efforts, then those structures which were planned as part of his building campaign but not yet erected by 1167 would have taken about three years to complete before December's end in 1170—a tight but sufficient construction time span. Thus, given the considerations above, a date as late as 1170 and perhaps even a year or more after this is entirely plausible for the *Waterworks Drawing*.

Importantly, evidence beyond that already considered here advances the hypothesis that the drawing was commissioned following Wibert's death in 1167. The neglected evidence is contained in the Eadwine Psalter and precedes the drawing by a single turn of the page: the *Scribal Painting* (c. 1170). This appended image honored the calligraphic achievements of a different Christ Church monk, Eadwine—who, according to the analyses conducted in the 1992 volume, was the Psalter's primary scribe ("Scribe L_1"). Not only did he set the layout of the book and provide "a model of each size and grade of script for the other scribes to follow,"[57] but as the book's primary designer, Eadwine may also have been involved in coordinating the Psalter's illustration and decoration.[58] Almost certainly Eadwine completed the project during Wibert's tenure as prior of Christ Church; and if Wibert was the book's early patron, Eadwine did so under his direction.

[57] See Webber, "The Script," 14-21.

[58] Heslop, "Eadwine and his Portrait," 180-181. The second part of the *Scribal Painting*'s inscription attributes the beauty of the book to Eadwine. See the translation on p. 18 below.

That two images commemorating the efforts of Canterbury monks lie side by side in the Eadwine Psalter is now difficult to dispute, but a closer evaluation of the function of the *Scribal Painting* will advance the hypothesis that both images were commissioned as tributes to deceased foundational figures of the Christ Church community. Before Zarnecki's 1981 study, the *Scribal Painting* had been regarded in the art-historical scholarship as a portrait directly inspired by the *living* Eadwine. Zarnecki countered this view by proposing that the painting's inscription indicated it was designed as a posthumous memorial (Figure 1). The inscription, which surrounds Eadwine's effigy on all sides in red and green lettering, reads:

> **Scribe:** "The prince of scribes am I; neither my praises nor my fame shall ever die. Cry out, o my letter, what kind of man I am." (**SCRIPTOR**: S[C]RIPTORUM PRINCEPS EGO. NEC OBITURA DEINCEPS LAUS MEA NEC FAMA. QU[-]IS SIM MEA LITTERA CLAMA)
>
> **Letter:** "That you, o Eadwine, whom the painted figure traces, are in reputation immortal, your writing proclaims – you, whose genius the beauty of the book declares, which, o God, take to yourself with the man himself as an acceptable gift." (**LITTERA**: TE TUA S[C]RIPTURA QUEM SIGNAT PICTA FIGURA. PREDICAT EADWINUM FAMA PER SECULA VIVUM. INGENIUM CUIUS LIBRI DECUS IND[-]ICAT HUIUS. QUEM TIBI SEQUE DATUM MUNUS DEUS ACCIPE GRATUM)[59]

Because the first line is written in the first person and in the present tense, scholars before Zarnecki deemed the inscription (and the painting itself) self-commemorative. In other words, Eadwine *himself* was said to have proclaimed *Ego scriptorum princeps* and to have determined how this declaration would be presented in his portrait. To Zarnecki, on the other hand, the inscription's overall content implied Eadwine was deceased at the time the painting was devised. He explains:

> It is hardly conceivable that Eadwine inspired his own image of that size and importance and with such a laudatory inscription. The concluding words of the inscription are somewhat ambiguous, but they do imply that he was dead. Thus, it is quite likely that on his death, which, I suggest, occurred about 1170, the monastery wished to commemorate the admired scribe by having his portrait added to one of the manuscripts he copied.[60]

---

[59] Zarnecki, 93. The only words appearing in green in the Latin inscription are the first word of the first line, *Scriptor* ("Scribe"); and the second *Littera* ("Letter") painted on the right side of the image. Both words are bolded in the translation provided here.

[60] Ibid., 96.

Zarnecki rightly noted that such a majestic tribute honoring a living monk is, at least on the face of it, a contradiction in terms—especially given that humility is the primary virtue in Benedictine monasticism. On the other hand, if the Christ Church community wished to honor Eadwine with a lasting memorial to his achievements, then a eulogizing portrait placed in a book he designed would have been an apt tribute.[61]

Scholars treating this issue have since fallen into two camps, both dependent on the painting's rather ambiguous inscription as evidentiary support. The first camp endorses Zarnecki's view that the painting was designed as a posthumous memorial,[62] and the second camp endorses the view that Eadwine was fundamentally involved in the planning of his portrait. In 1993 C. R. Dodwell aligned himself with the latter camp, presenting a compelling counterargument to the theory that the painting was intended as a "visual obituary."[63] Dodwell claimed that Eadwine's agency in coordinating the painting is revealed in the last line of the inscription—wherein the "Letter" beseeches God to receive the Psalter and Eadwine himself as gifts. Rather than indicating the scribe was dead at the time (as Zarnecki had argued), the line according to Dodwell establishes that Eadwine, like so many artists and patrons of his day, sought *while alive* divine favor through his calligraphic labors. But as it happens, this line bears a close correspondence to a prayer written by

---

[61] Even if Eadwine was not an author in the traditional sense, Heslop's analysis of the *Scribal Painting*'s iconography placed it firmly within the pictorial tradition of monastic author portraiture. The full-page portrait of the monk and scribe, Lawrence of Durham, is offered up as a nearly contemporary equivalent. See Heslop, "Eadwine and his Portrait," 183. On the author portrait of Lawrence (c. 1150), see also Kauffmann, *Romanesque Manuscripts*, 104 (No. 76).

[62] See, for example, Heslop, "Eadwine and his Portrait," 185. While Heslop stresses the likelihood that the painting was a "retrospective" work—done without Eadwine's knowledge or his direct input, he also acknowledges that his stance is taken as a "matter of opinion."

[63] See C. R. Dodwell, *The Pictorial Arts*, *The Pictorial Arts of the West: 800-1200* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993), 357.

Eadwine ("Scribe L_1") after the collect for Psalm 150 on fol. 262^{r}.[64] In the prayer, Eadwine beseeches God to award him a "happy end" and asks that the Psalter "be perfected for the health and eternal salvation" of his soul.[65] The prayer's content, in my mind, begs two questions. In forecasting the completion of his work, did Eadwine envision the inclusion of his portrait? Or did his prayer inspire the creation of a portrait of the celebrated scribe following his death? To unravel this enigma, we must turn again to the *Scribal Painting*'s inscription, but not to its words per se—to its visual form.

What is missing thus far in the scholarship on this image is a close look at twelfth-century funerary imagery, which sheds light on the question of why the artist of the *Scribal Painting* enclosed Eadwine's effigy with a painted inscription. Most instructive for our purposes is a consideration of how the image relates formally to the two types of figural tomb monuments then in currency in England and Northern Europe: the two-dimensional grave slab and the three-dimensional sculpted tomb, both of which could be incised and adorned. Extant medieval examples of the two types reveal that they often carried inscriptions.[66] In some cases, the writing circumscribed the effigy like a rectangular framing device, much like we see in Eadwine's painted portrait. The incised grave slab of the architect Hughes Libergier (d. 1263) in Reims Cathedral offers

---

[64] The connection between the painting's inscription and Eadwine's prayer has been overlooked in the scholarship on the *Scribal Painting*, probably due to the fact that this appended image is usually treated separately from the Psalter proper. (Heslop merely points out that the prayer is another place in the book wherein Eadwine's name appears.) Heslop translates the prayer as follows: "*Almighty and merciful God I humbly beseech yo* Ophrys*,ur clemency that you allow me, your servant Eadwine, to serve you faithfully, and will deign to confer on me good perseverance and a happy end. And may this Psalter 'that I have sung in your sight' be perfected for the health and eternal salvation of my soul. Amen*." Heslop, "Eadwine and his Portrait," 180 n. 10.

[65] Ibid., 180.

[66] The bibliography on this topic is vast. See especially Erwin Panofsky, *Tomb Sculpture: four lectures on its changing aspects from ancient Egypt to Bernini*, ed. H. W. Janson (New York: H. N. Abrams, 1964); F. A. Greenhill, *Incised effigial slabs: a study of engraved stone memorials in Latin Christendom, c. 1100 to c. 1700* (London: Faber & Faber, 1976); Paul Binski, *Medieval Death: Ritual and Representation* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996), 70-122; and Thomas E. A. Dale, "The Individual, the Resurrected Body, and Romanesque Portraiture: The Tomb of Rudolph von Schwaben in Merseburg," *Speculum* 77 (2000): 707-743.

a useful later parallel (Figure 15). In this monument, Hughes appears surrounded by the tools of his trade (a rod, a pair of dividers, and a set square), and his effigy is bounded on all sides by an incised inscription. Another example is the sculpted tomb slab of Pope Lucius III (d. 1185) in Verona, wherein the open-eyed pope appears with two angels at his head and a prostrate cleric at his feet and all are enclosed by an inscription on three sides (Figure 16).[67] Additionally, twelfth-century funerary inscriptions often celebrated the dead as if living.[68] As Paul Binski notes, "The effigy, like the will, was a central means by which the dead were given a voice and a presence in medieval art."[69] To highlight just one example from the period, the inscription on the brightly-colored enamel tomb plaque of Geoffrey of Anjou (d. 1151) from Le Mans reads in translation: "With your sword, prince, the band of robbers is put to flight; with peace flourishing, repose is given to churches."[70] Nearly contemporaneous with the *Scribal Painting*, this Angevin plaque thus captures a similar spirit of life and agency as that which is found in the written celebration of Eadwine framing his figural effigy.

Comparisons with contemporary medieval funerary monuments thus suggest that in enclosing Eadwine's effigy with an inscription, the artist of the *Scribal Painting* was looking outside the medium of painting to tomb imagery of the day.[71] This conclusion not only accounts for the overall look of the painting's inscription, but it also explains why Eadwine's form in the image is more plastic in character than pictorial. The artist, perhaps inspired by the three-dimensional figural tomb monument, registered a body with real substance on the flat surface of the parchment leaf, even

[67] See Julian Gardner, *The Tomb and the Tiara: Curial Tomb Sculpture in Rome and Avignon in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 29-30.

[68] For general background on the subject of funerary writing, see Armando Petrucci, *Writing the dead: death and writing strategies in the Western tradition* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1998).

[69] Binski, 93.

[70] Heslop, "Eadwine and his portrait," 183.

[71] Professor C. Jean Campbell put forward this idea in an Art History graduate seminar session on medieval and Early Renaissance portraits at Emory University.

conveying the appearance of sculpted stone. That the *Scribal Painting* is richly illuminated in blue, green, red, and gold also suggests the inspiration of an enamel tomb plaque, a good example of which is Geoffrey of Anjou's (Figure 17).

Insights from the recent art-historical scholarship on medieval portraiture help to substantiate the conclusion that the *Scribal Painting* functioned as a memorial to the deceased Eadwine. Thomas E. A. Dale's 2002 study of the functions of the Romanesque funerary effigy is especially instructive. Dale demonstrates that funerary effigies of this period reflected contemporary medieval concerns for how an individual was defined both during and after his lifetime. Stressing that these works must be understood within the religious culture of the period, Dale defines the Romanesque funerary effigy as the "theological image of the individual, representing simultaneously the virtues of the living officeholder and the resurrected body of the deceased at the end of time."[72] He concludes:

> On the one hand, it gives palpable presence to the corpse of the deceased…recalling aspects of his vocation during his lifetime and reintegrating the deceased into the community of the living, who are bound to commemorate his passing; on the other hand, the effigy projects the deceased in the likeness of the "glorified body" of the resurrected at the end of time.[73]

In developing the second part of this definition, Dale draws upon Caroline Walker Bynum's The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336 (1995), a work that examines how the writings of twelfth-century theologians reflected St. Augustine's materialist position on the fate of the body after the Second Coming.[74] This position maintained that the individual body would not remain disintegrated after death but instead would be fully reintegrated and perfected in the likeness of Christ and the saints. Dale also draws upon the content of twelfth-century funerary liturgies in

---

[72] Dale (as in n. 66), 717. See also Willibald Sauerländer, "The Fate of the Face in Medieval Art," in *Set in Stone: The Face in Medieval Sculpture*, ed. Charles T. Little (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2006), 16.

[73] Dale, 728.

[74] See Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336*, Lectures on the History of Religions, n.s., 15 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 115-226.

Roman pontificals. Like the theological writings of the day, these liturgies iterated the notion that the blessed dead would be perfected at the end of time. They also announced that the deceased would come to occupy "eternal thrones" with the saints in their "mansions" in the sky.[75]

The *Scribal Painting* fulfills the twofold function of the Romanesque funerary effigy as outlined by Dale, and it also evokes themes that frequently found expression in twelfth-century tomb imagery. To begin with, the painting gives "palpable presence" to the absent Eadwine by showing him actively engaged in the work that occupied his living days—writing. Garbed in monastic dress, the tonsured Eadwine appears seated before an open book utilizing the attributes of his scribal profession, the quill pen and scraper. Secondly, Eadwine appears materially intact, and the voluminous character of his effigy evokes his bodily reintegration at the end of time. His throne-like chair and the palace-like structures that frame him also call to mind the architectural imagery of the funerary liturgies of his day. Indeed, Eadwine's elaborate setting is suggestive not only of his scriptorium during life but also of an eternal one situated within the heavenly realm. But if the painting, operating as a two-dimensional funerary effigy, projected Eadwine in the likeness of the blessed at the end of time, it also gives clues that indicate his assimilation to the *imago* of a specific saintly model.

Produced at Canterbury during the late eleventh century, a large drawing of St. Jerome bears a striking resemblance to the *Scribal Painting*—and it may have served, I contend, as the latter's iconographic model (Figure 18).[76] In The Canterbury School of Illumination: 1066-1200 (1954), Dodwell states that this drawing was appended to an empty leaf of an "Anglo-Saxon" manuscript

[75] Dale, 729-730.

[76] The similarities between these two Canterbury images have yet to be acknowledged in the scholarship. On the drawing of Jerome, see C. R. Dodwell, *The Canterbury School of Illumination: 1066-1200* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954), 27; and idem (1993), 121.

dating to the tenth century (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS. 389).[77] Like Eadwine, Jerome is figured in his portrait as a monastic scribe seated in his scriptorium. An open book and a set of writing utensils signify his scribal profession, and a tonsured head and habit operate as signs of his monasticism. Also like Eadwine, Jerome appears actively engaged in his work, although a dove is shown hovering at his right ear. In describing the drawing, Dodwell notes that Jerome "is chiefly coloured in soft green," the very color used by the artist of the *Scribal Painting* for Eadwine's face, neck, and much of his garment.[78] Though the rendering of these two images differ, their compositions are also strikingly similar.[79] This, I believe, is telling. The Eadwine Psalter contains the *Gallicanum*, *Romanum*, and *Hebraicum* versions of the Psalms, all of which are attributed to Jerome. Thus, a drawing bearing Jerome's image would have made a fitting prototype for the "author portrait" of Eadwine—who we now know was responsible for laying out Jerome's Latin versions with vernacular translations and commentary in the Psalter proper, which Eadwine faces in the context of the book.[80] While we cannot know today how accessible the drawing of Jerome was during the time, we could imagine it was familiar within the Canterbury scriptorium. The artist of the *Scribal Painting*, I suggest, knew it well.

In conceiving the *Scribal Painting*, the artist employed Jerome's portrait as a compositional model to reflect not only Eadwine's conscious imitation of Jerome's work within the Psalter but also his adoption of Jerome as his monastic scribal exemplar. This reading is in accordance with how

---

[77] Dodwell (1954), 27.

[78] Ibid.

[79] On the importance of differentiating between the kinds of sources a medieval artist or patron might have utilized—whether iconographic or stylistic, see Madeline H. Caviness, "Suger's Glass at Saint-Denis: The State of the Research," in *Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis: A Symposium*, ed. Paula Lieber Gerson (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1986), 262-268.

[80] See n. 61 above.

individual identity was formulated in medieval portraiture. Recent scholarship has stressed how personal portraits of the period conformed to contemporary expectations for how an individual was defined. Accordingly, these images registered identity not so much through the illusion of physiognomic likeness but through the outward display of attributes that to a medieval beholder signaled institutional or group affiliation, as well as conformance to one or more exemplary models.[81] Viewed in this light, the *Scribal Painting* is less about Eadwine's distinctive "personality" and more about his identity and status as a monk of Christ Church Priory—and as chief scribe within this context. Cast as a contemporary author portrait, the image demonstrates the conscious fashioning of the Christ Church monk in the image of his early Christian model, Jerome, whose exemplary contributions are also featured in the book.

The evidence examined here thus suggests that the *Scribal Painting* operates as a memorial to the deceased Eadwine and his achievements. But if we revisit the controversial first line of the inscription, we find our most overt indication of the image's posthumous function. Here, we learn that Eadwine *is* "the prince of scribes," a designation which must have been synonymous with the famed biblical translator and exegete, Jerome. For example, an inscription in an early medieval manuscript of the Latin Vulgate Bible from Wearmouth-Jarrow calls Jerome "the learned interpreter of languages, proclaimed throughout the world," further adding, "Our library will reveal you through your writings."[82] Informed medieval beholders of the *Scribal Painting*, principally those who were

[81] On the subject of medieval individualism, see Caroline Walker Bynum, "Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?," in *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 95-102; and n. 113 below. Also instructive is Clark Maines, "Good Works, Social Ties, and the Hope for Salvation: Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis," in *Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis*, 77-94.

[82] A comparison between this inscription on the contents page of the Codex Amiatinus and the one contained on the twelfth-century *Scribal Painting* is revealing. On the former inscription, which is said to rely on a *titulus* from Isidore of Seville, see Jennifer O'Reilly, "The Library of Scripture: Views from Vivarium and Wearmouth-Jarrow," in *New Offerings, Ancient Treasures: Studies in Medieval Art for George Henderson*, ed. Paul Binski and William Noel (Thrupp, Stroud, Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2001), 21. For further discussion of the Eadwine Psalter's relationship to the Codex Amiatinus, see pp. 38-41 below.

conscious of its posthumous nature, therefore interpreted the first line of its inscription not as a statement of prideful arrogance but as a confirmation of Eadwine's material assimilation to the *imago* of his saintly exemplar at the end of time. Eadwine's exemplary feat during his lifetime—namely, the laying out of the Psalter with vernacular translations, glosses, and handsome colored illustrations—accorded him status like that of the historical Jerome, whose fame lived on long after his bodily death.

PART II: REPRESENTING THE CHRIST CHURCH CORPORATE BODY

In the first part of this paper, I made a case for how the *Scribal Painting* and the *Waterworks Drawing* served as posthumous memorials to two Canterbury monks, Eadwine and Wibert, whose individual achievements were remembered and celebrated in a Psalter that both were involved in producing. In this section, I will expand upon the portrait functions of these images by situating each in a larger tradition of corporate representation at Canterbury during the second half of the twelfth century. On the surface, the portrait function of the *Scribal Painting* is readily comprehensible given that it contains a figural effigy—an image that, even without conveying an individual likeness, fits our expectations for what a portrait should look like.[83] However, existing visual evidence unequivocally demonstrates that the priory represented itself through its architecture during the

---

[83] As a category of representation, 'portraiture' is often said to comprise only those images which strive for individual physiognomic likeness. The *Scribal Painting* does not fit this traditional definition but instead registers identity according to the distinct conventions of medieval portraiture. Important recent contributions to the literature on medieval portraits include Thomas E. A. Dale, "The Individual, the Resurrected Body, and Romanesque Portraiture" (2000); Brigitte Miriam Bedos-Rezak, "Medieval Identity: A Sign and a Concept," *The American Historical Review* 105, no. 5 (Dec., 2000): 1489-1534; Stephen Perkinson, "From 'Curious' to Canonical: *Jehan Roy de France* and the Origins of the French School," *The Art Bulletin* 87, no. 3 (2005): 507-532; and the recent exhibition catalogue, *Set in Stone: The Face in Medieval Sculpture*, ed. Charles T. Little (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2006). See also Joan Holladay, "Portrait Elements in Tomb Sculpture: Identification and Iconography," in *Europäische Kunst um 1300*, ed. Gerhard Schmidt and Elisabeth Liskar (Wien: H. Böhlau, 1986), 217-221; and Geraldine A. Johnson, "Activating the Effigy: Donatello's Pecci Tomb in Siena Cathedral," *The Art Bulletin* 77 (1995): 445-459.

period in which the *Waterworks Drawing* was made. This evidence takes the form of one half of a pair of "portrait" seals used by the priory to authenticate legal documents and, as we shall see, to outwardly affirm its identity as custodian of the oldest and most important Roman Christian institution in England. Together, the seals record Christ Church's heightened consciousness of how it represented itself in visual media during the mid-twelfth century. They also provide a useful framework in which to examine the Eadwine Psalter's appended images. Before considering this evidence in detail, however, a brief account of Canterbury Cathedral and the monastic community that served it will be instructive.

According to the Venerable Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of England*, Canterbury Cathedral was founded on the site of an existing Roman basilica by St. Augustine, Canterbury's first archbishop, who was sent by Gregory the Great to the south of England as a Roman Christian missionary. A group of secular clerks served the cathedral establishment from its foundation in the late sixth century through to the late tenth century, at which point a Benedictine monastery is thought to have been established.[84] Soon after the Norman Conquest, Archbishop Lanfranc (1070-89) enacted wide-ranging initiatives at Canterbury in an effort to place the monastery at the center of England's ecclesiastical reform—and hence, to establish the cathedral's primacy among competing sees.[85] Lanfranc constructed a new cathedral and new monastic buildings, and he also drew up a set

[84] See David Knowles and Christopher Brooke, *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 35-37.

[85] William Stubbs's description of the cathedral priory sufficiently attests to its importance during the twelfth century. He writes: "The cathedral monastery at Canterbury was the mother church of England, the seat of the ruling prelate; more than that, it was the center and gathering place of all ecclesiastical news; and, inasmuch as its chief officer was frequently the chief officer of the state likewise, it was the focus of much secular news also. It was the first place to receive all intelligence from Rome." Stubbs, *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, Rolls Series, Vol. 1 (London: Longman & Co., 1870-80), 9.

of regulatory statutes for the monks of Christ Church.[86] Supplementing the *Rule of St. Benedict*, Lanfranc's *Constitutions* (c. 1077) served as the primary guide for monastic life at Canterbury. They also provided "a description of the functions of the leading officials."[87] A prior was designated administrative head of the monastic community, which, by the mid-twelfth century, comprised about one hundred and fifty monks.[88] On the official level, however, the archbishop of Canterbury functioned as the monks' titular abbot and maintained "ultimate authority and control over the monastery."[89]

A description of the medieval priory at Canterbury would be incomplete without noting the central place it held in English art production. Its library contained an extensive collection of ancient and patristic writings as well as illustrated manuscripts gifted to the monastery by Canterbury's archbishops and other benefactors.[90] At least some of its holdings became prototypes for the creation of new works within the scriptorium. One such prototype was the Utrecht Psalter. Produced at the Benedictine abbey of Hautvillers near Reims, this ninth-century manuscript crossed the Channel and made its way to Canterbury by the early eleventh century.[91] Probably considered "ancient" at the time, the Utrecht Psalter's monochrome drawings served as a model for the Psalm illustrations of not

---

[86] On Lanfranc's building efforts at Canterbury, see especially Richard Gem, "The Significance of the 11th-century Rebuilding of Christ Church and St Augustine's, Canterbury, in the Development of Romanesque Architecture," in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Canterbury before 1220*, The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions for the Year 1979, ed. Nicola Coldstream and Peter Draper (Leeds: W. S. Maney and Son, 1982), 1-19.

[87] Knowles and Brooke, 28.

[88] Kahn, 35 & 186 n. 4.

[89] Ibid., 19.

[90] For an overview of the library's mid-twelfth century holdings, see Noel, "The Utrecht Psalter in England," in K. van der Horst, et al., *The Utrecht Psalter*, 124.

[91] See the catalogue entry for the Utrecht Psalter in K. van der Horst, et al., *The Utrecht Psalter*, 168-170.

only the Eadwine Psalter but also at least two other works originating at Christ Church—the Harley Psalter and the Paris Psalter (Figure 19).[92]

While much of the priory's mid-twelfth century artistic production conveys a reverence for the past and age-old tradition,[93] some works created at the time were also forward-looking and even experimental in nature. For example, Peter Fergusson has drawn attention to the fact that many of the new monastic buildings associated with Wibert's priorate—including the fountain houses, the *vestiarium*, and the *Aula Nova*—were products of local experimentation and innovation.[94] This notion suggests that a "modern" approach to building was in place well before *opus francigenum* established itself at Canterbury after the cathedral fire of 1174. Moreover, the drawing made to visually document these building works in the Eadwine Psalter is another innovative artistic statement for the period.

Turning now to the visual evidence at focus in this section, a mid-twelfth century seal speaks to both of these tendencies displayed in Canterbury's artistic record. It made use of an existing model but reworked it, resulting in a pictorial formula that was far from conventional. The seal also attests to the priory's conscious use of architecture, and more specifically, the architecture of its cathedral, to represent itself to the world beyond the cloister. Measuring eighty millimeters in diameter, the seal—sometimes referred to as the "second seal" of the priory—contains an image of Canterbury Cathedral in its Norman Romanesque state (Figure 20).[95] Although the representation is

---

[92] For further background on these works and their relationship to the Utrecht Psalter, see Noel, "The Utrecht Psalter in England," in K. van der Horst, et al., *The Utrecht Psalter*, 120-165.

[93] See Gibson, "Conclusions," 212-213.

[94] For example, Fergusson writes that these buildings were "without precedent in the slow-changing traditions of monastic architecture." Fergusson, "Modernization and Mnemonics," 50.

[95] T. A. Heslop, "The Conventual Seals of Canterbury Cathedral: 1066-1232," in Nicola Coldstream, et al., *Medieval Art and Architecture*, 94-96.

not topographical, the cathedral is clearly rendered through broad outlines and surface patterning. Visually distinctive details are also included. For example, a figure of Christ—the priory's dedicatee—appears under the central tower, an angel adorns the top of this tower, and two heads (probably suggestive of locally-honored saints) are incorporated in the windows of the flanking towers.[96] The seal's legend contains a place name identifying the represented structure as belonging to Christ Church, Canterbury.[97]

T. A. Heslop has observed that the second seal came into use at the priory beginning in the mid to late-1150s and that it replaced an earlier seal containing an image of Canterbury's pre-Conquest cathedral (Figure 21, a/b).[98] According to Heslop, the second seal preserved the basic symmetry of the first, but its pictorial formula was entirely new for the time in that it united two contemporary fashions in monastic seal design: the use of a building as the primary motif; and the use of a full-length figural representation (usually of a patron saint or dedicatee) as the principal image.[99] The priory's second seal reconciled the two fashions by devoting only a small amount of space to the figure of Christ in Majesty—an arrangement that in all likelihood inspired the development of a large figural counterseal.[100] While counterseals had been in use by individuals

---

[96] Heslop relates these peering heads to similar ones featured in the illustrations of Psalms IV and XLVII of the Eadwine Psalter proper. Ibid., 97.

[97] Though not transcribed in Heslop's study, the legend reads, "SIGILLUM ECCLESIE XPISTI CANTUARIE PRIME SEDIS BRITTANNIE."

[98] Measuring roughly half the size of the second seal, the priory's first seal contains no place name in the legend and no figural representation. The legend of this seal reads, "SIGILLVM ECCLESIAE CRISTI," and according to Heslop, "the building on it can fairly be taken as a representation of the pre-Conquest cathedral." Ibid., 96. The priory's first seal appears on charters dating from before 1107 to March of 1155. The second seal appears on documents dating through to the 1220s. Ibid., 94.

[99] Ibid., 97.

[100] Heslop explains, "As though to compensate for the smallness of the image of Christ a new alternative was introduced, the use of a comparatively large counterseal 57 X 35 mm ($2^{1}/_{4}$ X $1^{3}/_{8}$ in.) with a Majesty." Ibid.

since the previous decade, Christ Church was the first institution to adopt one. It was also the first to use a contemporary image of its patron as opposed to an antique gem.[101]

Oval in shape and measuring nearly sixty millimeters from top to bottom, the priory's mid-twelfth century counterseal shows Christ seated before a cross nimbus lifting his right hand in benediction while holding a book in his left (Figure 22).[102] The legend reads in translation, "I am the way, the truth, and the life," a quotation derived from John 14:6. Our earliest documented use of this seal is on a charter in the British Library dating to July of 1158 (Additional Charter 67,123). Here, it appears on the reverse of the priory's main seal, which in the years to follow would be the customary arrangement.[103] It should be noted, however, that a different seal sometimes occupied the counterseal's place on documents originating at Canterbury. This was the personal seal of the archbishop, Christ Church's abbot, which featured his full-length portrait (Figure 23).[104] For example, a charter dated to 1155-61 bears two seal impressions attached as pendants to its base (Figure 24).[105] One is of the priory's main seal. The other is of the personal seal of Archbishop Theobald, who is shown holding the archiepiscopal staff in his left hand while making a sign of benediction with his right.[106]

---

[101] Ibid.

[102] According to Heslop, "Main seal and counterseal are apparently by the same craftsman, the lettering style and punctuation are very close, and were probably made at the same time." Ibid., 94.

[103] Ibid., 99 n. 3.

[104] For a discussion of the pairing of monastic and archiepiscopal seals in medieval France, see Brigitte Bedos-Rezak, "Towns and Seals: Representation and Signification in Medieval France," in *Form and Order in Medieval France: Studies in Social and Quantitative Sigillography*, Variorum Collected Studies Series (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1993), XII, 35-36.

[105] Saltman, 260. The charter itself, which is directed to Prior Wibert, concerns an archiepiscopal reform regarding the treatment of fugitive or evicted monks. In Saltman's discussion of Archbishop Theobald's relations with Christ Church during his tenure, this document and the legislation it enacts are employed to demonstrate Theobald's "interest in the internal welfare of the priory." Ibid., 63.

[106] Ibid., 259-260 (No. 31).

As this brief overview of Canterbury's sigillographic record demonstrates, Christ Church became greatly concerned with how it represented itself in visual media in the decade or so before the creation of the Eadwine Psalter's appended images. The priory reformulated its main seal to show the cathedral as it actually stood within the Canterbury landscape, also fixing it with a legend tying the represented edifice specifically to Christ Church. Moreover, a counterseal was created to complement the main seal. For this image, a figure of the priory's dedicatee was adopted, but given the increasing preference amongst medieval individuals for corporeal self-representation on seals, it is tempting to think that Christ Church considered other alternatives for how it might represent itself according to this growing trend. The contemporaneous use of a figural portrait seal by the archbishop most likely prompted this kind of reflection.

In the decades following their original manufacture, the priory's main seal and counterseal possessed a function that went far beyond the routine authentication of official documents. Together, they articulated the self-representation of Christ Church, Canterbury within the legal (and literate) milieu. In her extensive research on the agency of seals within medieval society, Brigitte Bedos-Rezak has specifically underlined their portrait function. In her words, seal iconographies operated as "signs conveying identity, status, prestige, and power-covenant."[107] Employing emblems of function and kinship, they generated and shaped social identity much like traditional portraits of the period.[108]

Importantly, the very seals that officially formulated the self-representation of Christ Church beginning in the mid-twelfth century bear close correspondences to the appended images of the Eadwine Psalter. Parallels in pictorial formulae and content and in image function can be identified.

---

[107] Bedos-Rezak, *Form and Order,* "Preface," 9.

[108] Ibid.

For example, like the priory's main architectural seal, the *Waterworks Drawing* (Figure 2) shows an image of Canterbury Cathedral in its Norman Romanesque state. (The largest building depicted in the drawing, the cathedral was also the first visible after the preceding folio was turned from right to left.) Both seal and drawing use many of the same descriptive features to identify the edifice. These include weather vanes, cockerels on the western towers, crosses on the eastern towers, and an angel atop the central tower.[109] Similarly, the *Scribal Painting* resembles the priory's counterseal in that it contains a figural portrait surrounded on all sides by an inscription. Like a seal legend, the painting's inscription names and describes the depicted figure. He is Eadwine, and he is "the prince of scribes." Eadwine's throne-like chair suggests his princely status, as do the two words ending in *ceps* that effectively frame his head: *princeps* ("chief"/"prince") and *deinceps* ("hereafter").

Advantages of size and medium allow the Psalter's appended images to communicate far more visual information to the beholder than the seals, but much of this additional information also conveys defining aspects of the priory's identity c. 1170. For example, the extensive waterworks depicted in the drawing defined Christ Church's identity in terms of technological skill and know-how. Whether experienced firsthand or visually via the appended image, this sophisticated system differentiated the priory from nearly all of its contemporaries in England and across the Channel.[110] State-of-the-art monastic buildings like the *vestiarium* and the *Aula Nova* also served as a similar purpose within the drawing, imparting knowledge about the priory and validating its status in relation to the outside world. If one considers that competition among monastic institutions is a

[109] Carol F. Davidson, "Images of Gothic Architecture: Structure or Symbolism?," in *The image of the building.* Papers from the Annual Symposium of the Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain 1995, ed. M. Howard (London: Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain, 1996), 8.

[110] On the importance of water for both practical and sacramental purposes within the medieval monastery, see Meredith Lillich, "Cleanliness with Godliness: A Discussion of Medieval Monastic Plumbing," in *Studies in Medieval Stained Glass and Monasticism* (London: Pindar Press, 2001), 355-394.

documented phenomenon for the period and that Christ Church undoubtedly had a stake in it,[111] the commissioning of a drawing to record these modern building achievements within a display Psalter becomes all the more comprehensible.

According to Bedos-Rezak, medieval portrait seals were "appended to a document as a testimony of the personal participation of its author, thus rendering the documented act valid and executory."[112] In a similar way, the *Scribal Painting* and the *Waterworks Drawing* were added at the end of the previously bound Psalter to assert communal authorship and to authenticate the book and its meanings. For example, the *Scribal Painting* attests to the individual Eadwine's involvement in the book's making. It also attests to his status and authority within the Canterbury scriptorium. On another level, however, the painting implicates the corporate monastic body as its primary subject. As Bedos-Rezak explains, "Seals empowered not the individual as particular being but the person as category, the person as representative."[113] The seal-like portrait of Eadwine thus serves as a vehicle through which the priory itself is represented and defined. The very attributes that on one level signify Eadwine's social identity become symbols conveying the power and authority of the monastic institution to which he belonged. Within the painting, these symbols—the quill pen, the scraper, the open book—combine with Eadwine's overall form to invoke the act of creating itself. Celebrated both inside and outside the Canterbury scriptorium,[114] the historical Eadwine called to

---

[111] Bynum (1982), 92.

[112] Bedos-Rezak, *Form and Order*, XII, 35.

[113] Bedos-Rezak, "Medieval Identity," 1492. Bedos-Rezak's definition of medieval "identity" is instructive. She writes: "In the medieval lexicon, the concept of identity did not address individual personality. Rather, identity in the eleventh and twelfth centuries centered on the logic of sameness and operated by assuming a model of similarity, referring to human beings as members of identical species, or to the person as a psychosomatic whole, a social agent identical to itself with respect to number, essence, or properties." For the full bibliography, see n. 9 of Bedos-Rezak's study.

[114] Heslop notes that Eadwine ("Scribe L_1") created other important pieces of calligraphy during the mid-twelfth century, such as the Archbishop's Pontifical (BL, MS Cotton Tiberius B VIII). Containing "long texts for the

mind central aspects of Christ Church's identity, most notably its long history of preserving and cultivating learning through book production. Eadwine as a represented subject did the same. Paired with the *Waterworks Drawing*, his portrait became a powerful means to assert corporate identity within the Psalter while at the same time branding the book a creation of Christ Church Priory.

The *Scribal Painting*'s evocation of Jerome adds another layer of significance to this reading. In the first part of this study, I argued that the painting fashions Eadwine as a new Jerome, "the prince of scribes." As a collective portrait, however, the painting also suggests Christ Church's association with, and imitation of, this foundational figure and his exemplary acts of biblical translation and exegesis. In fact, this notion is in keeping with how corporate identity was formulated within medieval society. Caroline Walker Bynum has examined this process in great detail, observing that twelfth-century groups closely identified with exemplars. She writes, "A variety of models were used: the primitive church (*forma primitivae ecclesiae*), the apostolic life (*vita apostolica*), the desert fathers, the garden of Eden, Christ himself."[115] Allowing the *Scribal Painting* to be our cue, the priory's exemplar of choice, it would seem, was the historical Jerome. Just as Jerome had translated the Psalms from their original languages into the Latin Vulgate versions reproduced in the Psalter, Christ Church (through the efforts of its individual members, especially Eadwine and Wibert) made Jerome's versions more accessible to the diverse audience of medieval England, then comprising speakers of Old English and Anglo-Norman. Given that the monks themselves could read the Psalms in their Latin versions, the provision of vernacular

---

profession and consecration of a bishop and the consecration of a king," this work was most likely intended for the Archbishop of Canterbury—either Theobald or Thomas Becket. See Heslop, "Eadwine and his Portrait," 184 n.33.

[115] Bynum (1982), 102. Bynum stresses that "twelfth-century religious writing and behavior show a great concern with how groups are formed and differentiated from each other, how roles are defined and evaluated, how behavior is conformed to models."

translations in the Psalter suggests that this demonstration of scholarly aptitude was directed outwardly—that is to say, to an audience beyond the cloister.

PART III: THE EADWINE PSALTER C. 1170

Examined within the larger visual culture at Canterbury c. 1170, the Eadwine Psalter's appended images emerge as communal monastic portraits with seal-like agency. Combined with other internal evidence, they also suggest that the updated book reflected pressing concerns of the later twelfth century at Christ Church. Two prognostications, or divinatory texts, were added to the book around the same time as the appended images.[116] These texts directly precede the *Scribal Painting* in the book's original ordering. One is a *chiromancy* (fol. 282r), a text that explains the meaning of lines on the hand; and the other is an *onomancy* (fol. 282v), which reveals how converting names into numbers and calculating the results can predict the outcomes of various situations. In the analysis of the chiromancy in the 1992 volume, Charles Burnett writes:

> Can one explain why the chiromancy should be in a Psalter? The only clue is that two of the predictions refer specifically to ecclesiastical promotion: 'If around the foot of the first natural line a mark like a 'c' should occur…he will be a bishop,' and: 'If a kind of triangle lies next to it in the flat part, it denotes a prebend.'[117]

So why exactly were prognostications included in the Eadwine Psalter? A review of the sociopolitical context suggests that a singular episode preoccupied the community around 1170, and this episode pertained to the cathedral priory's contested right to elect the archbishop. Traditionally, the monks of Christ Church held the right to elect the archbishop, a right confirmed by papal decree

[116] See Charles Burnett, "The Prognostications of the Eadwine Psalter," in M. Gibson, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, 165-167; and Gibson, "Conclusions," 209.

[117] Burnett, "The Prognostications," 166. For further background, see Charles S. F. Burnett, "The Earliest Chiromancy in the West," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 50 (1987): 189-195.

in 1158.[118] As might be expected, they most often desired to elect one of their own to the archbishopric, but at times the decision was beyond their control—especially when the king and his supporters were involved. Tensions around this legal issue and around the rights of the respective parties reached an apex in the wake of Thomas Becket's murder in the cathedral on December 29, 1170, an event that left a vacancy in Canterbury's archiepiscopal seat. Intensifying these tensions and further unsettling the monks, a plan—probably initiated by Becket—to move the cathedral to a new collegiate church at Hackington was also in the air during the time.[119] In the aftermath of Becket's death, the community's candidate for the archbishopric—their very own prior, Odo of Kent—was involved in many negotiations over the vacant see, traveling extensively to meet with the king to discuss the matter.[120] When the bishops of the province selected Richard of Dover instead, the monks of Christ Church appealed to Rome, asserting their rights in the election of their abbot.[121]

It is possible that the updated Psalter played a role in the priory's defense of its candidate (and of its sovereignty) during this episode following Becket's death. A plausible hypothesis is that the community's prior requested the addition of the prognostications—and perhaps also the institutional portraits—to the otherwise completed Psalter so that he could use them to assert his claim to the archbishopric to an outside audience. If the markings on his palm were of the right order, his claim according to one text was backed by divine providence. In this case, the adjacent portrait of a monk majestically seated on a throne-like chair would have provided visual affirmation of the prior's right to rule.

---

[118] In exchange, the archbishop held the right to elect Christ Church's prior.

[119] See Kidson, 973-4; and Draper, 192.

[120] Peter Draper, "Interpretations of the Rebuilding of Canterbury Cathedral, 1174-1186: Archeological and Historical Evidence," *JSAH* 56, no. 2 (Jun., 1997): 197.

[121] Ibid. Despite these efforts, Richard of Dover was eventually confirmed Becket's successor in April of 1174.

Whether at the priory or in the possession of envoys representing the interests of the community at courts outside of Canterbury, the Eadwine Psalter c. 1170 made a powerful statement about Christ Church. Multilingual, scholarly, and luxurious, the Psalter reflected the priory's ability to appeal to all audiences, including its own diverse membership. More importantly, it showcased the community's general learnedness and sophistication—qualities which made Christ Church a fitting incubator of a future archbishop, whose court in prior years had been among the most cultured in England. In addition, the book's many references to Christian antiquity, especially in its *Utrecht*-inspired Psalm illustrations, conveyed status and heightened the impact of the book.[122] But in point of fact, the Psalter's appended images may also have been modeled after "ancient" precedent, adding new significance and prestige to an already impressive book.

Produced at Bede's monastery of Wearmouth-Jarrow in England and now preserved in the Bibliotheca Laurentiana in Florence, the Codex Amiatinus is an enormous early eighth-century Bible containing, in addition to the inscription about Jerome cited above (p. 27), two images of relevance to our study.[123] The first image is a two-page picture of the Tabernacle in the wilderness located at the beginning of the book (fols. 2^{v}-3^{r}, Figure 25). The second image is a late-antique style portrait of "Ezra the Scribe" placed between the Tabernacle picture and the text (fol. 5^{v}, Figure 26).[124] Together, these Amiatinus images offer an early precedent for the pairing of a portrait of a scribe in

[122] Gibson, "Conclusions," 212-213. For a discussion of antiquarianism at twelfth-century Canterbury, see Antonia Gransden, "Realistic Observation in Twelfth-Century England," *Speculum* 47, no. 1 (1972): 29-51.

[123] The Amiatinus was produced as a gift for Pope Gregory II. See Margaret Gibson, *The Bible in the Latin West* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993), 24; Mary Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, rhetoric, and the making of images, 400-1200* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 234-236; and Celia Chazelle, "Ceolfrid's Gift to St. Peter: The First Quire of the Codex Amiatinus and the Evidence of its Roman Destination," *Early Medieval Europe* 12, no. 2 (2004): 129-157.

[124] For additional background on both Amiatinus images, see especially Celia Chazelle, "Christ and the Vision of God: The Biblical Diagrams of the Codex Amiatinus," in *The Mind's Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages,* ed. Jeffrey F. Hamburger and Anne-Marie Bouché (Princeton, 2006), 84-111; idem, "Ceolfrid's Gift," 129-157; and O'Reilly, 3-39.

his study with an architectural *pictura* in the context of a biblical volume. However, what most interests us about the Amiatinus is that it was modeled after Cassiodorus's Codex Grandior,[125] a now lost sixth-century pandect which incorporated at its beginning (*in capite*) diagrammatic pictures of both the Tabernacle in the wilderness and the Temple in Jerusalem as well as a portrait of Cassiodorus in his study.[126] Christ Church certainly knew of this book and its contents at the time the Eadwine Psalter was produced. In fact, Cassiodorus specifically mentions the Tabernacle picture from his pandect in his Psalm commentary,[127] which was at Canterbury during the mid-twelfth century and directly informed the glosses of the Eadwine Psalter.

If linked to one or both of these early precedents by the informed beholder, the Eadwine Psalter's scribal portrait and architectural plan imbued the book with added patristic significance. Simply the pairing of the two image types at the back of the volume may have been enough to draw the association. If so, the Psalter was seen to participate in a longstanding tradition going all the way back to Cassiodorus's esteemed codex. That these images were included in a Psalter rather than a pandect would not have been an issue, for the Psalter was seen to comprise, according to Cassiodorus's Psalm commentary, "all of Genesis, the Prophets, the Gospels and the message of the

[125] For a discussion of how the Codex Grandior made its way to Jarrow after Cassiodorus's death and the subsequent dispersal of his library, see Carruthers, 235-236.

[126] Carruthers writes, "The Tabernacle *pictura* was in the initializing and orienting position in the Codex Grandior, as it is now in the Amiatinus." Ibid., 235. See also Paul Mayvaert, "Bede, Cassiodorus, and the Codex Amiatinus," *Speculum* 71, no. 4. (Oct., 1996): 866.

[127] Carruthers, 347 n. 36. Cassiodorus writes in his *Institutiones* (1.5.2) that a blind man named Eusebius described the Tabernacle and Temple structures in Jerusalem to him. Afterwards, he commissioned paintings of the structures in accordance with Eusebius's descriptions to be placed in his pandect, "with the intention that what the text of the Divine Scripture says of these structures might appear more clearly when set before the eyes." See Joseph Gutmann, "Josephus' Jewish Antiquities in Twelfth-Century Art: Renovatio or Creatio?," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 48 Bd., H. 4 (1985): 440; and Mayvaert, 834 n. 45.

Apostles."[128] The question is, how did the association with the earlier precedent(s) shape the reading of the appended images themselves? We have already discussed the *Scribal Painting*'s allusions to Jerome, but its connection to Cassiodorus and his early example of scribal portraiture now merits consideration. Even without additional inquiry we can see that this connection placed the Canterbury scribe Eadwine in a long line of venerated scholar-scribes which included Jerome and Cassiodorus but perhaps also Ezra—who, as "the most learned scribe of the law of God" (1 Ezra 7:1-6), was celebrated throughout Middle Ages as an editor of the Holy Scripture and as a restorer of sacred law and worship in his day.[129] (The fact that Cassiodorus thought of himself as a "second Ezra" is revealing on this point.)[130] As for the painting's counterpart in the Eadwine Psalter, a comparison between the appended drawing and the architectural representations of the "ancient" codices brings to light a few important similarities. Not only are the *Waterworks Drawing* and the surviving Tabernacle picture in the Amiatinus large works spanning two folia, but they also render structures from different perspectives, opting for a birds-eye view in some places but giving interior and exterior viewpoints (or combinations of both) in others.[131] Moreover, there is evidence to suggest that like its hypothetical precedent(s) the *Waterworks Drawing* was intended to be read symbolically

---

[128] Quoted from Cassiodorus's Psalm commentary in O'Reilly, 18. O'Reilly writes on this point, "The Psalter is, therefore, a *caeleste armarium scripturarum devinarum*; it 'embraces both the New and Old Testaments in such a way that…a spiritual library is built up in this book'.

[129] Ibid., 23-24. Koert van der Horst writes, "There can be no doubt that the well-known portrait of Ezra, the prophet and scribe who rewrote the Holy Scripture after the end of the Babylonian captivity, who is shown writing with a tallith on his head while seated before a cupboard with leather-bound parts of the Bible, was also inspired by an illustration in the Codex grandior." See Koert van der Horst, "Picturing the Psalms of David," in K. van der Horst, et al., *The Utrecht Psalter*, 31.

[130] See J. W. Halporn, "Pandectes, Pandecta, and the Cassiodorian Commentary on the Psalms," *Revue bénédictine* 90 (1980): 299.

[131] Carruthers, 237. Carruthers suggests that this technique encourages memory work. On the use of this technique in the *Waterworks Drawing*, see Fergusson, "Prior Wibert's Fountain Houses," 4.

within the context of the Eadwine Psalter.[132] This last point is significant and warrants further analysis here.

Before arriving at the *Waterworks Drawing* at the back of the Eadwine Psalter, the medieval beholder came across much visual (and textual) material which effectively primed him for symbolic reading, and more specifically, for Christian interpretation. In fact, the first leaf of the Psalter's prefatory picture cycle set the stage for this kind of reading early on. Now located in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York (MS M. 724), the leaf shows scenes from the Old and New Testaments (as well as from Josephus's *Antiquities of the Jews*) with a "Tree of Jesse" motif serving as a point of transition between the two of "types" of imagery (Figures 27 & 28).[133] The leaf was intended to be read typologically, and in the words of one scholar, its primary objective was to usher in the New Covenant after the "failure" of the Old Law.[134] The Psalm illustrations at the heart of the Eadwine Psalter operated in a similar way. William Noel has drawn attention to many instances in the series wherein by visual means patristic interpretation is registered and a Christian reading of the Psalms is promoted.[135] That the illustrations represented colored versions of the *monochrome* drawings in the Utrecht Psalter is also noteworthy. For the visually-attuned beholder, color may have prompted a Christian reading of the Old Testament imagery with an eye towards patristic exegesis.[136] Even the *Scribal Painting*, which precedes the drawing by a turn of the page, was

---

[132] See n. 127 above; and Herbert Kessler, "Review of Insular Manuscripts, 6th to the 9th Century, by J. J. Alexander," *Speculum* 56, no. 2 (Apr., 1981): 339. Kessler writes of the Amiatinus image, "Copied from Cassiodorus's *Codex grandior*, the diagram was probably meant to serve as a harmony image for the Old and New Testaments."

[133] George Henderson, "The Textual Basis of the Picture Leaves," in M. Gibson, et al., *The Eadwine Psalter*, 35-36.
[134] Ibid., 42.

[135] Noel, "The Utrecht Psalter in England," in K. van der Horst, et al., *The Utrecht Psalter*, 128.

[136] Herbert Kessler has noted many places in medieval exegetical writing wherein the process of adding color to a drawing is used to explain the relationship between the Old and New Laws. For example, Kessler highlights select writings of John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria which compare the Old Testament to a preliminary drawing and Christ's covenant to a more beautiful and perfect painting. See Herbert Kessler, *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 53-63.

intended to be read symbolically. Evoking the ideal scholar-scribe (*scriptorum princeps*), it encouraged the beholder to consider exemplary acts of past biblical interpretation—as well as present-day efforts to emulate them using new methods and resources.[137]

All of this suggests that a medieval beholder who encountered the *Waterworks Drawing* at the back of the Eadwine Psalter understood it as more than just a "visualization" of Canterbury's cathedral precinct. But what precisely did it evoke? What was it intended to evoke? Peter Fergusson has recently argued that many of the monastic buildings represented in the drawing carried visual references that connected them to archetypes in Jerusalem, most notably Solomon's Temple and judgment hall.[138] Within the Canterbury landscape, these buildings served as mnemonic triggers for the recollection of the *loca sancta*. As visual representations within the drawing, they did the same. To follow this trajectory one step further, the drawing may have operated within the Psalter as a form of visual exegesis on the theme of the Temple, in which case the topography of Christ Church, Canterbury provided a foil to prompt reflection on a greater spiritual landscape—for example, the Temple of the Old Covenant or that which it prefigured, *Ecclesia*; the new heavenly Jerusalem; or even the individual soul.[139] The drawing's connection to the architectural *picturae* of the "ancient" codices supports this reading, as does the fact that literal interpretations of visionary temple landscapes like the one described by the prophet Ezekiel gained currency during the mid-twelfth century. The theologian Richard of St. Victor (d. 1173) proposed a literal interpretation of Ezekiel's

---

[137] For background on Jerome's interpretive efforts, see especially Dennis Brown, *Vir Trilinguis: A Study in the Biblical Exegesis of Saint Jerome* (Kampen, The Netherlands: Kos Pharos Publishing House, 1992), 121-165.

[138] Fergusson, "Prior Wibert's Fountain Houses," 9-16; idem, "Modernization and Mnemonics," 58-64.

[139] Allusions to all of these occur in Bede's treatises on the Tabernacle and the Temple. See O'Reilly, 30-34.

temple vision accompanied by a set of architectural illustrations (Figure 29).[140] Andrew of St. Victor also suggested a reading *ad litteram*.[141] Moreover, the Temple was not the only biblical structure to receive this kind of treatment during the period. Hugh of Saint Victor (d. 1141) employed a visual image of Noah's Ark to explicate the structure's allegorical meaning,[142] concluding in his commentary *De Archa Noe*:

> And now, then, as we have promised, we must put before you the pattern of our ark. Thus you may learn from an external form, which we have visibly depicted, what you ought to do inwardly, and when you have impressed the form of this pattern on your heart, you may rejoice that the house of God has been built in you.[143]

In addition to the items prefacing the *Waterworks Drawing* in the Eadwine Psalter, an important piece of internal evidence further substantiates an exegetical function for the image. Directly following the drawing in the Psalter is a one-page schematic rendering of Canterbury's hydraulic system and the monastic buildings it was intended to service (fol. 286^{r}, Figure 30).[144] The second drawing now serves as an endleaf, and at one point it probably adjoined a pastedown.[145] It contains no inscriptions, and compared to the two-page *Waterworks Drawing*, it renders the buildings in a less detailed manner. Also, unlike the larger drawing, the smaller waterworks drawing seems to have been made *before* the Psalter was bound because its lines representing pipes and channels do not break at the far edge of the leaf, which lies just beyond the original fold. While some

---

[140] See Walter Cahn, "Architecture and Exegesis: Richard of St.-Victor's Ezekiel Commentary and Its Illustrations," *The Art Bulletin* 76, no. 1 (Mar., 1994): 53-68.

[141] For general background on the relationship between art and biblical exegesis during the High Middle Ages, see Christopher G. Hughes, "Art and Exegesis," in *A Companion to Medieval Art: Romanesque and Gothic in Northern Europe*, ed. Conrad Rudolph (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 173-192.

[142] See especially Conrad Rudolph, *"First, I Find the Center Point": Reading the Text of Hugh of Saint Victor's* The Mystic Ark (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2004).

[143] Hughes, 174.

[144] For a description of this drawing, see Woodman, "The Waterworks Drawings," 170-171.

[145] Pickwoad, "Codicology," 6. See also Sheppard (as in n. 17), 380.

scholars have hypothesized that this drawing operated as a preliminary step in the production of the larger, two-page version,[146] a more convincing theory is that it served as a working plan, "done to aid rather than record the [water]works."[147] In this case, the drawing became a superfluous leaf after the real construction took place, so it was cut down and included as an endleaf in the Psalter. This reading of the evidence provides a compelling explanation for why the smaller drawing was retained for the Psalter. It also suggests the Eadwine Psalter contains the earliest extant project drawing on parchment known today.[148]

In view of the discussion at hand, a different explanation for the smaller drawing's inclusion in the Psalter also emerges. The image provides another link to Cassiodorus's Codex Grandior. The Grandior was known to have contained *two* architectural pictures alongside its scribal portrait—one of the Mosaic Tabernacle; and the other of the Temple of Solomon, which is said to have taken seven years to complete. Both Grandior images have been interpreted as expounding the harmony of the Old and New Testaments, but most interesting is the fact that within the medieval exegetical tradition—and notably in Bede's commentaries *De tabernaculo* (c. 721-5) and *De templo* (c. 729-31), the Tabernacle symbolically designates the building of the Church on earth while the Temple indicates its future completion through Christ.[149] Bede had studied Cassiodorus's pictures at Jarrow, and he considered them "reliable aids in understanding specific features of the biblical accounts" of

[146] Woodman, "The Waterworks Drawings," 170-171. Woodman states, "The Small Drawing may contain the gist of the arrangement but, in comparison with the Large Drawing, it is of little practical value."

[147] Sheppard, 381.

[148] Further analyses are warranted to verify this conclusion. For general background on the use of small-scale working drawings in the Gothic design process, see Robert Branner's "Villard de Honnecourt, Reims, and the Origin of Gothic Architectural Drawing," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* Ser. 6, Vol. 61 (1963): 129-146; Roland Recht, "Sur le dessin d'architecture gothique," in *Études d'art médiéval offertes à Louis Grodecki*, ed. Sumner Crosby, et al. (Paris: Ophrys, 1981), 233-250; and more recently, Michael T. Davis, "On the Drawing Board: Plans of the Clermont Terrace," in *Ad Quadratum: The Practical Application of Geometry in Medieval Architecture*, ed. Nancy Y. Wu (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 183-204.

[149] O'Reilly, 30.

these historical archetypes and perhaps also means by which to convey deeper spiritual meanings about the Gospel, the Church, and the Christian soul.[150] Of the two architectural pictures contained in the Eadwine Psalter, one is sketchy and unfinished and the other is polished and completed. It is thus tempting to read these images as visual commentaries on the Tabernacle and Temple, both of which carried multivalent meanings in the period preceding the Psalter's creation and also prompted various forms of interpretation.

For the waterworks drawings of the Eadwine Psalter, a connection to a different landscape of the past is, I believe, also relevant for our purposes. The connection I submit here is to Vivarium—the monastery Cassiodorus founded during the sixth century on his estate in Southern Italy which became a renowned center of classical and Christian learning.[151] Vivarium contained a prolific scriptorium, an extensive library (Cassiodorus was a great collector of books), and most significantly, a highly-efficient waterworks system. A literary description of Vivarium has survived. Written by Cassiodorus himself in his *Institutiones*, it reads:

> The site of the monastery of Vivarium conduces to making provision for travelers and the poor, since you have irrigated gardens and the nearby river Pellena full of fish—its waves threaten no danger, but neither is it despicable for its size. It flows into your precincts, channeled artificially where it is wanted, adequate to water your gardens and turn your mills. It is there when you want it and flows on when no longer needed; it exists to serve you, never too roisterous and bothersome nor yet again ever deficient. The sea lies all about you as well, accessible for fishing with fishponds [*vivaria*] to keep the caught fish alive. We have constructed them as pleasant receptacles, with the Lord's help, where a multitude of fish swim close by the cloister, in circumstances so like mountain caves that the fish never sense themselves constrained in any way, since they are free to seek their food and hide away in dark recesses. We have also had baths built to refresh weary bodies, where sparkling water for drinking and washing flows by. Thus it is that your monastery is sought by outsiders, rather than that you could justly long for other places. These are the delights of temporal things, as you know, not the things the faithful hope for in the future; these things shall pass

[150] Ibid., 5.

[151] The connection is also proposed by Marcia Kupfer in her review of the *The Eadwine Psalter* (1992). See Kupfer (as in n. 8), 1171.

> away, but those shall abide without end. But placed here in the monastery, let us be in the power of those desires that will make us co-regents with Christ (*Inst.* 1.29.1).[152]

Ekphrastic in character, Cassiodorus's description of the waterworks at Vivarium inspired the creation of a number of drawings during the Middle Ages. At least two reconstructions are known to me. One is found in an Italian manuscript dating to the eighth century, and the other is located in a copy of Cassiodorus's *Institutiones* made in Germany around the year 900.[153]

At Vivarium, Cassiodorus fostered a monastic and intellectual ideal that undoubtedly appealed to Prior Wibert and the monks of Christ Church. This ideal, which is outlined in Cassiodorus's *Institutiones*, included the study and cultivation of both classical and divine letters by the monks through reading, copying, and translating. Cassiodorus also instructed his monks to "correct copies of the divinely inspired Scriptures 'from the codices which the blessed Jerome emended in his edition of the Septuagint and translated from the Hebrew...'"[154] If during the twelfth century Christ Church looked to Vivarium as an institutional model, then the latter's scholarly enterprise was a likely model for emulation. So too the defining feature of its landscape. In fact, there is evidence to support the idea that Vivarium's waterworks served as a prototype for Canterbury's. Traces of Cassiodorus's description of Vivarium appear in Wibert's *obits*, which credit the prior for creating at Canterbury "the watercourse with its ponds, conduits and fishpools; which water he marvelously brought over 1000 paces from the town into the precinct and so through all the offices of the precinct."[155] Our most compelling evidence is, however, the *Waterworks Drawing* itself. We have already established that the drawing functioned to commemorate Wibert's

---

[152] James J. O'Donnell, "Vivarium," in *Cassiodorus* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979). < http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/jod/texts/cassbook/chap6.html > (16 February 2007).

[153] For further background on these images, see Walter Cahn, "Medieval Landscape and the Encyclopedic Tradition," in *Contexts: style and values in medieval art and literature* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1991), 14.

[154] O'Reilly, 16.

[155] Kahn, 96.

patronage. We have also determined that its pairing with a scribal portrait in the Psalter invoked Cassiodorus, a connection made more explicit by the fact that the drawing shows a state-of-the art hydraulic system like the one known to have been at Vivarium. These points suggest that in commissioning the medieval waterworks at Canterbury, Wibert desired not only to perpetuate Cassiodorus's legacy during his priorate but also to imitate Vivarium—one of the foremost monasteries of Christian antiquity. Indeed, under Wibert's direction, Canterbury became as it were a "new" Vivarium.

PART IV: CONCLUSION

Incorporating five different versions of the biblical Psalms together with learned commentary and sumptuous illustrations, the Eadwine Psalter made a powerful statement about the community that commissioned and produced it. Some scholars have deemed it a fundamentally backward-looking book, including Margaret Gibson, who in the concluding remarks of the 1992 volume called it, "a monument to a comprehensive conservatism conceivable only in an institution where wealth and tradition were equally available."[156] While the Psalter certainly reflects antiquarian tastes, it is also true that it embodies remarkable ingenuity and innovation, demonstrating its corporate maker's ability to draw upon "ancient" prototypes and patristic interpretation in the creation of new works, especially visual works.

In this paper, diverse pieces of evidence—including mid-twelfth century Canterbury seals (p. 29), an obituary notice (p. 16), an overlooked prayer written by Eadwine (p. 19), divinatory texts contained within the Psalter (p. 36), and other external sources and comparanda—have been employed to make the case that the seemingly distinct images appended to the back of the Eadwine

[156] Gibson, "Conclusions," 213.

Psalter operated together to formulate the self-representation of Christ Church Priory c. 1170. As a pair, the *Scribal Painting* and the *Waterworks Drawing* branded the Psalter a creation of the communal monastic body, and they also authenticated and deepened its meanings. Allusions to earlier visual and textual models indicated that Christ Church closely identified during the late twelfth century with specific exemplars of the past—namely, the scholar-monks Jerome and Cassiodorus. Most revealing were the references to Cassiodorus's celebrated pandect, the Codex Grandior; to the scribal portrait and architectural *picturae* it contained; and to the waterworks Cassiodorus installed at his monastery at Vivarium. Rather than fixing the meanings of the appended images, these comparisons opened them up to new readings. The prognostications of the Eadwine Psalter helped to substantiate the notion that the updated book reflected specific concerns of the community c. 1170—in particular, concerns relating to archiepiscopal succession. The priory faced not only institutional rivalry during this period but also real challenges to its sovereign right to name its own successor and to control its future history. By commissioning representations of its past achievements and communal ideals for inclusion in the Psalter, Christ Church responded to these challenges in an intellectually resourceful and visually compelling way.

Bibliography

Bedos-Rezak, Brigitte. "Medieval Identity: A Sign and a Concept." *The American Historical Review* 105, no. 5 (Dec., 2000): 1489-1534.

----------. *Form and Order in Medieval France: Studies in Social and Quantitative Sigillography*, Variorum Collected Studies Series. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1993.

Binski, Paul. *Medieval Death: Ritual and Representation*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Branner, Robert. "Villard de Honnecourt, Reims, and the Origin of Gothic Architectural Drawing." *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* Ser. 6, Vol. 61 (1963): 129-146.

Brown, Dennis. *Vir Trilinguis: A Study in the Biblical Exegesis of Saint Jerome*. Kampen, The Netherlands: Kos Pharos Publishing House, 1992.

Burnett, Charles S. F. "The Earliest Chiromancy in the West." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 50 (1987): 189-195.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336*, Lectures on the History of Religions, n.s., 15. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

----------. "Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?." In *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*, 95-102. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

Cahn, Walter. "Architecture and Exegesis: Richard of St.-Victor's Ezekiel Commentary and Its Illustrations." *The Art Bulletin* 76, no. 1 (Mar., 1994): 53-68.

----------. "Medieval Landscape and the Encyclopedic Tradition." In *Contexts: style and values in medieval art and literature*, edited by Daniel Poirion and Nancy Freeman Regalado, 11-24. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1991.

Carruthers, Mary. *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, rhetoric, and the making of images, 400-1200*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Caviness, Madeline. "'The Simple Perception of Matter' and the Representation of Narrative, ca. 1180-1280." *Gesta* 30, no. 1 (1991): 48-64.

----------. "Romanesque 'belle verrières' in Canterbury?." In *Romanesque & Gothic: Essays for George Zarnecki*, edited by Neil Stratford, 35-38. Woodbridge, 1987.

----------. "Suger's Glass at Saint-Denis: The State of the Research." In *Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis: A Symposium*, edited by Paula Lieber Gerson, 257-272. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1986.

----------. “Images of Divine Order and the Third Mode of Seeing.” *Gesta* 22, no. 2 (1983): 99-120.

Chazelle, Celia. “Christ and the Vision of God: The Biblical Diagrams of the Codex Amiatinus.” In *The Mind's Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages,* edited by Jeffrey F. Hamburger and Anne-Marie Bouché, 84-111. Princeton, 2006.

----------. “Ceolfrid's Gift to St. Peter: The First Quire of the Codex Amiatinus and the Evidence of its Roman Destination.” *Early Medieval Europe* 12, no. 2 (2004): 129-157.

Connolly, Daniel K. “Imagined Pilgrimage in the Itinerary Maps of Matthew Paris.” *The Art Bulletin* 81, no. 4 (Dec., 1999): 598-622.

Cragoe, Carol Davidson. “Reading and Rereading Gervase of Canterbury.” *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 154 (2001): 40-53.

Davidson, Carol F. “Images of Gothic Architecture: Structure or Symbolism?.” In *The image of the building*, Papers from the Annual Symposium of the Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain 1995, edited by Maurice Howard, 5-16. London: Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain, 1996.

Davis, Michael T. “On the Drawing Board: Plans of the Clermont Terrace.” In *Ad Quadratum: The Practical Application of Geometry in Medieval Architecture*, edited by Nancy Y. Wu, 183-204. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.

Dale, Thomas E. A. “The Individual, the Resurrected Body, and Romanesque Portraiture: The Tomb of Rudolph von Schwaben in Merseburg.” *Speculum* 77 (2000): 707-743.

Dodwell, C. R. *The Pictorial Arts of the West: 800-1200*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993.

----------. *The Canterbury School of Illumination: 1066-1200.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954.

Draper, Peter. “Interpretations of the Rebuilding of Canterbury Cathedral, 1174-1186: Archeological and Historical Evidence.” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 56, no. 2 (Jun., 1997): 184-203.

Fergusson, Peter. “Prior Wibert’s Fountain Houses: Service and Symbolism at Christ Church, Canterbury.” In *The Four Modes of Seeing: Approaches to Medieval Art in honor of Madeline Harrison Caviness*, edited by Evelyn Staudinger Lane, Elizabeth Pastan, and Ellen Shortell. Forthcoming from Ashgate Publishers, Oxford.

----------. “Modernization and Mnemonics at Christ Church, Canterbury: The Treasury Building.” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 65, no. 1 (Mar., 2006): 50-67.

Gardner, Julian. *The Tomb and the Tiara: Curial Tomb Sculpture in Rome and Avignon in the Later Middle Ages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Gaudio, Michael. "Matthew Paris and the Cartography of the Margins." *Gesta* 39, no. 1 (2000): 50-57.

Gem, Richard. "The Significance of the 11th-century Rebuilding of Christ Church and St Augustine's, Canterbury, in the Development of Romanesque Architecture." In *Medieval Art and Architecture at Canterbury before 1220*, The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions for the Year 1979, edited by Nicola Coldstream and Peter Draper, 1-19. Leeds: W. S. Maney and Son, 1982.

Gibson, Margaret, T. A. Heslop, and Richard W. Pfaff (eds.). *The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image, and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-Century Canterbury*. London and University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.

Gibson, Margaret. *The Bible in the Latin West*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.

Gransden, Antonia. "Realistic Observation in Twelfth-Century England." *Speculum* 47, no. 1 (1972): 29-51.

Greenhill, F. A. *Incised effigial slabs: a study of engraved stone memorials in Latin Christendom, c. 1100 to c. 1700*. London: Faber & Faber, 1976.

Grewe, Klaus. "Der Wasserversorgungsplan des Klosters Christchurch in Canterbury." In *Die Wasserversorgung im Mittelalter* 4, 229-236. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Phillip von Zabern, 1991.

Gutmann, Joseph. "Josephus' Jewish Antiquities in Twelfth-Century Art: Renovatio or Creatio?," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 48 Bd., H. 4 (1985): 434-441.

Halporn, J. W. "Pandectes, Pandecta, and the Cassiodorian Commentary on the Psalms." *Revue bénédictine* 90 (1980): 290-300.

Harley, J. B. "Silences and Secrecy: the Hidden Agenda of Cartography in Early Modern Europe." *Imago Mundi* 40 (1988): 57-76.

----------. "Maps, Knowledge, and Power." In *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design, and Use of Past Environments*, edited by Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels, 277-312. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Hayes, John. "Prior Wibert's Waterworks." *Canterbury Cathedral Chronicle* 71 (1977): 17-26.

Hearn, M. F. "Canterbury Cathedral and the Cult of Becket." *The Art Bulletin* 76 (Mar., 1994): 19-52.

Heslop, T. A. "The Conventual Seals of Canterbury Cathedral: 1066-1232." In *Medieval Art and Architecture at Canterbury before 1220*, The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions for the Year 1979, edited by Nicola Coldstream and Peter Draper, 94-100. Leeds: W. S. Maney and Son, 1982.

Holladay, Joan. "Portrait Elements in Tomb Sculpture: Identification and Iconography." In *Europäische Kunst um 1300*, edited by Gerhard Schmidt and Elisabeth Liskar, 217-221. Wien: H. Böhlau, 1986.

Horst, Koert van der, William Noel, and Wilhelmina C.M. Wüstefeld (eds.). *The Utrecht Psalter in Medieval Art: Picturing the Psalms of David*. Tuurdijk, The Netherlands: HES Publishers BV, 1996.

Hughes, Christopher G. "Art and Exegesis." In *A Companion to Medieval Art: Romanesque and Gothic in Northern Europe*, edited by Conrad Rudolph, 173-192. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

James, M. R. *The Canterbury Psalter*. London: Printed and published for the Friends of Canterbury Cathedral by P. Lund, Humphries & Co., ltd., 1935.

Johnson, Geraldine A. "Activating the Effigy: Donatello's Pecci Tomb in Siena Cathedral." *The Art Bulletin* 77 (1995): 445-459.

Kahn, Deborah. *Canterbury Cathedral and Its Romanesque Sculpture*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991.

Kauffman, C. M. *Romanesque Manuscripts: 1066-1190*. London: Harvey Miller, 1975.

Kessler, Herbert K. *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

----------. "Review of Insular Manuscripts, 6th to the 9th Century, by J. J. Alexander." *Speculum* 56, no. 2 (Apr., 1981): 338-340.

Kidson, Peter. "Gervase, Becket, and William of Sens." *Speculum* 68, no. 4 (1993): 969-991.

Knowles, David and Christopher Brooke. *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

Kupfer, Marcia. "Review of The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image, and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-Century Canterbury." *Speculum* 69, no. 4 (Oct., 1994): 1171-1174.

Lillich, Meredith. "Cleanliness with Godliness: A Discussion of Medieval Monastic Plumbing." In *Studies in Medieval Stained Glass and Monasticism*, 355-394. London: Pindar Press, 2001.

Little, Charles T. (ed.). *Set in Stone: The Face in Medieval Sculpture*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2006.

Mayvaert, Paul. “Bede, Cassiodorus, and the Codex Amiatinus.” *Speculum* 71, no. 4. (Oct., 1996): 827-883.

O’Donnell, James J. *Cassiodorus*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979. <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/jod/texts/cassbook/chap6.html > (16 February 2007).

O’Reilly, Jennifer. “The Library of Scripture: Views from Vivarium and Wearmouth-Jarrow.” In *New Offerings, Ancient Treasures: Studies in Medieval Art for George Henderson*, edited by Paul Binski and William Noel, 3-39. Thrupp, Stroud, Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2001.

Panofsky, Erwin. *Tomb Sculpture: four lectures on its changing aspects from ancient Egypt to Bernini*, edited by H. W. Janson. New York: H. N. Abrams, 1964.

Perkinson, Stephen. “From ‘Curious’ to Canonical: *Jehan Roy de France* and the Origins of the French School,” *The Art Bulletin* 87, no. 3 (2005): 507-532.

Petrucci, Armando. *Writing the dead: death and writing strategies in the Western tradition*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Recht, Roland. “Sur le dessin d'architecture gothique.” In *Études d'art médiéval offertes à Louis Grodecki*, edited by Sumner Crosby, et al., 233-250. Paris: Ophrys, 1981.

Rudolph, Conrad. *“First, I Find the Center Point”: Reading the Text of Hugh of Saint Victor’s* The Mystic Ark. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2004.

Saltman, Avrom. *Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury*. London: University of London, The Athlone Press, 1956.

Stubbs, William. *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*. Roll Series, LXXIII, Vol. 1. London: Longman & Co., 1879-80.

Tatton-Brown, Tim. “The Two Mid-Twelfth-Century Cloister Arcades at Canterbury Cathedral Priory.” *The Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 159 (2006): 91-104.

----------. “The Precincts Water Supply.” *The Canterbury Chronicle* 77 (1983): 45-51.

Urry, William. “Canterbury, Kent, *circa* 1153x1161.” In *Local Maps and Plans from Medieval England*, edited by R. A. Skelton and P. D. A. Harvey, 43-58. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Willis, Robert. *The Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral*. London: Longman & Co., 1845.

----------. “The Architectural History of the Conventual Buildings of the Monastery of Christ Church in Canterbury.” *Archaeologia Cantiana* 7 (1868): 1-206.

Woodman, Francis. *The Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral*. London, Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

Zarnecki, George. “The Eadwine Portrait.” In *Études d’art médiéval offertes à Louis Grodecki*, edited by Sumner McKnight Crosby, André Chastel, Anne Prache, and Albert Chatelet, 93-98. Paris: Ophrys, 1981.