PREFACE

The Cleopatra text of the Aureus Rivo is printed in this edition in general conformity with the conventions laid down for the Society's series of the versions of the work, without emendation, but with modifications of plan made necessary by the special conditions of the manuscript; these are explained in the Introduction. It is based on my own transcription and any errors are mine. But there would have been more if I had not had the benefit, from the beginning of my work, of a transcription made many years ago by J. A. Herbert for Hope Emily Allen for use in her researches, which were assisted by a grant from the American Council of Learned Societies; and Miss Allen, when she gave (or rather in intention lent) Herbert's transcription to the Early English Text Society, asked that if it were printed, as she expected it would be, acknowledgement should be made to the American Council. In fact the text now printed is not Herbert's, but I gladly make the acknowledgement because I have been greatly helped by his work, as my introduction and my notes testify. Her other request—'Please let me have the copy back after printing'—no one can carry out, for both she and Herbert are dead; printing has taken far longer than she foresaw, and the text is now edited by someone of whom she had never heard—someone indeed who, if he had foreseen how long the job would take, would not willingly have accepted it.

I am indebted to the Trustees of the British Museum for permission to reproduce photographic facsimiles of pages of their manuscript, and to the Keeper of the Manuscripts, Mr. T. C. Skeat, and his staff for their advice and assistance and for their kindness; and similarly to the Master and Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge, for their permission to reproduce a facsimile of a page of their manuscript B. 1. 45, and to the sub-librarian of Trinity College, Mr. A. Halsow, for his advice.

My other obligations are to friends and colleagues: to Mr. N. R. Ker for his advice on palaeography and for reading and contributing to my introduction; to Professor Norman Davis, the Director of the Society, and to Mr. R. W. Burchfield, its former secretary,
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and his successors, Dr. Pamela Gradon and Dr. Anne Hudson; to the other members of the Council of the Society; to Mr. Peter Dronke, Dr. A. B. Emden, Miss M. E. Griffiths, Dr. R. B. Mitchell, Mr. M. B. Parkes, Miss Celia Sisam, and Dr. A. Zettersten, all of whom I remember to have consulted; and especially to Professor J. R. R. Tolkien, whom I do not think I have consulted but to whom his pupils remain always indebted, not least for their interest in and for any understanding they may have of Ancrane Wisse.

E. J. D.

Jesus College, Oxford
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TEXT AND NOTES 1
ILLUSTRATIONS

British Museum Cotton MS. Cleopatra C. vi, f. 4r (scribes A and B) and f. 19r (scribes A, B, and D) frontispiece

British Museum Cotton MS. Cleopatra C. vi, f. 57r, and Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. B. i. 45, f. 24r-v (scribe D) between pages 110 and 111

British Museum Cotton MS. Cleopatra C. vi, ff. 194r and 195r (scribes A and B) between pages 308 and 309

British Museum Cotton MS. Cleopatra C. vi, f. 198r (scribes A, B, and D) and f. 199r (scribes D and E) between pages 316 and 317

INTRODUCTION

British Museum Cotton MS. Cleopatra C. vi is certainly one of the two oldest extant manuscripts of the Ancrene Ritale (Ancrene Wisse), and probably by a year or two the oldest. This view depends on the judgement that certain of the additions made in the margins of the Cleopatra MS. by the scribe whom I distinguish below as scribe B, especially in Part VIII, were not copied from any other manuscript (as earlier scholars assumed, without evidence), but were first composed by scribe B as he worked on this manuscript and were earlier drafts of additions incorporated in the text in the revision of which MS. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 402 is a fair copy. If this is so, then scribe B (whom I take to be identical with the reviser, and indeed with the original author) worked on the Cleopatra MS. before the revision was made, and it follows a fortiori that the copying of the Cleopatra MS. by its original scribe preceded the copying of the Corpus MS. But it is virtually certain that scribe B’s correction of the Cleopatra MS. was undertaken when the manuscript was newly written and indeed before it was bound, for his additions are often written on the inner side of the page, very close to the binding-margin, where it would be difficult to write in a bound book; and it was probably the correction and amplification of the Cleopatra MS. which occasioned the making of the ‘Corpus revision’. The Corpus MS. itself is plainly a direct fair copy of the revised text, and is therefore likely to have been made almost immediately after the revision had been completed. The whole process, from the original writing of the Cleopatra MS. to the writing of the Corpus MS., is likely to have been contained within a short space of time, not more than one or two years. But we know that the ‘Corpus revision’ must have been made after 1224, when the Franciscans came to England, and was probably a little later than 1227, the approximate date of the establishment of their house in Hereford;1 if then the ‘Corpus revision’ and the writing of the Corpus MS. are dated ‘about 1228–1230’ (though strictly the evidence does not allow us to be quite so precise, and the Corpus MS. could be a

1 (cf. J. Dobson, ‘The Date and Composition of Ancrene Wisse’, Proceedings of the British Academy, lli (1966), 192–3.)
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little later than this), then the writing of the Cleopatra MS. might be dated 'about 1227–8' (with similar qualifications). One could hardly be wrong to say that it was written between 1225 and 1230. This is of course a dating on textual, not on palaeographical grounds; but the hands of the original scribe A and of scribe B are both early. The nature of scribe B’s additions, especially but not only in Part VIII, shows clearly that he knew that the manuscript was being made for a community of women religious, and specifically for anchoresses; and there is nothing to suggest that this was not the community for which the work had originally been written—indeed the whole tenor of the additions, including those peculiar to the Cleopatra MS., is that they were addressed to the original community. But it no longer consisted only of the ‘three sisters’, for the main passage referring to them (which only the Nero MS. gives unaltered) is truncated in the Cleopatra MS.; the increase in numbers that led to the ‘twenty now or more’ referred to in a Corpus addition had already at least begun. It was, indeed, probably this increase in the size of the community which, by creating a need for additional copies of the Rule, occasioned the writing of the Cleopatra MS., for we shall see that it must have been one of two copies made simultaneously from a single exemplar by a form of the pecia system.

Its age, and the method and presumed occasion of its making, would of themselves be enough to make the Cleopatra MS. of particular interest and importance. As a witness to the text it is much less reliable than the Corpus MS. and also (as far as the sense is concerned) than the French version of MS. Vitellius F.

1 J. Hall, *Early Middle English* (1920), p. 356, dates the hand ‘about 1240 A.D.,’ and evidently thought that the Cleopatra MS. was a little later than Corpus; but he accepted Macaulay’s view that the additions in the Cleopatra MS. were copied from Corpus or a MS. closely resembling it, and obviously thought that the additions were written by the original scribe (i.e. he did not distinguish hand A from hand B, though the two are in fact very different). This view of the Cleopatra additions is in fact quite untenable; it does not account for those which are not in Corpus, still less for those which are obviously occasioned by copying errors of the original scribe. On scribe B’s work of correction and addition, see further pp. xiii–xiv, below.

2 The English original of the French version also influenced the MSS. of the \( \varepsilon \)-group, though less than Cleopatra did; it too must have been valued, probably for the same reason, that it had been made under the author’s supervision.

3 The textual editor would nevertheless much prefer to have the English original of the Vitellius translation, since it was obviously much more carefully copied than the Cleopatra MS.; better still, their common original—even though the loss of the Cleopatra MS. would have deprived us of scribe B’s corrections and additions.

4 The surviving Cains and Titus MSS., which give a generalized text, cannot have been meant for the original community, but must have descended from copies belonging to it which showed the results of cross-collation. Collation continued, however, even after the text had spread beyond the original community; this is shown by the complications of the textual tradition of the MSS. and versions belonging to the ‘Titus-group’. Scribe D, busy at Canons-leigh collating the Cleopatra MS. with some lost MS. belonging to the Titus-group (see pp. clxx–clxxi, below), is an actual instance.
Method of the edition

That so important a manuscript has not hitherto been printed is to some extent due to the peculiar difficulties which it presents to an editor. For scribe B's are not the only alterations of the original text; there are also countless annotations and alterations to punctuation, word-form, and text by a later 'corrector' (scribe D) and a few by other hands. The editorial problem is how to present the complex facts of the manuscript, with its bewildering variety of alterations, in a printed text; and A. H. Smith, who had originally undertaken to edit the manuscript in this E.E.T.S. series, told me, after the assignment had been transferred to me, that the reason why he had not gone on with the job was that he had been unable to devise a means of dealing with the alterations. To publish a photographic facsimile is not the way out. It is true that photographs present the facts (or some of them, and not always truthfully), but they do nothing to interpret them; the interpretation is left to the individual reader. But to understand what has gone on in this manuscript requires years of patient study: the collation of the other texts, and particularly of Corpus and the Vitellius French translation; familiarity with the hands of the scribes, until one can even make a shrewd guess, in many cases, which scribe made a point; knowledge of the dialectal forms and the spellings used by the several scribes; and recognition of their differing habits, methods, and purposes in dealing with the text. The dangers of drawing conclusions about this manuscript from a superficial study are well illustrated by Macaulay, who failed to distinguish between the authoritative early thirteenth-century reviser (scribe D) and the unauthorized and generally foolish meddling of the later 'corrector' (scribe D), though their hands, dialects, spelling-systems, alphabets, and even their inks were different; and by Hall, who did not distinguish between the original scribe (scribe A) and the reviser (scribe B), though the general appearance of their hands is quite different and there are numerous differences of detail (one need mention only scribe A's curious form of j, which contrasts sharply with scribe B's more normal form). If so great a scholar as Macaulay and so industrious

1 I avoid the designation 'scribe C' because C is the siglum commonly employed for the Cleopatra MS. as an entity.

2 Scribe D did not use ς (ς or ς), and apparently did not understand the last when he saw it.

and erudite a scholar as Hall could go so egregiously wrong, it is no answer to the editorial problem simply to put a photographic facsimile in the hands of postgraduate students or even of their teachers. What is necessary is that a single editor should spend the time necessary to solve the problems of the manuscript, even those that are in themselves trivial and unimportant, and should find a means of presenting his results so that others may benefit from his pains; the job should be done thoroughly once, not superficially by each individual user of a facsimile.

J. A. Herbert, in the transcription which he made for Hope Emily Allen, adopted a method which set out essentially to display the original text, as written by scribe A, and the alterations side by side in the transcribed text. Cancelled letters, words, and phrases were placed in the transcribed text within round brackets, their replacements immediately after (or sometimes before) them in caret brackets; shorter additions to the text were also inserted in the body of the transcribed text, again within caret brackets, but longer additions were noted in the margin of the transcription. With this method it would be possible to display all the facts of the manuscript and its alterations, but only at the cost of producing a printed text even more unreadable than the rest of the series of Ancrene Riwle texts; and though it is possible to work out, from Herbert's transcription and the accompanying notes, what the original text was and what the correctors were doing to it, it is not easy to do so. Moreover his method is ill-adapted to the case where both correctors worked on the same passage. Apart from its method, Herbert's transcription had many faults of detail. The most serious is that, though he was careful to distinguish alterations made by the original scribe from those made, in his recurrent phrase, 'in a different ink and hand' (which, when he first uses it, refers to the ink and hand of my scribe B), he made no serious attempt to distinguish between scribe B and scribe D. He was obviously aware of the difference, for on the first few sheets of his transcription there are a number of notes 'hand C' (referring to my scribe D), but all these notes have been heavily crossed out and thereafter Herbert gave up distinguishing between the correctors. He treated the punctuation as it now stands in the manuscript as

1 Herbert divided his page into two; the transcribed text was written on the right-hand side of the page, his notes (including his transcriptions of the longer additions) on the left-hand side. If his transcription had been printed, the notes on the left-hand side of the page would presumably have become footnotes.
if it had been original, though scribe B made many, and scribe
D made countless, changes in the punctuation. He frequently
failed to notice scribe D’s extensions and modifications to the
shapes of scribe A’s letters, and often treated such extended letters
as if they were the original scribe’s capitals; he sometimes failed
to notice alterations of letters (i.e. alterations from one letter to
another), and when he did notice them he was sometimes at fault
in interpreting what had been done (e.g. the direction of change,
or what the original letter had been, or what the final result was
intended to be). He was often unsuccessful in reading erased
letters, or in conjecturing what the erased letter must have been,
partly because he does not seem to have had an exact knowledge
of Middle English and in particular a detailed understanding of
scribe A’s dialect and spelling-system, partly because he normally
compared the text only with the Nero MS., whose readings and
forms are usually unhelpful (the most helpful comparison is always
with Corpus); and as he did not appreciate the concern of the
correctors with punctuation, he sometimes thought that a letter had
been erased when in fact only a punctuation-mark, or part of one,
had been taken out. I have been concentrating on the blemishes,
but it would be improper not to add that Herbert’s great experience
and skill and his sharp eye resulted in a most useful transcription,
which it has been of inestimable value to me to have available for
comparison; he has saved me from many errors of both commission
and omission, and he succeeded in reading things which I could not
at first read—indeed there are a few things which he contrived
to make out which I still find illegible. The extent of my debt is
indicated by the number of times that I cite his transcription in
my notes, even when it is only to express my disagreement.1

The method of my transcription is a development of Herbert’s.
Its primary aim is to recover and reproduce the text as it was left
by the original scribe and rubricator, before even scribe B had
corrected and revised it; for the text as the original scribe wrote

1 These are instances of plummet marginalia, which may have become more
rubbed and fainter since he made his transcription.

2 It is right to point out that Herbert’s transcription was made to a private
commission, and presumably in accordance with his client’s wishes; for example,
it may have been Miss Allen who instructed him not to waste time by attempting
to distinguish the hands of the correctors, as he started to do. Certainly he must
have worked to some sort of a time-limit; he cannot have spent anything like
the time on his transcription that I have on mine. Moreover, when he made it
the Corpus MS. was unpublished; comparison of the Cleopatra text with that of
Nero would have seemed natural.

it is the nearest we can get to that of his exemplar, and for the
textual critic the attempt to work back towards the archetype must
always be of first importance. The details of scribe A’s work, and
the problems which they present for a modern transcription de-
signed to be printed, are discussed below (pp. lv-xxii); here I
am concerned with the general principle. As far as is reasonably
practicable in print, I aim to reproduce in my text the manuscript
text as scribe A left it. If he himself interlined letters or words,
I insert them in the text at the point which he intended (and
usually marked), enclosed within caret brackets; if he himself sub-
pointed letters or words, I print them so. But when he intended
an interlined letter as a substitute for a subprocessed letter, I print
the word as he finally intended it to be (with the interlined letter
in caret brackets) and record the fact of the correction in my notes.

I restore scribe A’s primitive system of punctuation, recording
in the notes the alterations made by the correctors. Where letters
or words or punctuation-marks have been erased, I try to recover
them, printing them within square brackets. If the erased letter
seems to me to be legible, I print it in roman; if it has to be con-
j ectured, in italic. But by ‘legible’ I do not mean ‘legible at first
sight’. Sometimes the erased letters do remain quite easily legible;
more often they can be made out only with difficulty, after one has
worked out what to look for. To do this one must collate the other
manuscripts, decide what is likely to have stood in scribe A’s
exemplar, and then decide what he himself is likely to have written
and how he is likely to have spelt it; then, with the possibilities
in mind, one can often make out enough to be reasonably sure
what it was that was erased. Again, though the eraser may have
taken out the bulk of a letter, he may leave some tell-tale fragment,
such as scribe A’s characteristic long off-stroke of the letter e,
especially in final position; in such a case, though the body of the
e may be entirely illegible, there can be no doubt that it is an e that
has been erased. I have often had recourse to the device of tracing
on transparent paper the letters or combinations of letters that I
conjectured were missing, from examples on the same or neigh-
bouring pages, to see whether they would fit the gap; often, in such
cases, the tracing not only fitted the gap, but also exactly covered
the remaining fragments of letters, so that little or no doubt was pos-
sible that the reconstruction was correct.1 Roman type, therefore,

1 For this process I of course used photostats, not the manuscript itself.
means that there is some visible surviving evidence sufficient, in my judgement, to make the reconstruction of the erased letter certain or at least probable; italic type means that I do not think that there is enough visible surviving evidence to confirm the hypothetical reconstruction (though the reconstruction may be certain on other grounds). I have doubtless been inconsistent in making the distinction, but in either case the enclosing square brackets warn the reader that there has been an erasure and that the text is reconstructed. I preserve the lineation of the manuscript, since the corrections, and the method of the corrections, often depend on the fact that the word concerned comes at the end or the beginning of the line; indeed the alterations were sometimes designed merely to correct scribe A’s often very arbitrary division of a word between one line and the next. But for technical reasons of printing it has proved undesirable to try to keep a straight right-hand margin; the right-hand margin is left ragged in the printed text, whereas the scribe observed his ruled right-hand margin with reasonable fidelity—indeed it was his respect for it that often led him to cramp the words and letters towards the end of the line and to resort to arbitrary and inconvenient divisions of words.

If I had deserted the manuscript lineation—even if I had marked the ends of lines by vertical strokes—I should have produced a more handsome printed page and a more compact book, but the reader would have found it much more difficult to follow my notes explaining the alterations made by scribes B and D, and to visualize the reasons for them.

My text is accompanied by two series of notes, a general series and a special series. References to the general series of notes are given by superscript numbers, thus Lauerd; references to the special series by superscript letters, thus poneg. If the note refers to a punctuation-mark the reference-number or reference-letter is placed after the punctuation-mark, thus hoten 1 or neowe 6, but if it refers to the word preceding the punctuation-mark the number or letter precedes, thus gr[a]ce 8, or woid 8. on the first page. If there is a note both on the preceding word and on the punctuation-mark there are two references, one before and one after the punctuation-mark, thus videue[ ],[ ] on f. 7; both references may be numbers, as in this case (since both are to the general series of notes), or both may be letters, or one may be a letter and one a number. The usual reason is that the correctors, or one of them, have altered both the preceding word and the punctuation-mark. In order to avoid repetition of notes, the same reference-number or reference-letter may occur repeatedly in the transcription of a single manuscript page; this means that the note referred to applies to each of the words or punctuation-marks to which the reference is appended.

(Thus on a single page there may be several instances of a point that has been erased or has been changed to the punctus elevatus, or a repeated word, such as sumne, may more than once have been altered in the same way, in this case to simne by scribe D.) Each page of the manuscript has its own group of notes, and therefore its own series of reference-numbers and reference-letters; the numbering and the lettering begin again with a new page of the manuscript.

The reference-letters and reference-numbers are of course repeated before the note in question. The notes are grouped beneath the text, preceded by a reference to the page of the manuscript (f. 4, f. 4*, etc.); the special series of notes, when it is running, is printed above the general series, separated from it by a horizontal rule. The folio-references are also given in the margin of the text, against the first line of the manuscript page, thus f. 4 and the Morton references, as in the other texts in this Ancrene Riwle series, are given in the margin in the usual form, thus (M. 64) against the line in which Morton’s page begins.

The special series of notes records scribe B’s corrections, alterations, and additions to the text, and therefore occurs only where he has been at work on the text. His alterations are of such interest and importance, even if he was not (as I believe he was) the author of the Rule, that I wished to give them special prominence. My principle has been to record in these notes all alterations which were certainly or probably by scribe B (alterations in his hand, or logically linked with alterations in his hand, or aiming at a result characteristic of him and uncharacteristic of scribe D), but to exclude from them alterations which, though they may be his (even
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in some cases though they are almost certainly, or probably, his), could not be ascribed to him on any ground that might reasonably be considered objective. A typical instance of the latter case is the erasure of scribe A’s points. Obviously no one can say who erased a point. If such erasures come on a page where scribe B is making corrections, especially if he is modifying the punctuation, one may feel pretty sure that the erasures are part of his modifications, but one can hardly demonstrate it, especially if scribe D (who is also interested in punctuation) is at work on the same page or a neighbouring page. Such ‘ambiguous’ alterations (in the sense that they may or may not be scribe B’s) are as a matter of policy recorded not in the special notes, but in the general notes; but I am conscious that I may not have been consistent in applying this policy. The reader will find, among the general notes, the record of alterations on which I comment that they are ‘probably’ or ‘possibly’ by scribe B; and sometimes, at the end of the special notes to a particular page, I give cross-references to the general notes for the record of changes which I think are likely to be B’s, though I judge them to come in the ambiguous category. The case almost always concerns alterations by erasure; but I have sometimes taken the risk of ascribing such alterations more definitely to B, for one reason or another, and recording them among the special notes. The grounds on which I ascribe alterations to one scribe or another are discussed in more detail below.

Of the general series of notes I can say only that it is intended to include everything else, and in particular the record of scribe D’s industrious fiddling with the text. The number and length of the notes to any page are almost always directly proportionate to the extent of his activity; and if the reader should wish for fewer notes, so would I. In my notes I often record scribe A’s errors and omissions, especially when they are destructive of sense; and I cite the readings of other manuscripts rather more often than is normal in this series of editions. In doing so, I commonly use the siglum F to refer to the French text of the Vitellius MS., but I avoid the use of the customary A to refer to the Corpus MS. (except in the conventional expression ‘AB language’ for the language of the Corpus MS. and MS. Bodley 34); lest there should be confusion with my use of A to denote the original scribe of the Cleopatra MS.; the manuscripts other than F are referred to by an abbreviated form of their names (thus Corpus, Nero, etc.). But it should not be thought that I am setting out to give a complete or systematic account of scribe A’s departures from the true text (which I could not do unless I had fully established a text), or even from F and from Corpus; I am not trying to do the work of a critical edition, but merely to record scribe A’s errors when I have noticed them and think that it would be helpful to the reader to point them out. Obvious mechanical errors (e.g. omission or transposition of letters) are left to speak for themselves, or are signalled only by the note ‘so MS.’ when the error might otherwise be thought to be the printer’s or my own. Like the scribes of the other manuscripts, even of Corpus, the Cleopatra scribe did not produce a text readable in itself, nor could his text alone be a satisfactory basis for a readers’ edition. This, like the other books in the Ancrane Rivule series, is in unus editorum philologorumque; scholars whose interest is literary can expect little profit from it.

Foliation of the manuscript

Two systems of foliation have been used in the manuscript. The older is written in ink in the top right-hand corner of the recto of the leaves; it does not number the illuminated leaf which now serves as a frontispiece to the manuscript, and makes the text of A.R. begin on f. 3. The other is written in pencil at the foot of the recto of the leaves, somewhat to the right of the centre of the page; it numbers the illuminated leaf as f. 1, and makes the first page of the text f. 4. As there are no errors in either foliation, the pencil foliation runs consistently one above the ink foliation. When I began work on the manuscript, and when I had photostats made in 1952, there was nothing to indicate which was the official British Museum foliation except a pencil note on the recto of the first of the four paper leaves which now end the volume, to the effect that in October 1875 the manuscript contained 203 folios; to the initiate, it seems, this was a sufficient indication that the ink foliation had been superseded by the pencil foliation, which runs to f. 203. But the ink foliation had not at that time been struck out. By September 1968 the ink folio-numbers from 1 to 6 had been struck through in pencil and replaced by the numbers 2 to 7, but the rest of the ink numbers had been left unaltered. At my suggestion, they have since all been cancelled.

The Catalogue of the MSS. of the Cottonian Collection (1802) naturally refers to the older foliation, and even since the
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B.M. Cotton MS. Cleopatra C. vi

Recti² diligent te. In canticis sponsa
Ad sponsum. [e]st[rectum] grammaticum
Rectum geometricum. rectum theologicum. sunt difference totidem regularum. Recto te Lauder² seid godes sp
use to hire dese woste spus. peo richte
Luieś pe. peo beoś [pe]richte. pe luieś
after riwele. ]b mine l[e]oue sustren habbeś
moni dei iraued [on] me after riwe. mo<
ni canne riwien beoś. Ach twa beoś bi
mong alle ṭ ich wille speken of purch
ower bone <d godes gr[α]ce, ṭ an riweś pe
heorte ṭ maken efnie ṭ smede wið vte c[n]

f. 4  a Initial e partly erased, and altered to E by scribe B. After first t a letter erased (almost certainly r), and B writes r above line over but slightly to left of the following e; purpose of change merely to separate words joined by original scribe.  b After riwele an erasure; point still faintly visible, but following letters completely gone. Over erasure B writes r e in line with original text but in larger letters. I guess that the word erased was re written with A's curious 3, which is quite unlike B's and which B may not have recognized at its first occurrence; but if so, A's text differed here from F, which has Et vous. Text as altered is correct; cf. Corpus.  c B alters initial m to M.  d After e double insertion-mark, and B writes mid above. B may perhaps have meant to replace the amperand by his mid; cf. Nero mid, Corpus mid, where C as emended now has σ mid. If so, he forgot to erase the amperand.  e Hyphen added at end of line; B's ink and penmanship. A does not use hyphens.

f. 4  a Four-line ornamental initial R in blue with red pen-flourishes, continued down left margin.  b Initial L in blue with red flourishes.  c Erased, presumably by B; correct emendation (cf. Corpus). Second letter certainly e (characteristic off-stroke not completely erased); shape of erasure shows first letter was j.  d Worm-hole in vellum, cutting out bottom of l and all but very top of e.  e Erased, presumably by B, but still visible; false emendation (cf. Corpus, and for preposition Nero), in sense that it alters the original text, but the construction with a direct pronoun object seems more regular than that with on (cf. OED).  f Worm-hole in vellum, but part of a still visible.
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oste s dolke of þonge¹ inwið unwreyst s zirn
inde þ pu¹ herz sunegest oðer þis nisnaut
ibet yet als⁹ hit schulde. þeos riwle is
(M. 4, l. 5)
eauer Inwið s richted⁹ þe hoerte.¹ Dco⁹
oðer is alwið vten s riwle⁹ þe licome[,³]
þe licomliche deden. Heo teache⁸ al hu
me schal beoren him wið⁴, hu cotten s dr
inken. Werien s singen. Slepen s waken¹.
þe þeos riwle nis naut buten to seruin þa
oðer. þeo oðer is als⁹[w]a¹ laudei. þeos is als⁹
þuften. for al þ me de⁸ of ordre wið⁴ uten⁶
nis buten to riuwlin ðe hoerte wið⁶ innen.
Nυ¹ aske þe wat riiwen þe ancren schu
len habben. 3 schulen alleswicis wið³ alle
michte þe strengðe wel witen þihere³ þe put
tere for hire sake. þihere³ is euer ilich.
þe vterre is mislich. for uh an schal
halde putere efter þe hoest mei[,]⁴ wið
hire seruin þeo inre. Nu schal hit swa
beoen þ alle ancren maßen helden an ri
wle⁶[,]⁴ Quantum ad Puratatem cordis
circa quam uersatur omnis religio. Þ³ is als⁹

¹ From þonge to end of line underlined and also struck through; above, B writes woh insul = of werynde = segge (correct emendation; cf. Corpus). In next line, to complete correction, B strikes through inde þ pu. ² After her B writes þu above line (i.e. þu is transposed from before to after her; correct emendation, cf. Corpus). ³ After al ðe double insertion-mark, and B adds sas as above line (cf. Corpus). ⁴ Above ts of hoerte a cross, repeated in right-hand margin before the following addition in B's hand: Set þe conscience þis þe inse of þi pold[¹] of þin hoerte[¹] beðu wilhisse i þe seli[¹] intrigme[¹] þe sculmum þu tu ort i
nueme[¹] insuium[¹] þis þu misdest þ{¹} þe. ⁵ ðe hauæ þe unawa ðe pe ð. ⁶ full conscience. ⁷ þe p[k]o]s riuwle gneid³ hire ã
Maked hire smede⁸ e softe. In first line of this addition, conscience þe conscience is
a spelling-error paralleled elsewhere in B's additions; in tenth line, after ah
double insertion-mark, and B himself adds ins in smaller lettering between
lines of addition. ⁴ After oðer insertion-mark, and B adds riwle above line (correct emendation; cf. Corpus). ⁵ After wið three insertion-mark, and B adds uten above line (correct emendation). ⁶ After k an insertion-mark, and B adds i above line to make wahien.

f. 4⁴ ² B alters initial a to capital A.
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mazen = ahæn. halden an riwle anon
ðen Purte of hoerte. þis is clene s schir²
inwið⁶ wið⁶ vten weote of sunne³ þ ne beo
purhc schrift ibet. þia⁶ maket þe laue
di riwle þe riwlet s smæð² þe richted³
þe hoerte þe wið⁶ hire from⁶ suone. for
naut ne marre⁸ hire þong⁴ bute sunne
ane. Richten hire þe smæðe hire, is of
vhe ordre s of uh religion[²]³ þe god ðs³
þe strengðe. þeos riwle nis naut
imaked of monnes findles[,]¹ Aeh³ is of go
des heste. for þi hoio is eauer an⁴ wið⁵
ten changeling[,]¹ þa alle aægn hire inan⁶
eauer to halden. ach⁶ alle ne maßen naut
helden ane riwle. ne ne purue naut
nene ahæ naut halden on ane wise þe
vterre riwle. Quantum scilicet ad ob
seruantas corporales. þ is anonde lico⁶

² After schir, in right margin, B adds imulat. in large letters, and then in smaller lettering, in conscience þe ne is beo weote ne sunne is of naut pret suone imulat hire
soldun (to replace following phrase in A's text; see next note). ³ B strikes through inwið and then in separate single stroke wið⁶ vten weote of suone. This double act of deletion corresponds to the double act of writing in the marginal correction inscribed in previous note. Over the space after suone, a double oblique stroke, presumably intended as reference-mark to show where the marginal addition links up with the original text. B's substitution of imulat for imulat is a correct emendation; but the rest, an obvious afterthought, is a revision of a phrase that was part of the original text (cf. F, Nero, and Corpus; but Corpus adds conscience after imulat, to that extent following B's marginal revision, and F has an addition which closely follows B's substituted passage). ⁴ B alters initial a to capital b. ⁵ B strikes through text hire from and above line writes þe insul aægn (Corpus te imulat of; so Nero). ⁶ So MS., for wong (F fort); struck through, and B writes above line toeh. scarages ð uone. After toeh. three letters, in line with rest of addition and certainly also written by B, have been struck through; though slightly obscured by the deleting stroke, they were almost certainly ser, perhaps deleted because the first two letters were unclear (blotted). B's wo is a correct emendation (cf. Corpus), the rest an expansion or gloss. ⁷ Point altered to i by B.

f. 5 ⁵ B inserts i after an. ⁶ B adds hyphen at end of line. ⁷ B adds doubled marks of separation, below and above line, between in and an. ⁸ B alters initial a to capital A (cf. Corpus), and marks of separation (single mark below line, double above) at ah, which is written close to following alle though I think A intended them to be read as two words.

³ So MS., for makeb. ⁴ A's i (which is indistinguishable from question-mark, as at end of third line of this page) erased, presumably by B. ⁵ f. ³ Point erased, presumably by B. ⁶ Part of original scribe's capital A erased, presumably by B, to make minuscule a. (Original scribe's capital is distinguished from a only by a small downward stroke from the top left-hand end of the main stroke of the letter; it is this which has been erased.)

² Large black N, over which has been drawn a large red N of different shape, with blue and red flourishes extending down left margin. ³ Point erased.
ANCRENE Riwle
mes louenges. Efter þe otere riwle þþ ich þuften cleopede þþ is monnes findles for nan þing elles nis* heo ioitâ bute to seruen þe inre. þþ fe maketh festen, wakien. calde þþ harde werien. þþ swich ðeðere hardschipes þþ moni fleisch mi þþ po lîen[,]1 þþ moni ne mei natu. forþþ mot þþos riwle changin hire misliche[,]11 after vchane manere þþ efter hire euen.2 for sum is strong. sum vs strong. þþ mei fulwel beon quit þþ Painen gud mid lesse. sum is clersesse þþ sum nan. þþ mot þþ march wurchen[,]11 þþ on oðre11 wise segen hi re bonen. sum is ald þþ feuþe. þþ is þþ lea[b se dreef. sum is yeung þþ strong þþ is neod þþ betere warde. for þþ schal vh ancre habben þþ vtere riwle efter hire schriftes red. þþ hwet se þþ he bit þþ hat inobiedien ce[,]11 þþ cneawþe hire manere þþ wat hire stre ngëe. he mai þþ vtere riwle changin efter wisdom[,]11 ase he aðh hu þþ inre mei beon bete ihalde. nan2 ancre ne schal bi mi read makien profission. þþ is bihaten heste alawa ashe heste buten þþo þþinges. þþ beðo
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obedience. chaste, sh. studeþæcleustnin* geþ. þþ heo ne schal þþen[e]7 stude neaur mare changin buþ for nede ase. ase strangëe[,]11 mór deafes drednesse.4 obedience of hire bishopp5 offer of his herrer.e for hwase nime þþ ping on honð[,]15 hit bihat god þþ ase heste to donne.66 ha bint hire þþr to. þþ sundegeþ deæliche þþe þþSr. þþ obeo heo hit bre ketþ willos.2 þþe heo hit ne bihat naut heo hit þþch mei don. þþ leue wenne1 heo wel wule. ase of mete þþ of druhte.7 Flesc8 for gan oðer fisch þþ alte ðeðere swiche þþinges.10 of werunge. of liggenge. of huires. of ðeðere beoden12 segen.10 þþos þþ pul lich ðeðere beoþ alte ifreo wil to don1 of offer to leten hylwe me wuleþ buten heo boon

f. 6
1 B adds hyphen at end of line. 2 B strikes through hiso ioitâ and writes isial så above line (correct emendation; cf. Corpus isial). 3 It is hard to tell whether A originally wrote þþe or þþo, but I think it was þþe (true text; cf. Corpus) and that B later added o: certainly B adds double insertion-mark below line after the o and the letter s above the line, thus completing the change of þþe to þþe; thereafter B continues, between lines and into right margin, þþos untere Riwal þþi þþemote of þþis boþ þþe endënte 11 distincþion. þþ æ þþleste dale (and so continuing with makerd of original text). All this is an addition, not in Corpus; endënte for endënte is a spelling-error of a sort paralleled elsewhere in B's additions. 4 B alters initial þþ to capital F. 5 Under point after euen B adds double insertion-mark and writes above line and in right margin as hire meiþre saþ hire, for he beroð1 þþos riwle inowð þþis hroþe þþe ahe þþ he sum is oðer see 1 oðer halþ scal after his wig 1 changi þþos untere riwle 11 after suchanes euen. (addition, not in Corpus). 6 After oðer B adds r above line to make oðer.
ANCRENE RIWLE

forb hoten. Ach cherite. ò is luue. edmod nesse. ò polemodesse. treewe schipe. ò 〈h〉al
dunge of pe alde ten hestes. Schrift.

penitence. òeos ò puellich dēere òeoc beoc summe of pe alde læge[.1] summe of pe neowe. nebeoc òeosec naut monnes fin
dles. ach beoc godes hestes. ò for pimot vhm monedelice ham holden

è e overi alle pinige. for òeoc riwloð
dè hoerte. of hire [r]ulunge[2] is al mest
ò ich write. bute ò[ŋ]i pe frumbe inbip
boe è i[ŋ]p è estunde ende. ò beoc pinige ò ich
write òerof [in]òe[ŋ]t vttere riwleke è ham
holde alle mine

leuoc sustren vre
laured beo hit
ponked è schule
porch his grace

se lengere se betere
è pauch nulle ich naut ò è bi hoten

heon as heste to holden. for as ofte

ase è 1 bre[œ]ke[œ]n an ò per ofs. hit hurteð

So originally MS., but an attempt has been made, I think by B, to alter for to be (correct emendation) by changing the a to o and superimposing ő on the a-shaped r. Presumably the corrector attempted to complete his work by erasing the f and part of the r, but forgot to do so.

B strikes through þe alde and writes alle þe above (alteration of true text; cf. Corpus).

Point altered to ò by B.

B deletes bote, second godes, and pinige by striking through; in each case correct emendation.

B alters lefters (which I think was certainly ð, though Herbert read it as s) to þ.

B alters initial ò to capital O.

B alters initial þ to capital ð.

Note: Initial þ is initial in and final i erased to leave þe, obviously by B (goes with preceding and following changes).

B adds þ after rate to indicate phrase of òe vonne riuðe mis-
copied by A.

The ø and final ð erased, and abbreviation-mark for n added above second e to make brekenn; correct emendation (cf. Corpus), obviously by B as part of a series of corrections by him.

B strikes through òer of and writes e[n]i of ham (correct emendation; cf. Corpus).

B strikes through hurteð and writes svailde above (see note ð on p. 7).
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towisèp owre heorte. è make[s]9 ou wa

offe[a]læg[3] þe muge sone as godð forbæo
de. ᵀfallen[4] in an vn hope[.] ᵀ ev an vi

Leauel[.] for to beon iboren. for[.]

p i ich
write ou rende susten of uttere pin
ges in þe careste dale of ouwer boc.[1]

ouwer seruise. ò nomeliche inbe leste.

ìe ne schule naut bi haten hit ach ha

bben hit on heorte. è don hit as ò hit
ou[.][1] of wat ordre þe beoc ase summe doð

3e telleð me þe siȝeþ þe gnete s swole

3eþ þe fleðe þe ondwere[2] of seint ìa

mes þe wes godes apostel[3] s for his

a Point altered to ò by B.

b After swèf B writes hurten above line. With previous change, this emends text into agreement with Corpus.

c Final ò erased and abbreviation-mark for n added above ò, to make maken, obviously by B (goes with change of hurteð to svailde... hurten); but patching of A's form results in anomalous infinitive maken for normal mahan (as in Corpus).

The a nased and the preceding ò slightly retouched; alteration beyond reasonable doubt by B. But A's spelling was that normally used in the 'AB language' in this word (as here by Corpus); B's change substitutes ò for ea in word with Anglian ò for WS ø. (c) B strikes through muge and writes mahan above.

Dewægton ascender of ð an oblique stroke, sloping upwards to the right, has been added, certainly by B; similar in penmanship and purpose to stroke added to ø of þe when it means 'thee', which is also certainly by B (see f. 32, notes i and j, and f. 16, notes j and h). In this case the stroke is a diacritic to distinguish godð in the sense 'God', which is also added by B in f. 5*, f. 15*, f. 20, f. 21, f. 24, f. 15*, f. 13, and f. 20, f. 13; it is wrongly added to god 'god' on f. 18 (see note ð to f. 18). It therefore corresponds to the Corpus spelling godð, and the diacritic mark is probably intended as an indication that the letter should be doubled; Herbert's transcription god, here and on f. 18, is wrong. A himself occasionally adds a similar stroke, but lighter and with a different slope, to the ø of god in the sense 'good' (so on ff. 47*, 52*), equivalent to his spelling good (sometimes altered from god, and on f. 8*, 6th line from foot, there is an accent-stroke on the g of segen, probably to indicate it should be segen. (d) After fallen double insertion-mark, and above line (after double oblique stroke as reference-mark) B writes òaspeorance þe is inte (presumably the in of A's text, after fallen, should have been cancelled, but it is not). Correct emendation except for the unnecessary inte; cf. Corpus.

e After ò an insertion-mark, and B writes inte above line; unnecessary addition to text, which agrees with A, but it goes with the inte in the previous addition. Nero here has in subline for an unblique, but this is plainly not the original reading.

f. 6* A himself adds h above line, marked for insertion before ø.

f. 6* Point erased.

f. 6* Flourished initial G in red and blue, with red and blue ornament continued down left margin, superimposed on large black G. Here as elsewhere, rubricator (and original scribe, if black initial is his) does not distinguish a capital þ from capital G. B writes cong on above line, as gloss.

f. 6* D adds ordre above line, unnecessarily and against true text.

f. 6* D extends and bars top of ò of apostel and adds paragraph-mark after original point.