

BY
E. J. DOBSON

1972

[illegible]

△
CWM 54.1.99
✓
Oxford University Press, Ely House, London W. 1

GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON
CAPE TOWN IBADAN NAIROBI DAR ES SALAAM LUSAKA ADDIS ABABA
DELHI BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS KARACHI LAHORE DACCA
KUALA LUMPUR SINGAPORE HONG KONG TOKYO

ISBN 0 19 722269 2

© Early English Text Society, 1972

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CHILD MEMORIAL LIBRARY

Child Mem.

Printed in Great Britain
at the University Press, Oxford
by Vivian Ridler
Printer to the University

PREFACE

THE Cleopatra text of the *Ancrene Riwe* 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. Halcrow, 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,

PREFACE

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 *Ancrene Wisse*.

E. J. D.

Jesus College, Oxford

CONTENTS

PREFACE	v
INTRODUCTION	ix
Importance and date of the manuscript	ix
Method of the edition	xii
Foliation of the manuscript	xix
Description of the present manuscript	xx
Early history of the manuscript	xxv
Description and analysis of the main manuscript	xxix
Distinction of the hands	xlvi
Scribe A	
His characteristics, lv; marginal rubrics, lvi; other marginal entries, lxi; rubrication and decoration, lxii; use of capitals and 'lower-case' letters, lxv; word-spacing, lxx; abbreviations, lxxi; his language, lxxii.	
Scribe B	
Extent and nature of his work, xciii; his corrections of punctuation, xcix; of the text, cvii; his revisions and additions, cxvi; his alterations of scribe A's linguistic forms, cxxvi; his language and its differences from that of the Corpus MS., cxxx.	
Scribe D	
Extent and nature of his work, cxl; scribe D and Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. B. 1. 45, cxlii; relationship of his texts in the Cleopatra and Trinity MSS., and their date and provenance, cxlv; scribe D's language and his alterations of scribe A's linguistic forms, cxlviii; his use of another <i>Ancrene Riwle</i> manuscript, clxv.	
Other hands	clxxii
TEXT AND NOTES	i

ILLUSTRATIONS

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

British Museum Cotton MS. Cleopatra C. vi, f. 57^v, and Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. B. 1. 45, f. 24^{r-v} (scribe D) *between pages 110 and 111*

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

British Museum Cotton MS. Cleopatra C. vi, f. 198^v (scribes A, B, and D) and f. 199^r (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 Riwe* (*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. E. J. Dobson, 'The Date and Composition of *Ancrene Wisse*', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, lii (1966), 192-3.

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.¹ 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.;² 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.³

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. xciii-cxxv, below.

² Nero MS., ed. Day, 85/8-86/5; Cleopatra MS., f. 81/11-81v/8; cf. E. J. Dobson, art. cit., pp. 203-4.

³ This exemplar, as the stemma shows, was itself at least two removes from the author's holograph, though it may have been a direct copy of the archetype of the β -group, which is likely to have been the fair copy originally supplied to the 'three sisters'. Cf. E. J. Dobson, 'The Affiliations of the Manuscripts of *Ancrene Wisse*' in *English and Medieval Studies presented to J. R. R. Tolkien* (1962), pp. 128-63.

vii, a translation of an English manuscript very closely allied to (and more correct than) the Cleopatra MS., which must have been the other copy made simultaneously from the same exemplar. But though inferior to these, the Cleopatra MS., by virtue of its position in the stemma and its early date, is the second most important witness to the English text after the Corpus MS.¹ Its interest is all the greater if, as I hold and seek to prove below, scribe B's hand is the author's, preserved for our study, and his corrections, revisions, and additions are consequently of prime authority. There can be little doubt that in the thirteenth century the Cleopatra MS. was especially valued, and as its text is not especially good, owing to the deficiencies of the original scribe, it seems probable that it was esteemed because it was known to have been corrected by the author himself. Its influence can be traced on all the surviving manuscripts of the β -group, especially those of the Nero-Titus sub-group (or ϵ -group), the original nucleus of which (ϵ and its immediate descendants) must have been made at an early date, probably before 1240 (in view of the dating of the Nero and Titus MSS. themselves); readings from Cleopatra—both the corrected or altered readings of scribe B and corrupt readings for which scribe A was responsible—must have been copied into other early manuscripts made at much the same time.² As the Cleopatra MS. was evidently made for the original community, this would imply that the early manuscripts of the β -group (including the original nucleus of the ϵ -group) were also made for, and belonged to, this community, in which they could be freely collated with each other.³ But at a later date, as we shall see, the community parted with the Cleopatra MS. and it passed into the possession of Canonsleigh Abbey in Devon.

¹ 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.

² The English original of the French version also influenced the MSS. of the ϵ -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 surviving Caius 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 Canonsleigh collating the Cleopatra MS. with some lost MS. belonging to the Titus-group (see pp. clxv-clxxii, 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)¹ 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 B) and the unauthorized and generally foolish meddling of the later 'corrector' (scribe D), though their hands, dialects, spelling-systems, alphabets,² 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 *ȝ*, 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 *wynn*, *ȝ*, or *ȝ*, 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.¹ 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 Riwele* 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 eyes 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.¹ 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.²

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 designed to be printed, are discussed below (pp. lxxv–lxxii); 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-puncted letters or words, I print them so. But when he intended an interlined letter as a substitute for a subpuncted 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 conjectured, 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 neighbouring 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 possible 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;¹ 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*²; references to the special series by superscript letters, thus *poncg*^f. 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

¹ The difficulty is largely due to lines containing abbreviations, especially lines containing heavily abbreviated Latin words; when the abbreviations are expanded, these lines become far too long. In any case scribe A varied a good deal in the number of letters he wrote in a line. In the case of the Corpus MS., the scribe's lines were mostly of a very convenient length for the printer, and in Professor Tolkien's edition it was possible to combine the retention of the MS. lineation with a straight right-hand margin; in the present case it has proved impossible. My edition therefore resembles, in this respect, Herbert's edition of the cognate Vitellius MS., though this is fortuitous. Herbert's reason for preserving the MS. lineation was presumably a different one—to give an indication of the incidence of the fire-damage from which the Vitellius MS. has suffered.

it refers to the word preceding the punctuation-mark the number or letter precedes, thus *gr[a]ce*⁶. or *wið*^k. 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 *widewen*⁷[.]⁴ 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 *sunne*, may more than once have been altered in the same way, in this case to *sinne* 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^v, 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 Riwe* 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

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 *Ancrene Riwele* series, is *in usum 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^r. 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^r. 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 1962, 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

ANCRENE RIWLE

B.M. Cotton MS. Cleopatra C. vi

f. 4 (M. 2)

Recti¹ diligunt te. In canticis sponsa
Ad sponsum. [e]st[r]ectum^a grammaticum
Rectum geometricum. rectum theolo
gicum. ⁊ sunt difference totidem re
gularum. Derecto theologico sermo nobis est. 5
Cuius due sunt regule. vna circa Cordis direc
cionem. altera uersatur circa exteriorum rectificacionem.
Recti diligunt te **L**auerd² seið godes sp
use to hire deore wurðe spus. þeo richte
Luuið þe. þeo beoð [þe]³ richte. þe liuið 10
efter riwle.]^b mine l[e]oue⁴ sustren habbeð
moni dei icraued [on]⁵ me efter riwle. mo^c
ni cunne riwlen beoð. Ach twa beoð bi
mong alle þ̅ ich wille spoken of þurch
ower bone ⁊^d godes gr[a]ce⁶. þ̅ an riwleð þe 15
heorte ⁊ makeð efne ⁊ smeðe wið vte cn^e

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 *riwle* an erasure; point still faintly visible, but following letters completely gone. Over erasure B writes ⁊ *þe* in line with original text but in larger letters. I guess that the word erased was *þe* written with A's curious *þ*, 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 ⁊ double insertion-mark, and B writes *mid* above. B may perhaps have meant to replace the ampersand by his *mid*; cf. Nero *mid*, Corpus *wið*, where C as emended now has ⁊ *mid*. If so, he forgot to erase the ampersand. ^e Hyphen added at end of line; B's ink and penmanship. A does not use hyphens.

f. 4 ¹ Four-line ornamental initial *R* in blue with red pen-flourishes, continued down left margin. ² Initial *L* in blue with red flourishes. ³ 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 *p*. ⁴ Worm-hole in vellum, cutting out bottom of *l* and all but very top of *e*. ⁵ 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). ⁶ Worm-hole in vellum, but part of *a* still visible.

oste ⁊ dolke of þoncƿ^f inwið unwrest ⁊ ȝirn
 inde þ þu^f her^g sunegest oðer þis nisnaut
 ibet ȝet alse^h hit schulde. þeos riwle is
 (M. 4, l. 5) eauer Inwið ⁊ richteð þe heorte.ⁱ **Þeo**⁷ 20
 oðerⁱ is alwið vten ⁊ riwleð þe licome[.]⁸
 ⁊ þe licomliche deden. Heo teacheð al hu
 me schal beoren him wið^k. hu eoten ⁊ dr
 inken. Werien ⁊ singen. Slegen ⁊ waken^l.
 f. 4^v ⁊ þeos riwle nis naut buten to seruīn þa
 oðer. þeo oðer is als[w]a¹ lauedi. þeos is alse²
 þuften. for al þ me deð of ordre wið uten.
 nis buten to riuwlin ðe heorte wið innen.
 Nu³ aske ȝe wat riwlen ȝe ancren schu
 len habben. ȝe schulen allesweis wið alle
 michte ⁊ strengðe wel witen þinre ⁊ þut
 tere for hire sake. þinre is eauer ilich.
 þe vtterre is mislich. For uh an schal
 halde þuttere efter þ heo best mei[.]⁴ wið 10
 hire seruīn þeo inre. Nu schal hit swa
 beon þ alle ancren maȝen halden an ri
 wle wel[.]⁴ Quantum ad Puritatem cordis
 circa quam uersatur omnis religio. þ is. alle^a

^f From þoncƿ to end of line underlined and also struck through; above, B writes *woh inuit* ⁊ of *wreȝinde þ segge* (correct emendation; cf. Corpus). In next line, to complete correction, B strikes through *inde þ þu*. ^g After *her* B writes *þu* above line (i.e. *þu* is transposed from before to after *her*; correct emendation, cf. Corpus). ^h After *alse* double insertion-mark, and B adds *wel* as above line (cf. Corpus). ⁱ Above *te* of *heorte* a cross, repeated in right-hand margin before the following addition in B's hand: *ȝef þe conſcience* ¹ *þ is þe inuit of þi þoht* ⁊ ² *of þin heorte* ³ *bered witnesse i þe seolf* ⁴ *teȝines* ⁵ *þe seoluen þ tu art i sunne* ⁶ *unſcriuen ⁊ þ tu miſdeſt þ* ⁷ *⁊ þ. ⁊ haueſt þ unþeaw ⁊ þet.* ⁸ *þullic conſcience.* *þullic inuit* ⁹ *is woh ⁊ uilefne* ¹⁰ *⁊ cnoſti* ¹¹ *⁊ dolki.* *ah* ¹² *þeos* ¹³ *Riwle efneð* ¹⁴ *hire ⁊ Makeð hire smeðe* ¹⁵ *⁊ ſofte.* In first line of this addition, *conſcience* for *conscience* is a spelling-error paralleled elsewhere in B's additions; in tenth line, after *ah* double insertion-mark, and B himself adds *þeos* in smaller lettering between lines of addition. ¹ After *oðer* insertion-mark, and B adds *riwle* above line (correct emendation; cf. Corpus). ² After *wið* double insertion-mark, and B adds *uten* above line (correct emendation). ³ After *k* an insertion-mark, and B adds *i* above line to make *wakien*.

f. 4^v ^a B alters initial *a* to capital *A*.

⁷ Red initial *þ* with blue flourishes. ⁸ Point erased, presumably by B.

f. 4^v ¹ The *w* erased, presumably by B, to make two words *als a*. The objection must have been to the form *alswa*, for otherwise A's text agrees with Corpus, which has *as leafdi*. ² Altered, probably by A himself, from *asse*.

³ Large black *N*, over which has been drawn a large red *N* of different shape, with blue and red flourishes extending down left margin. ⁴ Point erased.

maȝen ⁊ ahȝen. halden an riwle anon
 den Purte of heorte. þ is clene ⁊ ſchir^b 15
 inwið^c wið vten weote of sunne^c þ ne beo
 þurhc ſchrift ibet. þis^d maket þe laue
 di riwle þe riwlet ⁊ smeðeð ⁊ richteð
 þe heorte ⁊ wit^e hire from^e sunne. for 20
 naut ne marreð^s hire þoncƿ^f bute sunne
 ane. Richten hire ⁊ smeðen hire.^e is of
 vñ ordre ⁊ of uh religion[.]⁶ þe god ⁊
 (M. 6) þe strengðe. þeos riwle nis naut
 f. 5 imaked of monnes findles[.]¹ Ach² is of go
 des heste. for þi heo is eauer an^a wið v^b
 ten changinge[.]¹ ⁊ alle aȝen hire inan^c
 eauer to halden. ach^d alle ne maȝen naut
 halden ane riwle. ne ne þurue naut 5
 nene ahȝe naut halden on ane wiſe þe
 vtterre riwle. Quantum ſcilicet ad ob
 ſeruancias corporales. þ is anonde lico^b

^b After *ſchir*, in right margin, B adds *inuit*. in large letters, and then in smaller lettering *þ is. conſcience þe ne* ¹ *beo weote ne witnesse* ² *of nan gret sunne inwið* ³ *hire seoluen* (to replace following phrase in A's text; see next note). ^c B strikes through *inwið* and then in separate single stroke *wið vten weote of sunne*. This double act of deletion corresponds to the double act of writing in the marginal correction described in previous note. Over the space after *sunne*, 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 *inuit* for *inwið* 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 *inuit*, to that extent following B's marginal revision, and F has an addition which closely follows B's substituted passage). ^d B alters initial *þ* to capital *þ*. ^e B strikes through *wit hire from* and above line writes *þe inuit aȝen* (Corpus *te inuit of*; so Nero). ^f So MS., for *wrong* (F *tort*); struck through, and B writes above line *woh. ſcraggi ⁊ uñefne*. After *woh*, 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 *scr*, perhaps deleted because the first two letters were unclear (blotted?). B's *woh* is a correct emendation (cf. Corpus), the rest an expansion or gloss. ^g Point altered to *z* by B.

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

⁵ So MS., for *makeð*. ⁶ A's *z* (which is indistinguishable from question-mark, as at end of third line of this page) erased, presumably by B.

f. 5 ¹ Point erased, presumably by B. ² 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.)

mes locunges[.]¹ Efter þeo vttere riwle þ
 ich puften cleopede ⁊ is monnes findles 10
 for nan ping elles nis^e heo italt^e bute
 to seruin þe inre. þe^f madeð festen.
 wakien. calde ⁊ harde werien. ⁊ swich
 oðere hardschipes þ moni flesch mei þo
 lien[.]¹ ⁊ moni ne mei naut. forþi⁸ mot 15
 þeos riwle changin hire misliche[.]¹ efter
 vchanes manere ⁊ efter hire euene.^h for
 sum is strong. sum vn strong. ⁊ mei
 fulwel beon quite ⁊ Paien god mid lesse.
 sum is clergesse ⁊ sum nan. ⁊ mot þe 20
 mare wurchen[.]¹ ⁊ on oðeⁱ wise segen hi
 re bonen. sum is ald ⁊ feble. ⁊ is þe les^b
 se dred of. sum is ȝeung ⁊ strong ⁊
 f. 5^v is neod þe betere warde. for þi schal vñ ancre
 habben þe vttere riwle efter hire schriftes
 red. ⁊ hwet se he bit ⁊ hat hire inobedien
 ce[.]¹ þe cnaweð hire manere ⁊ wat hire stre
 ngðe. he mai þe vttere riwle changin efter 5
 wisdom[.]¹ ase he sið hu þe inre mæze beon
 best ihalden. Nan² ancre ne schal bi mi
 read makien professiun. þ is bihaten heste
 alswa ase heste buten preo pinges. þ beoð

^b B adds hyphen at end of line. ^e B strikes through *mis heo italt* and writes *istalt* above line (correct emendation; cf. Corpus *istald*). ^f It is hard to tell whether A originally wrote *þe* or *þeo*, but I think it was *þe* (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 *þe* to *þeos*; thereafter B continues, between lines and into right margin, [*þeos*] *utterere Riwele þ is i þe ende of þis boc þe eahtuþe i distincciun. þ is þe leaste dale* (and so continuing with *madeð* of original text). All this is an addition, not in Corpus; *eahtuþe* for *eahtuðe* is a spelling-error of a sort paralleled elsewhere in B's additions. ⁸ B alters initial *f* to capital *F*. ^h Under point after *euene* B adds double insertion-mark and writes above line and in right margin *as hire meistre seið hire. for he bereð i þeos riwle inwið his breoste i ⁊ he efter þ sum is oðer sec i oðer hal! scal efter his wit i changi þeos uttere riwle i efter euchanes euene.* (addition, not in Corpus). ⁱ After *oðe* B adds *r* above line to make *oðer*.

¹ Point erased, presumably by B.

f. 5^v ¹ Point erased. ² Large black initial *N*, on which is superimposed large red *N* of different shape, flourished in blue and red.

obedience. chastete. ⁊ studestaðeluestnin^a 10
 ge^a. þ heo ne schal þen[e]³ stude neauer mare
 changin bu^b for nede ane. ase strengðe[.]¹ ⁊^c
 deaðes drednesse.^d obedience of hire bischp⁴
 oðer of his herre.^e for hwase nimeð ping
 on hond[.]^f ⁊ hit bihat god⁸ ase heste to 15
 donne.⁵ ha hint hire þer to. ⁊ suneged⁶
 deaðliche iþe bruche ȝef heo hit bre
 ket^h willes.⁷ ȝef heo hit ne bihat naut
 heo hit þach mei don. ⁊ leaue wenneⁱ heo
 (M. 8) wel wule. ase of mete ⁊ of drunh⁸. Flesc⁹ 20
 for gan oðer fisch ⁊ alle oðere swiche
 pinges.¹⁰ of werunge. of liggunge. of
 hures. of oðere beoden¹¹ seggen.¹⁰ þeos ⁊ þul
 lich oðere beoð alle ifreo wil to don^j
 f. 6 oðer to leten hwile me wule^a buten heo beon

f. 5^v ^a B alters the original scribe's *studestaðeluestninge* (for which cf. Corpus *stude steaðeluestnesse*, and similarly Nero) to *stude uestnesse* by (i) a stroke through *staðel*, (ii) another through the letters *nin* at end of line, above which B writes *nesse*, with a single insertion-mark before the cancelled letters, (iii) a stroke through the letters *ge* at beginning of next line. ^b After *bu* B adds single insertion-mark and the letters *te* above line to complete *bute*. ^c At end of line, after *⁊*, B adds in right margin *as of fur. oðer of oþer peril?* (addition, not in Corpus). The addition appears to be intended to follow on where it is written, and may perhaps be so taken, though it comes in awkwardly: '... except for need alone, such as force and such as (occasioned by fire or by other peril) fear of death'. ^d B alters point to *·*. ^e Below point after *herre* B adds double insertion-mark, and writes above line and into right margin *ȝe ne schulen ic segge makie na Ma uux of feste biheastes.* (addition, not in Corpus). ^f MS now *honde*, but the *e* is smaller than the other letters and not formed in way typical of scribe A; added I think by B over erasure, probably merely of point. ⁸ B adds oblique stroke to right of ascender of *d*; cf. f. 6, note *t*. ^h Final *t* roughly altered to *ð* by B, though penmanship uncharacteristic and resulting improvised letter-shape quite different from his own *ð*. Scribe D would not make such a change; he does not use *ð*, nor understand it when used. ⁱ B adds *h* before initial *w*, in line with original, to make *hwenne*. ^j B adds *·* at end of line.

f. 6 ^a After *wule* double insertion-mark, and B adds *⁊ hwen me wule* above line (correct emendation; cf. Corpus).

¹ Point erased. ³ Worm-hole in MS.; most of *e* lost. ⁴ So MS. ⁵ Part of A's *·* erased to reduce resemblance to question-mark. ⁶ Scribe D (who begins work here) adds in right margin outline drawing of hand, with index finger pointing to this line; first of many such. ⁷ D adds small paragraph-mark after point. ⁸ So MS.; the use of *h* for *ch* in certain words is a frequent though sporadic feature of A's spelling. ⁹ D adds *·o*. at end of line in right margin. ¹⁰ D adds vertical stroke through or beside original point. ¹¹ D adds *to* above line, marked for insertion after *beoden*.

for^b hoten.¹ Ach cherite. þ is luue. ⁊ edmod
 nesse. ⁊ polemodnesse. treowe schipe. ⁊ <h>al²
 dunge of þe^c alde^c ten hestes. Schrift.
 ⁊ penitence. þeos ⁊ pullich oðere þeo beoð
 summe of þe alde laze[.]³ summe of þe
 neowe.^d nebeoð þeose^e naut monnes fin
 dles. ach beoð godes godes^e hestes. ⁊ for
 þimot vhmōn neodeliche ham holden
 ⁊ 3e over⁴ alle pinges^e. for þeos riwlið
 ðe^f heorte.⁵ of⁶ hire [r]iulunge⁶ is al mest
 þ ich write. bute i[n]⁷ þe frumðe inþis
 boc ⁊ i[n]⁷ þe leste ende. þe^h pinges þ ich
 write þerofⁱ [in]þe[t]⁷ vttere riwle^k 3e ham
 holdeð alle mine⁸ leoue sustren vre
 lauerd beo hit þonked ⁊ schule
 porch his grace se lengere se betere
 ⁊ þach nulle ich naut þ 3e bi hoten
 heom ase heste to holden. for ase ofte
 ase 3e¹ bre[o]ke[ð]^m anⁿ þer ofⁿ. hit hurteð^o

^b So originally MS., but an attempt has been made, I think by B, to alter *for* to *bi* (correct emendation) by changing the *o* to *b* and superimposing *i* on the 2-shaped *r*. Presumably the corrector intended to complete his work by erasing the *f* and part of the *r*, but forgot to do so. ^c B strikes through *þe alde* and writes *alle þe* above (alteration of true text; cf. Corpus). ^d Point altered to *;* by B. ^e B deletes *þeose*, second *godes*, and *þinge* by striking through; in each case correct emendation. ^f B alters initial letter (which I think was certainly *ð*, though Herbert read it as *s*) to *þ*. ^g B alters initial *o* to capital *O*. ^h B alters initial *þ* to capital *þ*. ⁱ B adds *;* above line after *r* to separate words, thus *þer: of* (true text *her of*; cf. Corpus). ^j Initial *in* and final *t* erased to leave *þe*, obviously by B (goes with preceding and following changes). ^k B adds *;* after *riwle* to isolate phrase of *þe vttere riwle* mis-copied by A. ^l After *3e* B adds *þrefter* above line (correct emendation; cf. Corpus). ^m The *o* and final *ð* erased, and abbreviation-mark for *n* added above second *e* to make *breken*; correct emendation (cf. Corpus), obviously by B as part of a series of corrections by him. ⁿ B strikes through *an þer of* and writes *eni of ham* above (correct emendation; cf. Corpus). ^o B strikes through *hurteð* and writes *walde* above (see note *p* on p. 7).

f. 6 ¹ D adds paragraph-mark through original point. ² A himself adds *h* above line, marked for insertion before *a*. ³ Point erased. ⁴ So MS.; *v* in medial position. ⁵ D adds vertical stroke just to left of original point. ⁶ Worm-hole in vellum; only foot of *r* remains. ⁷ Letter erased after *i* which can only have been *n*. In each case Herbert noted 'one or two letters erased', but I do not think there was room for a second erased letter. Erasure almost certainly by B, to alter form of preposition to the *i* used at these two points by Corpus, and by himself elsewhere. ⁸ In middle of this and next two lines, after *mine*, *hit*, and *grace*, a slit in vellum, avoided by original scribe.

to swiðe^p ower heorte. ⁊ make[ð]^q ou swa
 offe[a]red^r þ 3e muze^s sone as god^t forbeo
 de.^d fallen^u in an vn hope[.]³ ⁊^v an vn bi
 Leauē[.]³ for to beon iborezen. for^w þi þ ich
 write ou mine leoue sustren of uttere þin
 ges in þe eareste dale of ouwer boc[.]¹ of
 ouwer seruise. ⁊ nomeliche inþe leste.
 3e ne schule naut bi haten hit ach ha
 bben hit on heorte. ⁊ don hit as 3e hit
 hefde bihaten Gef² ani vnweote³ askið
 ou[.]¹ of wat ordre 3e beoð ase summe doð
 3e telleð me þe sizeð þe gnete ⁊ swole
 3eð þe fleze² ondsweð of seint ia
 mes⁴ þe wes godes apostel.⁵ ⁊ for his

^d Point altered to *;* by B. ^p After *swiðe* B writes *hurten* above line. With previous change, this emends text into agreement with Corpus. ^q Final *ð* erased and abbreviation-mark for *n* added above *e*, to make *maken*, obviously by B (goes with change of *hurteð* to *walde* . . . *hurten*); but patching of A's form results in abnormal infinitive *maken* for normal *maken* (as in Corpus). ^r The *a* erased and the preceding *e* 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 *e* for *ea* in word with Anglian *e* for WS *æ*. ^s B strikes through *muze* and writes *muhten* above. ^t To right of ascender of *d* an oblique stroke, sloping upwards to the right, has been added, certainly by B; similar in penmanship and purpose to stroke added to *e* of *þe* when it means 'thee', which is also certainly by B (see f. 32, notes *i* and *j*, and f. 16^v, notes *f* and *h*). In this case the stroke is a diacritic to distinguish *god* in the sense 'God', which is also added by B in f. 5^v, l. 15, f. 12, l. 24, f. 15^v, l. 12, and f. 20, l. 13; it is wrongly added to *god* 'good' on f. 18 (see note *c* to f. 18). It therefore corresponds to the Corpus spelling *godd*, and the diacritic mark is probably intended as an indication that the letter should be doubled; Herbert's transcription *gode*, here and on f. 18, is wrong. A himself occasionally adds a similar stroke, but lighter and with a different slope, to the *o* of *god* in the sense 'good' (so on ff. 47^v, 52^v), equivalent to his spelling *good* (sometimes altered from *god*), and on f. 32^v, 6th line from foot, there is an accent-stroke on the *g* of *segen*, probably to indicate it should be *seggen*. ^u After *fallen* double insertion-mark, and above line (after double oblique stroke as reference-mark) B writes *i deseperance þ 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. ^v After ⁊ an insertion-mark, and B writes *inte* above line; unnecessary addition to A's text, which agrees with Corpus, but it goes with the *inte* in the previous addition. Nero here has *in vnbeleue* for *an vnbeleue*, but this is plainly not the original reading. ^w B alters initial *f* to capital *F*.

³ Point erased.

f. 6^v ¹ Point erased. ² 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 *3* from capital *G*. ³ D writes *congoun* above, as gloss. ⁴ D adds *ordre* above line, unnecessarily and against true text. ⁵ D extends and bars top of *l* of *apostel* and adds paragraph-mark after original point.