Leeds Studies in English

A Note on Modernity and Archaism in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* and Earlier Texts of *Ancrene Wisse*[1]

Tadao Kubouchi

In the Preface to the Ælfric Royal manuscript facsimile Peter Clemoes says:

> In this facsimile we watch a major author at work, for the manuscript of Ælfric's First Series of *Catholic Homilies* here reproduced is not far removed from the author's draft – it is a unique witness to this early stage – and reveals much of the correction and revision which the author's text underwent before it was issued for general use. To observe the process of composition is keenly interesting to critics of any literature; to gain this sort of insight into a work of medieval literature is a rare experience indeed, all the more valuable in that one of the finest products of Old English literature is involved.[2]

Ælfric first composed both series of the *Catholic Homilies*, his earliest work – the first series, dated 989 and the second series 992[3] – 'for his own use as mass-priest at Cerne [Abbas]'.[4] Manuscript $A_{\cancel{E}}$ (London, BL Royal 7 C. XII for *CH* I) represents this stage. Clemoes notes that 'Soon after being written A [here $A_{\cancel{E}}$] was subject to extensive revision and correction. [. . .] The various hands of the fully authenticated entries include Ælfric's[5], and 'Later he issued them in two series for general circulation to furnish the clergy with a sufficiently comprehensive body of orthodox preaching material in the vernacular. This stage is marked by the composition of the prefaces which have survived only in K [here $K_{\cancel{E}}$] [. . .]'[6]. $K_{\cancel{E}}$ (Cambridge, University Library MS Gg. 3. 28 (Clemoes' K)) could be said to represent a version issued for 'general use' or 'general circulation'.

'There is no reason', Sisam says[7], 'that K [$K_{\cancel{E}}$] is itself that authoritative copy'. But drawing inferences from other circumstantial evidence, Sisam concludes that, 'It

is, then, a copy, direct or indirect, of a collection built up under Ælfric's instructions; and is thus very near the fountain-head'. Godden also emphasises 'K's remarkable faithfulness to Ælfric in text and in arrangement'.[8] $K_{Æ}$ has both prefaces and is the only complete copy of the second series of *CH*. Thus the relationship between the two manuscripts could surely shed illuminating light on the 'West Saxon Schriftsprache' problem, although homilies are in the first place orally delivered prose. 'Schriftsprache' here is used to mean what the fair-copy scribes like the $K_{Æ}$ one thought to be properly standardised enough for 'general use' or 'general circulation'.

About 240 years later the above relationship finds its echo in that between the texts of the *Ancrene Wisse* (hereafter *AW*) as contained in London, British Library Cotton Cleopatra C. vi (here C_{AW}) and in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 402 (here A_{AW}). A_{AW} is dated 'about 1228-1230' and C_{AW} '1225-1230'.[9] We have a rare experience here again. $K_{Æ}$ is to $A_{Æ}$ what A_{AW} is to C_{AW}. '[I]n the Cleopatra MS we have the opportunity of watching the author himself working on revisions which were to contribute to his completed revision as seen, in fair-copy, in the Corpus MS'.[10] Dobson places especial stress on scribe B of manuscript C_{AW}. He takes him 'to be identical with the reviser, and indeed with the original author'.[11] To observe his revision and A_{AW}'s response gives a rare opportunity for insights into the linguistic situation of early Middle English period. Moreover, comparison of the relationship between the Cleopatra and Corpus manuscripts for the *AW* text on the one hand and that between the Cambridge University Library and Royal manuscripts for the *CH* I text on the other hand can throw illuminating light on the 'medieval Schriftsprache' problem. It is noteworthy that there are evident similarities, but also that there is some essential difference between the two relations. The difference is substantial and significant.

Clemoes[12] gives a revised version of Royal alteration lists originally set out in the Introduction to Eliason and Clemoes.[13] The lists include Ælfric's correction of numerous grammatical irregularities such as those in the declension of nouns and their gender and in the declension of adjectives after demonstratives and possessives, in the form of the relative, in the classes of weak verbs, the cases following verbs, and the mood of the verb in subordinate clauses, and in cases after prepositions, particularly *þurh*.[14] These alterations were almost always faithfully followed by $K_{Æ}$, although it is undeniable that $K_{Æ}$ is occasionally at variance with the Royal text. Punctuation sometimes differs. But on the whole $K_{Æ}$ seems to be poised to follow the altered text. Even in exceptional cases apparently deviating from $A_{Æ}$'s altered text, the $K_{Æ}$ scribe seems to have anticipated $A_{Æ}$'s imaginative re-revision.

The first deck of the apparatus of Clemoes' EETS edition records 'alterations in A's text that are nearly contemporary with the writing of the manuscript, whether by the main scribes, by Ælfric himself, or by other correctors'.[15] Out of 14 alterations in the declension of nouns recorded by Clemoes for *CH* I. 1, all the $A_Æ$ alterations are faithfully followed except for one instance, where $K_Æ$ does not adopt $A_Æ$'s change from *god* to *gode* after *ongean* at 34 in *CH* I. 1. $K_Æ$ changes $A_Æ$'s 'ongean gode ælmihitigum' to 'ongean god ælmihitigne' (accusative). $A_Æ$'s alterations include change from dative to accusative after *ongean*.[16] This observation, although very brief, still shows how faithfully $K_Æ$ adopted the revised $A_Æ$ text. We could perhaps say that the scribes concerned in the making or revising of $A_Æ$ and $K_Æ$ share almost the same idea with respect to what we here call their 'Schriftsprache', i.e. the language to be used for the version for 'general use' or 'general circulation'. The $K_Æ$ scribe has his contemporaneous 'Schriftsprache' to follow.

Now we turn to the 240-years-later counterpart and the interaction that we see between the manuscripts C_{AW} and A_{AW}, or rather between the C_{AW} original scribe and the C_{AW} reviser-author on the one hand, and the fair-copy A_{AW} scribe on the other. When compared with the case of Ælfric as we saw it in *CH* I. 1, the interaction or relationship in the case of *AW* shows about as many differences as similarities.

In Part 1 of *AW* as it is found in A_{AW} (Part 1, fols. 4r-12r), we come across quite a few imperative clauses, which amount to 74 examples, and in which, as we might imagine, VO order is predominant. That order accounts for 53 examples in the 'Vnoun-O' (VOn) order and 11 examples in the 'Vpron.-O' (VOpron) order. The remaining 10 are in the 'Noun-OV' (OnV) order. The examples are as follows.[17] Italics are mine. Curly brackets ({ }) indicate a part of the line expuncted by the original scribe.

1(A_{AW}) 4v25-26: her efter scheoiende ow 7 claðinde ow seggeð . Pater noster [. . .] Miserere n. *þis word seggeð* {æ}auer aþet ȝe beon al greiðe .
'After this, putting on your shoes and dressing, say "Pater noster [. . .], miserere nobis". Say these words all the time until you are completely ready.'

2(A_{AW}) 4v26: *þis word habbeð* muchel on us 7 [. . .]
'Make much use of these words and [. . .]'

3(A_{AW}) 6r22: Efter euensong anan *ower placebo* euche niht *seggeð* hwen ȝe beoð eise .
'After Evensong, say your 'Placebo' at once each night, when you are able.'

4(A$_{AW}$) 6v3: *Requiescant in pace* i stude of Benedicamus *seggeð* on ende .
'Say 'Requiescant in pace' instead of 'Benedicamus' at the end.'

5(A$_{AW}$) 6v9: *Seoue psalmes seggeð* sittinde oðer cneolinde wið þe letaníe .
'Say the Seven Psalms sitting or kneeling with the Litany.'

6(A$_{AW}$) 6v10: *fiftene psalmes seggeð* o þis wise .
'Say the Fifteen Psalms in this way.'

7(A$_{AW}$) 6v22: *Seoue salmes 7* þus *þeose fiftene seggeð* abuten under .
'Say the Seven Psalms and the Fifteen in this way at about the third hour of the day, i.e. 9 a.m.'

8(A$_{AW}$) 8r13: *alle hare sares setteð* in ower heorte .
'Set all their sorrows in your heart.'

9(A$_{AW}$) 9r7: 7 þenne *þe antefne segge* eauer þus .
'and then always say the antiphon thus:'

10(A$_{AW}$) 9r19: *nawiht ne changeð* bute þe salmes 7 te ureisuns .
'Change nothing except the psalms and the prayers.'

So far as those instances are concerned, we can hardly talk of modernity. Did they faithfully reflect the linguistic usage of the early thirteenth century? Certainly not; we have manuscript C$_{AW}$ and its contemporary manuscript N$_{AW}$ for evidence on this point. N$_{AW}$ is London, British Library, Cotton Nero A. xiv, fols. 1-120v; dated to the second quarter of the thirteenth century.[18] When those Corpus examples are compared with the readings of these two contemporary manuscripts, C$_{AW}$ (fols. 9r-19v) and N$_{AW}$ (fols. 4r-11r), a different picture appears; a picture of modernity, as it were, rather than archaism.

 While the Cleopatra scribes A (C$_{AW}$'s original scribe), B (the scribe whom Dobson takes to be the original author of *AW*) and D (a scribe of the late thirteenth century) and the Nero scribe leave examples 1, 2, 6 and 8 unaltered, they make certain alterations in the other cases. In example 3, C$_{AW}$ (scribe A) adds a *punctus* or point after the noun object *Placebo*, and N$_{AW}$ takes an even more remarkable step and, putting the noun object after the verb *sigged*, changes the OnV order into the modern VOn. In example 4 the verb is omitted in C$_{AW}$, while N$_{AW}$ employs the VOn

order. In example 5, C_{AW} (scribe D) adds a *virgule* (/) after the noun object *seoue salmes*. In example 7, although N_{AW} leaves the text unaltered, C_{AW} (scribe B) adds a *punctus elevatus* after the noun object *seoue salmes 7 fiftene*. In example 9, C_{AW} (scribe A) alters the OnV order into the modern VOn element order, which scribe B accepts, and N_{AW}, in order to avoid a risk of confusion as to the OnV order, adds a *punctus* and, erroneously, *7* before the verb *sigge*. Finally, in example 10, where C_{AW} leaves the basic element order unchanged (cf. manuscript A_{AW}, f. 12r2), N_{AW} employs a completely different sentence construction (OVS) with the subject *ʒe* added and the verb altered into present subjunctive.[19]

The alterations which we saw in C_{AW} and N_{AW} above could be interpreted to reveal and testify to the situation of the element order in imperative clauses in the early thirteenth century. We could safely say that by the second quarter of the thirteenth century the OnV order had become so restricted in use in imperative clauses, at least on the spoken language level in the dialect concerned, that the scribes found it necessary to change the order into a then common one, or at least to mark the pause after the preverbal noun object. The practice of preverbal object pointing is but a step towards the change into the VOn order, as is evident from the Nero and Cleopatra examples 3(N_{AW}), 4(N_{AW}) and 9(C_{AW}).

Thus the element order usage as found in the Corpus manuscript, so far as our examples are concerned, could be described as 'more archaic or formal'. This reflects the fact that there is a possibility that, even in terms of element order, the language of the Corpus text has been adjusted to conform to what might be called a 'thirteenth-century English literary standard', although it must have been locally restricted, or to the so-called 'AB language'. The A_{AW} scribe was probably expected to produce the 'AB language', and he has his retrospective, not contemporaneous, 'Schriftsprache' to follow. Here the sort of 'antiquarian sentiments' which Stanley pointed out in the case of the *Brut* might be called upon to explain A_{AW} scribe's sentiments as well.[20]

Whereas in the $A_{Æ}$-$K_{Æ}$ interaction case there was 'remarkable faithfulness', in this later case there is a certain difference between the C_{AW} and A_{AW} scribes in terms of their intention. N_{AW} also has its own intention. The A_{AW} scribe was responsible for the fair-copy version to be used for 'general use' or 'general circulation', and his version shows some bias. What we see in this picture is the presence of a preference for archaism and regularities, although on a small scale, on the one hand (as in the A_{AW} text), and the general intention to modernise and elucidate the language of the text on the other hand (as in the C_{AW} and N_{AW} texts). This pattern can be traced in the usage of relative pronouns. The second quarter of the thirteenth century is a pivotal period of time for the shift in usage of the relative pronouns from *þe* (*þeo*) to *þet* (or

þat, þ̄).[21] The following table[22] shows the frequency of various sequences of selection among *þe / þet* (*þat, þ̄*) in A_{AW}, C_{AW}, N_{AW} and V_{AW} as seen in Preface and Part 1. V_{AW} is added in anticipation of information about later developments. V_{AW} (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Eng. poet. a. 1; its usual siglum is V) is a manuscript of the late fourteenth century. *þ̄* is an abbreviated form for *þet* or *þat.*

TABLE 1

	A_{AW}	C_{AW}	N_{AW}	V_{AW}	Preface	Part 1
(a)	*þ̄*	*þ̄*	*þ̄*	*þ̄*	19	19
(b)	*þ̄*	*þe*	*þ̄*	*þ̄*	1(4r25)	2(7r24,9v11)
(c)	*þe*	*þ̄*	*þ̄*	*þ̄*	5	9
(d)	*þe*	*þ̄*	*þ̄*	--	0	1(12r23)
(e)	*þe*	*þ̄*	*þe*	*þ̄*	1(3r19)	0
(f)	*þe*	*þe(o)*	*þ̄*	*þ̄*	6	6
(g)	*þe*	*þe*	*þ̄*	--	0	1(8v28)
(h)	*þe*	*þe*	*þe*	*þ̄*	5(1v22, 2r17, 3r01,3r18, 26)	0
	Others[23]				6	6
	Totals				43	44

The table neatly shows how the weak form *þe* declined and the strong form *þet* or *þat* gained ground. However, we must remember that chronologically C_{AW} comes first. That it looks as if chronologically A_{AW} preceded the other manuscripts betrays how A_{AW} assumes archaic aspects. Syntactic factors working in the *þe / þet* (or *þat, þ̄*) selection in the A_{AW} text are succinctly explained by G. B. Jack.[24] He observes:

> In the Corpus text of *Ancrene Wisse*, then, the main factors affecting the selection of *þe* or *þet* are the syntactic function of the pronoun and the animateness and number of the antecedent. *Þe* is most used when the relative pronoun is the subject or when the antecedent is animate. The selection of *þet,* by contrast, is unaffected by the syntactic function of the relative pronoun; the preferred situation for the use of *þet* is

when the antecedent is inanimate, and in particular inanimate
singular, for when the antecedent is plural *þet* is less used than *þe.*

This explanation works well, but does not account for many other instances. Even
the 'animate-inanimate' criterion in the case of the antecedent does not always show
thorough consistency. As Suzuki notes, *'þe* is used generally for a person, and *þæt*
[*þet*] for a thing, though this is not always the case'.[25] The table which follows gives
an idea of *þe / þet* (*þat*) frequency percentages in the four manuscript texts.
Percentages are for Preface and Part 1.

TABLE 2

		A_{AW}	C_{AW}	N_{AW}	V_{AW}
Preface	*þe*	20 (47%)	12 (32%)	8 (19%)	0
	þet/þat	23 (53%)	25 (68%)	34 (81%)	42
Part 1	*þe*	22 (50%)	10 (26%)	2 (5%)	0
	þet/þat	22 (50%);	29 (74%)	41 (95%)	43

In view of the extraordinary variations among the earliest contemporaneous texts
A_{AW}, C_{AW} and N_{AW}, it will be evident that the situation is not explainable solely on
syntactic or phonological grounds. In view of the short span of time, i.e. c. 1225-
c. 1250, within which the three texts (A_{AW}, C_{AW} and N_{AW}) fall, the variations in
terms of *þe*-frequency (47 and 50%, 32 and 26%, 19 and 5%) are unexpectedly large.
What could account for such variations within the rather short span of time of about a
quarter century? Archaism or conservatism could probably be invoked, as in the case
of word order and punctuation usage above.

In what follows I would like to examine some examples to see aspects of
this relative pronoun selection process that are representative of how the A_{AW} scribe
responded to the altered text of the C_{AW} scribes. Here again what we see is a
preference for archaism and regularities, although on a small scale, on the one hand
(in the A_{AW} text), and the general intention to modernise and elucidate the language
of the text on the other hand (in the C_{AW} text). Sequences (a) and especially (b) could
be taken as representing an innovating tendency in the A_{AW} text. Sequence (a)
includes an example with an animate antecedent and a *þ*-relative used as the object
(A_{AW} 10r03: *þi brihte blisfule sune þ te giws wenden forte aþrusmin i þruh* ('[. . .] thy

bright blessed Son, whom the Jews thought to stifle in the tomb')). This example could be labelled as 'modern' in view of Jack's explanation, which is rather applicable to more conservative usage. The following examples are from sequence (b). Example 12 could be classified as 'modern'. ' ' indicate insertion.

11 (A_{AW}) 4r25-26 'your heart, in which is order and religioun and the soul's life'
A_{AW} ower heorte $þ$ ordre 7 religiun 7 sawle lif is inne .
C_{AW} ouwer heorte . *þe* ordre 7 religiun saule lif is inne .
N_{AW} ower he'o'rte . $þ$ ordre 7 religiun 7 soule lif is inne .
V_{AW} oure herte .   *þat* ordre . 7 Religion . and soule lyf lith þer Inne .

12 (A_{AW}) 7r24 'for the seven hours which Holy Church sings,'
A_{AW} 7 for   þe seoue tiden $þ$ hali chirche singeð
C_{AW} 7 for   þe seoue tiden *þe* hali chirche singeð [.]
N_{AW} 7 for   þe seoue tiden $þ$ holi chirche singeð
V_{AW} And for þe seue tyden *þat* holi chirche singeþ .

13 (A_{AW}) 9v11 'for the great bliss which you had'
A_{AW} for þe ilke muchele blisse   *þet* tu hefdest
C_{AW} for þilke muchele blisse   *þe* þu hefdest
N_{AW} vor þe ilke muchele blisse $þ$ tu hefdest
V_{AW} ffor þat ilke muchele blisse . *þat* þou heddest .

A_{AW}'s archaism or conservatism can most typically be found in sequences (c), (d) and (e), although sequences (f), (g) and (h) as well, at least in part, could be taken as representing the Corpus scribe's archaistic intention. We could say even with respect to examples of sequences (f), (g) and (h) that the Corpus scribe left unaltered archaic constructions which the Cleopatra text has. *Al(le)-þ* accounts for 7 (2 in Preface and 5 in Part 1) and *þet* 'what' 6 (5 in Preface and 1 in Part 1) of 36 examples (sequence (a)). It is to be noted that there is an example of 'archaic' *alle þe*-type clauses (cf. *OED*, s.v. all, II.5). This is a case of sequence (c).

14 (A_{AW}) 6v11 'the first five for yourself, and for all who do you good and wish you well.'
A_{AW} 6v11
A_{AW} þe earste fiue   for ow seolf . 7 for alle þe   ow god doð
C_{AW} Þe eareste fiue .   for ouseolf   7 for alle $þ$ ou god doð .

N$_{AW}$ þe uormeste viue uor ou sulf .   7 for alle ꝥ   ou god doð .
V$_{AW}$ þe ffurste fyue .   for ow self ⁖ and for alle .   þat ow good doþ .
A$_{AW}$ 6v12
A$_{AW}$ oðer   unnen .
C$_{AW}$ oðer god vnnen .
N$_{AW}$ oðer   unneð .
V$_{AW}$ oþer   wilneþ .

Examples 15 and 16 are of *þeo-þe* type (Cf. A$_{AW}$ 3r19, 8r12):

15 (A$_{AW}$) 1r11 'They are right who live according to a rule.'
A$_{AW}$ þeo beoð rihte   þe luuieð efter riwle .
C$_{AW}$ þeo beoð þe richte . þe liuieð efter riwle .
N$_{AW}$ ꝥ   beoð riht þeo .   þet libbeð efter riwle
V$_{AW}$ þulke beþ rihte ⁖   þat loueþ af*tur* rule .

16 (A$_{AW}$) 3r22 'similarly, he is fatherless who has through his sin lost the father of heaven.'
A$_{AW}$ 3r22
A$_{AW}$ þe is alswa federles   þe haueð þurh his sunne   forloren
C$_{AW}$ þeo is alswa federlese ꝥ haueð þorch his sunne   iloren
N$_{AW}$ þe is also   federleas . ꝥ haueð þurh his sunne ⁖ vorlore
V$_{AW}$ He is also . faderles   þat haþ þorw his su*n*ne   for lore*n*
A$_{AW}$ 3r23
A$_{AW}$ þe   feader of heouene .
C$_{AW}$ þene heȝe   feder of heouene .
N$_{AW}$ þene   Veder of heouene .
V$_{AW}$ þe   ffader of heuene .

In the following example (A$_{AW}$ 1r16) we find an example where the Corpus scribe did not follow the revised readings from the Cleopatra manuscript (entered by scribe B). Dobson observes, 'From *þoncg* to end of line underlined and also struck through; above, B writes *woh inwit 7 of wreȝinde ꝥ segge* (correct emendation; cf. Corpus)'.[26] Dobson speaks of 'correct emendation', but with respect to relative-pronoun selection he is not right. The Corpus scribe did not adopt the Cleopatra reading (i.e. scribe B's emendation). His text has *þe* instead of *ꝥ*.

17 (A$_{AW}$)1r16 'The one rules the heart and makes it even and smooth without the lumps and pits of a conscience crooked and accusing, which says, "Here you sinned", or "This has not yet been atoned for [. . .] " '

A$_{AW}$ 1r15

A$_{AW}$	þe an riwleð	þe heorte 7	makeð	efne	7 smeðe wiðute
C$_{AW}$	þ an riwleð	þe heorte 7	makeð	efne	7 smeðe wið vte
N$_{AW}$	þe on riwleð	þe heorte .þe	makeð hire	efne	7 smeðe wið vte
V$_{AW}$	þe on ruleþ	þe herte . and	makeþ	euene .	and smeþe wiþouten

A$_{AW}$ 1r16

A$_{AW}$	cnost 7 dolc	of woh	inwit 7 of	wrei3ende	þe segge .
C$_{AW}$	cnoste 7 dolke	of þoncg	inwið	unwrest 7 3irninde	þ
(B scribe)		'woh	inwit 7 of	wre3inde	þ segge'
N$_{AW}$	knotte 7 dolke .	of woh	inwit 7 of	wreinde .	þet seið .
V$_{AW}$	spotte of fulþe	of vnriht	inwit 7 of	schewynge .	þat sigge

A$_{AW}$ 1r17

A$_{AW}$	her	þu sunegest . oþer þis nis nawt	ibet 3et ase wel	as
C$_{AW}$	þu	her sunegest oðer þis nisnaut	ibet 3et	alse
N$_{AW}$	her	þu sunegest . oðer þis nis nout	ibet 3et also wel	alse
V$_{AW}$	her .	þou sungest . oþer þis nis nou3t	i bet 3it . as wel	as

A$_{AW}$ 1r18

A$_{AW}$	hit ahte .
C$_{AW}$	hit schulde .
N$_{AW}$	hit ouhte .
V$_{AW}$	hit ouhte .

Thus the relative pronoun selection as we find in the Corpus manuscript, too, so far as our examples are concerned, could be described as 'more archaic or formal', just as in the case of the element order and punctuation usage that we saw above. The A$_{AW}$ scribe had his retrospective, not contemporaneous, 'Schriftsprache' to follow. This makes a difference between the interaction or relationship as we see here in the *AW* case and what we see in the case of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies, First Series*. The relationship between the Royal manuscript scribe and his 'Schriftsprache' is a contemporaneous one. That of the Corpus scribe and his fair-copy model was a retrospective one.

NOTES

[1]   I should like to acknowledge my indebtedness to John Scahill for his kind help and invaluable advice.

[2]   N. E. Eliason and P. A. M. Clemoes, eds, *Ælfric's First Series of Catholic Homilies: British Museum Royal 7 C. XII, fols. 4-218*, EEMF, 13 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1966), p. 11.

[3]   Peter A. M. Clemoes, 'The Chronology of Ælfric's Works', in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of their History and Culture Presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. by Peter Clemoes (London: Bowes and Bowes, 1959), pp. 212-47 (repr. as *Old English Newsletter*, Subsidia 5 (Binghamton, NY: CEMERS, SUNY, 1980).

[4]   Peter A. M. Clemoes, ed., *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series: Text*, EETS, s.s. 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 65.

[5]   Clemoes, *Catholic Homilies*, p. 66.

[6]   Clemoes, *Catholic Homilies*, p. 65.

[7]   Kenneth Sisam, *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), p. 168.

[8]   Malcolm R. Godden, ed., *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series: Text*, EETS, s.s. 5 (London: Oxford University Press, 1979), p. xliii.

[9]   Eric J. Dobson, ed., *The English Text of the Ancrene Riwle Edited from B.M. Cotton MS. Cleopatra C. VI*, EETS, o.s. 267 (London: Oxford University Press, 1972), pp. ix and x.

[10]   Quoted from the review article by M. L. Samuels of E. J. Dobson, *The English Text* (*Medium Ævum*, 43 (1974), 78-80 (p. 79)).

[11]   Dobson, *The English Text*, p. ix.

[12]   Clemoes, *Catholic Homilies*, pp. 126-29.

[13]   Eliason and Clemoes, *First Series of Catholic Homilies*, pp. 28-35.

[14]   Clemoes says, 'Additions of substance entered in his hand or in those of others can be assumed to have originated with Ælfric. But what about all the minor corrections and revisions entered in the manuscript in early hands? Were they all the fruits of intense but unsystematic revision on Ælfric's part and did a number of people transfer them to Royal piecemeal from the copy or copies in which Ælfric entered them? Not necessarily, I think. Ælfric may well have let interested friends see the manuscript, and it would have been natural for him – as for any author – to ask qualified readers to correct any mistakes they noticed and to make any improvements they thought fit. The number and character of the hands in which the alterations are entered, and the fact that a few of the alterations in early-looking hands are not absorbed into the text of other manuscripts may

be indications that some of Royal's entries are to be explained in this way': Eliason and Clemoes, *First Series of Catholic Homilies*, pp. 34-35.

[15] Clemoes, *Catholic Homilies*, p. 168.

[16] See Clemoes, *Catholic Homilies*, p. 128, fn 15. Footnote 15, incidentally, needs a correction. For 162 (2x) read 163 (2x).

[17] Tadao Kubouchi, 'Word Order in the *AW* Revisited', in *Essays in Linguistics and Philology Presented to Professor K. Hasegawa on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday February 8, 1995*, ed. by A. Baba and others (Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1995), pp. 573-81.

[18] Mabel Day, ed., *The English Text of the 'AR' Edited from Cotton MS. Nero A. XIV: On the Basis of a Transcript by J. A. Herbert*, EETS, o.s. 225 (London: Oxford University Press, 1952), p. ix.

[19] For details see Kubouchi, 'Word Order'; and T. Kubouchi, Keiko Ikegami and others, eds, *The 'A-W': A Four-Manuscript Parallel Text. Preface and Parts 1-4*, Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature, 7 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2003).

[20] Eric G. Stanley, 'Laȝamon's Antiquarian Sentiments', *Medium Ævum*, 38 (1969), 23-37 (p. 27).

[21] Angus McIntosh, 'The Relative Pronouns *þe* and *þat* in Early Middle English', *English and Germanic Studies*, 1 (1947-48), 73-87; Kikuo Miyabe, 'A Note on the Relative Pronouns in Early Middle English', *Anglica*, 4:1 (1959), 56-69; Robert D. Stevick, 'Historical Selection of Relative *þat* in Early Middle English', *English Studies*, 46 (1965), 29-36; Kirsti Kivimaa, '*Þe' and 'þat' as Clause Connectives in Early Middle English with Expected Consideration of the Emergence of the Pleonastic 'þat'* (Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1966); Shigetake Suzuki, *The Language of the 'AW'* (Tokyo: Society of Social Sciences and Humanities, Tokyo Metropolitan University, 1967); George B. Jack, 'Relative Pronouns in Language AB', *English Studies*, 56:2 (1975), 100-107; Yoko Wada, 'Relative Pronouns in *AW* (MS. Corpus Christi College Cambridge 402) and *AR* (British Museum Cotton MS. Nero A. xiv) as a Criterion for Determining their Dates', *Kansai University Studies in English Language and Literature*, 22 (Osaka, 1983), 70-79; Sayo Yanagi, 'The Relative Pronouns *þe* and *þ* in the *AR* (1)-(3)', *Fukuoka University Review of Literature & Humanities*, 20 and 21 (1989), 20: 1293-1321 (1); and 21: 207-35 (2), 713-33 (3).

[22] From Tadao Kubouchi, 'Relative Pronoun Selection in the *AW*', in *Studies in English Historical Linguistics and Philology: A Festschrift for Akio Oizumi*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature, 2 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2002), pp. 225-37.

[23] (i) *þ----þ-þ* 4v10, 12r16; *þ----þ---* 2v11; (j) *þ-as-þ-þ* 2v21; (k) *þe----þ-þ* 6v19; (l) *þe-----þ* 3r28; (m) þe-ase-*þ-þ* 7v17; *þe-þe -hwose-þ* 11v07; (n) *þe-wase-þe-þ* 7r14-15, 12r03; (o) *þe-he(o)-þe-þ* 1v04, 3v08.

[24] Jack, 'Relative Pronouns', p. 105.

[25] Suzuki, *The Language*, p. 105.

[26] Dobson, *The English Text*, p. 2.