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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 992³ – 'for his own use as mass-priest at Cerne [Abbas]'.⁴ Manuscript Aₐ (London, BL Royal 7 C. XII for CH I) represents this stage. Clemoes notes that 'Soon after being written A [here Aₐ] was subject to extensive revision and correction. [. . .] The various hands of the fully authenticated entries include Ælfric's⁵, 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 Kₐ] [. . .].'⁶ Kₐ (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 says⁷, 'that K [Kₐ] is itself that authoritative copy'. But drawing inferences from other circumstantial evidence, Sisam concludes that, 'It
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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. K,E 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,E 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'. We have a rare experience here again. K,E is to A,E 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'. 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'. 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 gives a revised version of Royal alteration lists originally set out in the Introduction to Eliason and Clemoes. 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 purh. These alterations were almost always faithfully followed by K,E, although it is undeniable that K,E is occasionally at variance with the Royal text. Punctuation sometimes differs. But on the whole K,E seems to be poised to follow the altered text. Even in exceptional cases apparently deviating from A,E's altered text, the K,E scribe seems to have anticipated A,E's imaginative re-revision.
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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’. Out of 14 alterations in the declension of nouns recorded by Clemoes for CH I. 1, all the AÆ alterations are faithfully followed except for one instance, where KÆ does not adopt AÆ’s change from god to gode after ongean at 34 in CH I. 1. KÆ changes AÆ’s ‘ongean gode ælmihitigum’ to ‘ongean god ælmihitigne’ (accusative). AÆ’s alterations include change from dative to accusative after ongean. This observation, although very brief, still shows how faithfully KÆ adopted the revised AÆ text. We could perhaps say that the scribes concerned in the making or revising of AÆ and KÆ 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 KÆ 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 CAW and AAW, or rather between the CÆ original scribe and the CAW reviser-author on the one hand, and the fair-copy AÆW 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 AAW (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. Italicics are mine. Curly brackets ({ }) indicate a part of the line expuncted by the original scribe.

1(AÆW) 4v25-26: her efter scheoiende ow 7 claðinde ow segged . Pater noster [. . .] Miserere n. pis word segged {æ}auer abet 3e 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(AÆW) 4v26: pis word habbed muchel on us 7 [. . .] 'Make much use of these words and [. . .]' 

3(AÆW) 6r22: Efter euensong anan ower placebo euche niht segged hwen 3e beoð eise . 'After Evensong, say your 'Placebo' at once each night, when you are able.'
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4(AW) 6v3: *Requiescant in pace* i stude of Benedicamus segged on ende.
'Say 'Requiescant in pace' instead of 'Benedicamus' at the end.'

5(AW) 6v9: *Seoue psalmes segged* sittinde oðer cneolinde wið þe letanie.
'Say the Seven Psalms sitting or kneeling with the Litany.'

6(AW) 6v10: *fiftene psalms segged* o þis wise.
'Say the Fifteen Psalms in this way.'

7(AW) 6v22: *Seoue salmes* 7 þus þeose fiftene segged 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(AW) 8r13: *alle hare sares setted* in ower heorte.
'Set all their sorrows in your heart.'

9(AW) 9r7: *7 penne þene antefne segge eauer þus*.
'And then always say the antiphon thus:'

10(AW) 9r19: *nawiht ne changed* 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, CAW (scribe D) adds a virgule (/) after the noun object seoue salmes. In example 7, although NAW leaves the text unaltered, CAW (scribe B) adds a punctus elevatus after the noun object seoue salmes 7 fiftene. In example 9, CAW (scribe A) alters the OnV order into the modern VOn element order, which scribe B accepts, and NAW, 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 CAW leaves the basic element order unchanged (cf. manuscript AAW, f. 12r2), NAW employs a completely different sentence construction (OVS) with the subject 3e added and the verb altered into present subjunctive.19

The alterations which we saw in CAW and NAW 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(NAW), 4(NAW) and 9(CAW).

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 AAW 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 AAW scribe's sentiments as well.20

Whereas in the AÆ-KÆ interaction case there was 'remarkable faithfulness', in this later case there is a certain difference between the CAW and AAW scribes in terms of their intention. NAW also has its own intention. The AAW 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 AAW text), and the general intention to modernise and elucidate the language of the text on the other hand (as in the CAW and NAW 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 pe (peo) to pet (or
The following table shows the frequency of various sequences of selection among pe / pet (pat, p) 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. p is an abbreviated form for pet or pat.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$A_{AW}$</th>
<th>$C_{AW}$</th>
<th>$N_{AW}$</th>
<th>$V_{AW}$</th>
<th>Preface</th>
<th>Part 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>1(4r25)</td>
<td>2(7r24,9v11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1(12r23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>1(3r19)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>pe(o)</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1(8v28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>5(1v22, 2r17, 3r01, 3r18, 26)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table neatly shows how the weak form pe declined and the strong form pet or pat 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 pe / pet (or pat, p) selection in the $A_{AW}$ text are succinctly explained by G. B. Jack. He observes:

In the Corpus text of *Ancrene Wisse*, then, the main factors affecting the selection of pe or pet are the syntactic function of the pronoun and the animateness and number of the antecedent. Pe is most used when the relative pronoun is the subject or when the antecedent is animate. The selection of pet, by contrast, is unaffected by the syntactic function of the relative pronoun; the preferred situation for the use of pet is
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when the antecedent is inanimate, and in particular inanimate singular, for when the antecedent is plural *pet* is less used than *pe*.

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, '*Pe* is used generally for a person, and *pet* [pat] for a thing, though this is not always the case'. The table which follows gives an idea of *pe / pet (pat)* frequency percentages in the four manuscript texts. Percentages are for Preface and Part 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>pe</em></th>
<th><em>pet/pat</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>20(47%)</td>
<td>23(53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12(32%)</td>
<td>25(68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8(19%)</td>
<td>34(81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>22(50%)</td>
<td>22(50%);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10(26%)</td>
<td>29(74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(5%)</td>
<td>41(95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In view of the extraordinary variations among the earliest contemporaneous texts *A*ₚₚ, *C*ₚₚ and *N*ₚₚ, 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*ₚₚ, *C*ₚₚ and *N*ₚₚ) fall, the variations in terms of *pe*-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*ₚₚ scribe responded to the altered text of the *C*ₚₚ 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*ₚₚ text), and the general intention to modernise and elucidate the language of the text on the other hand (in the *C*ₚₚ text). Sequences (a) and especially (b) could be taken as representing an innovating tendency in the *A*ₚₚ text. Sequence (a) includes an example with an animate antecedent and a *p*-relative used as the object (*A*ₚₚ 10r03: *bi brihte blisfule sune þe giws wenden forte aprusmin 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'
\[\text{A}_{AW} \text{ ower heorte } \hat{p} \text{ ordre } \hat{p} \text{ religiun } \hat{p} \text{ sawle lif is inne } . \]
\[\text{C}_{AW} \text{ ouwer heorte } . \hat{p} \text{ ordre } \hat{p} \text{ religiun saule lif is inne } . \]
\[\text{N}_{AW} \text{ ower he'o'rite } . \hat{p} \text{ ordre } \hat{p} \text{ religiun } \hat{p} \text{ soule lif is inne } . \]
\[\text{V}_{AW} \text{ oure herte } . \hat{p} \text{ ordre } . \hat{p} \text{ Religion } . \text{ and soule lyf lith } \hat{p} \text{ Inne } . \]

12 (A_{AW}) 7r24 'for the seven hours which Holy Church sings,'
\[\text{A}_{AW} \text{ 7 for } \hat{p} \text{ seoue tiden } \hat{p} \text{ hali chirche singe\text{\textcircled{o}} } . \]
\[\text{C}_{AW} \text{ 7 for } \hat{p} \text{ seoue tiden } \hat{p} \text{ hali chirche singe\text{\textcircled{o}}} \text{[.]} \]
\[\text{N}_{AW} \text{ 7 for } \hat{p} \text{ seoue tiden } \hat{p} \text{ holi chirche singe\text{\textcircled{o}}} \]
\[\text{V}_{AW} \text{ And for } \hat{p} \text{ seue tyden } \hat{p} \text{ holi chirche singe\text{\textcircled{o}}} . \]

13 (A_{AW}) 9v11 'for the great bliss which you had'
\[\text{A}_{AW} \text{ for } \hat{p} \text{ ilke muchele blisse } \hat{p} \text{ tu hefdest } . \]
\[\text{C}_{AW} \text{ for } \hat{p} \text{ ilke muchele blisse } \hat{p} \text{ tu hefdest } . \]
\[\text{N}_{AW} \text{ vor } \hat{p} \text{ ilke muchele blisse } \hat{p} \text{ tu hefdest } . \]
\[\text{V}_{AW} \text{ ffor } \hat{p} \text{ ilke muchele blisse } . \hat{p} \text{ tu hefdest } . \]

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. \text{A\text{\textcircled{o}}}-(le)-\text{\textcircled{o}} accounts for 7 (2 in Preface and 5 in Part 1) and \text{pet} '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' \text{alle } \hat{p} \text{-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.'
\[\text{A}_{AW} \text{ } 6v11 \]
\[\text{A}_{AW} \text{ } \hat{p} \text{ earste fiue } \text{ for ow seolf } . \text{ 7 for alle } \hat{p} \text{ ow god do\textcircled{o}} \]
\[\text{C}_{AW} \text{ } \hat{p} \text{ eareste fiue } . \text{ for ouseolf } \text{ 7 for alle } \hat{p} \text{ ou god do\textcircled{o}} . \]
N_{AW} be uormeste viue uor ou sulf. 7 for alle p ou god do0.  
V_{AW} be ffurste fyue. for ow self: and for alle. pat ow good dop.
A_{AW} 6v12  
A_{AW} oeder unnen.  
C_{AW} oeder god vnnen.  
N_{AW} oeder unned.  
V_{AW} ofer wilnep.

Examples 15 and 16 are of peo-pe type (Cf. A_{AW} 3r19, 8r12):

15 (A_{AW}) 1r11 'They are right who live according to a rule.'  
A_{AW} peo beo rihte pe luuied after riwle.  
C_{AW} peo beo pe riichte pe liuied after riwle.  
N_{AW} pe beo riht peo. pet libbeot after riwle  
V_{AW} bulke bep rihte: pat louep after rule.

16 (A_{AW}) 3r22 'similarly, he is fatherless who has through his sin lost the father of heaven.'  
A_{AW} 3r22  
A_{AW} be is alswa federles be haueo burh his sunne forloren  
C_{AW} be is alswa federleso be haueo porch his sunne iloren  
N_{AW} be is also federleas be haueo burh his sunne vorlore  
V_{AW} He is also. faderles pat hafo porw his sunne for loren  
A_{AW} 3r23  
A_{AW} be feadar of heouene.  
C_{AW} bene heze feder of heouene.  
N_{AW} bene Veder of heouene.  
V_{AW} be 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 poncg to end of line underlined and also struck through; above, B writes woh inwit 7 of wrezinde p segge (correct emendation; cf. Corpus).' 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 pe instead of p.
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 [...]">

\[\begin{align*}
A_{AW} & \text{be an riwled he heorte 7 make} \quad \text{efne 7 sme} \text{e wi} \text{dute} \\
C_{AW} & \text{Þ an riwled he heorte 7 make} \quad \text{efne 7 sme} \text{e wi} \text{d vte} \\
N_{AW} & \text{be on riwled he heorte he make} \text{d hire efne 7 sme} \text{e wi} \text{d vte} \\
V_{AW} & \text{be on rule} \text{þ he herte . and make} \text{þ euene . and sme} \text{pe wi} \text{houten}
\end{align*}\]

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 Seahill for his kind help and invaluable advice.


5 Clemoes, Catholic Homilies, p. 66.

6 Clemoes, Catholic Homilies, p. 65.


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)).


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.


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


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

