2.3 Excluded Dry-Point Material from Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts

Some Anglo-Saxon MSS feature additions in dry-point that are very interesting in their own particular way, yet the MSS will not be considered as OE dry-point gloss MSS in the present study, because the additions do not consist of OE glosses as outlined above. The dry-point additions may be made up of non-linguistic material, they may consist of names or non-commentarial additions, they may consist of textual emendations to an OE text, or the linguistic status of the gloss material cannot be identified as OE for certain.

2.3.1 Dry-Point “Marks” and Dry-Point “Doodles”

Two dry-point features that are quite common in Anglo-Saxon MSS are simple “marks” – both interlinear and marginal – and “doodles” – mainly in the margins. The broad category of marks can take on various forms (like those of similar marks in ink), such as acute or grave accents added for prosodic purposes or simple crosses, sometimes perhaps serving the same functions as present-day Post-it® slips, namely marking passages that were of some importance or passages where the reader stopped and wanted to continue his reading later on. It may well be that such marks were entered in dry-point in order to leave the visual appearance of the MS intact, but it may just as well have been the case that the stylus was simply at hand and accordingly the marks were added in dry-point for practical reasons. Such marks in dry-point are often not mentioned in editions and MS catalogues, and their study – and hence our documented knowledge of them – is restricted to individual MSS.²⁹

The other common dry-point element in Anglo-Saxon MSS is “doodles” – often small, sometimes largish drawings, executed in dry-point, most often found in MS margins.³⁰ They feature all kinds of motifs, sometimes related to the text next to it, sometimes (at least seemingly) unrelated, but – like dry-point glosses – they generally do not show well on photographic facsimiles.³¹

³⁰ London, British Library Cotton Vitellius A. xix [K:217] provides an example of such a drawing in non-marginal position: A dry-point figure, perhaps representing St Cuthbert, is placed in a coloured panel of f. 8v, which may have initially been intended as background for an incipit for the ensuing Vita Cuthberti; cf. Nees (2003: 360, n. 96) for a detailed description.
³¹ Pictures can be taken successfully, though, by making use of grazing light; cf. Clemens & Graham (2007: 45 [Fig. 3–23]) for a photo of a marginal dry-point drawing from a 12th-c. German Cistercian missal (Newberry Library MS 7, f. 95r).
so their documentation is often restricted to hand-drawn copies. Similar to dry-point glosses, dry-point doodles are outshone by ink and colour specimens, which lend themselves more easily to art historians’ interests. Neither dry-point marks nor dry-point doodles feature OE language material; hence, they are not discussed here.

2.3.2 Dry-Point Names and Non-Gloss Entries

Sometimes we find names scratched into MSS that may have been meant to state either the owner or perhaps merely the reader of the document at hand, but no discernible connection can be established between the main text of the MS and the names that are entered. Lichfield, Cathedral Library Lich. 1 [G:269] (also known as the “Gospels of St Chad”) provides a documented example of a MS in which 8 (perhaps 9) names are added in dry-point to the margins and to empty spots. Interestingly, six of the names also form part of a long list of names added – presumably as a liber vitae – in ink to p. 141 of the same MS. Charles-Edwards & McKee (2008: 87) suggest that the writers of the names “wished to mark a personal link with the manuscript”, though it is not clear if the dry-point entries pre- or post-date the ink entries. In any case, these dry-point entries do not constitute an identifiable comment on the base text per se. Of course, it is no coincidence that the MS contains the Gospels and it was certainly the high status of the MS that ultimately led to its use as a liber vitae; however, adding the names was definitely not meant to be a comment of any kind on the text. The dry-point material of the Lichfield Gospels can be visualized in an interesting fashion on the website of the ‘Lichfield Cathedral Imaging Project’.

Such entries give interesting codicological and palaeographical cues for a MS’s history and it seems likely that dry-point additions of this kind may be discovered in further MSS in the future. They partly touch on the subject of dry-point glossing as they are also evidence for the use of styli as writing instruments in the MS context, but their MSS will not be included in the Catalogue presented below, as they do not qualify as glosses as outlined above.

CLA (2: 257) reports letters in dry-point that probably represent an Anglo-Saxon name inscribed in Oxford, Bodleian Library Selden Supra 30 [G:665]: “the letters EADB and +E+ cut with a stylus on page 47 may refer to Eadburga, Abbess of Minster (†751)”. Hence, the inscription may be seen as evidence that

---

32 Cf. Pulsiano (2002) for some very interesting examples.
33 An edition of the dry-point names, along with hand-drawn facsimiles of the names, is given in Charles-Edwards & McKee (2008: 81–82). The dry-point names are added on pp. 217, 221 and 226 of the MS.
34 URL: <https://lichfield.ou.edu/st-chad-gospels/features>.
the MS belonged to Minster-in-Thanet Abbey at some stage. The MS itself is written in uncial script (cf. also Lowe 1960: 21), “probably in a Kentish centre, to judge by the script” (CLA 2: 257), sec. viii¹ and contains the Acts of the Apostles.³⁵

Cambridge, CCC 57 [3/K:34] also features some dry-point writing that is considered to represent a name. It consists of runic letters, set in two lines in the margin of f. 30⁰, some of which may have been lost in the process of trimming. While the second line cannot be read with confidence, the first line is reported to spell out auarþ, which is considered to be the anglicised Scandinavian name “Hávarðr” (Graham 1996: 17). In addition to that, Cambridge, CCC 57 [3/K:34] also features 4 dry-point glosses to SMARAGDUS, Diadema monachorum, which is why the MS is included in the Catalogue below.³⁶

Dry-point runes spelling out the name Edelþryþ are reported from St Petersburg, National Library of Russia F.v.I.8 [G:841] (also known as the “Codex Fossatensis”, sec. viii or ix, originating perhaps from Northumbria). The inscription is placed between the columns of the final page of the Gospel of John on f. 213³.³⁷

CLA (2: 183) reports a short entry in Insular dry-point writing on the lower margin of f. 41⁰ of London, British Library Cotton Caligula A. xv [G:311], reading liofric sacerd garulf leuita, which can be translated as “the priest Leofric [and] the deacon Garulf”; CLA dates it sec. ix or x and takes it as evidence that the MS must have been in England by then – originating from north-eastern France, sec. viii².

Small corrections to the base text or to glosses consisting of single letters are also sometimes executed in dry-point. London, British Library Cotton Vespa-

³⁵ Anglo-Frisian runes in dry-point quoting the beginning of Psalm 1 in L. (beatus uir qui non habit in consilio impiorum et in via peccatorum) are reported from f. 1⁰ of Wolfenbüttel (D), Herzog August Bibliothek Cod. Guelf. 17 Weisenburg, which contains commentaries of the Psalms, sec. ix, 1⁰ half (Düwel 1999: 40). They are barely visible (some of them even decipherable) along the top margin of f. 1⁰ in the digital facsimile, publicly available from “Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel: Handschriftendatenbank”, URL: <http://dbs.hab.de/mss/?list=ms&id=17-weiss>. The MS was produced in Weissenburg Monastery (Alsace, F) and only left that location in the 17⁰ c. when it became part of the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel (Butzmann 1964: 126–127). When and where the runes were added to f. 1⁰ is unknown; an Anglo-Saxon background of the entry is not likely (except for the fact that the entry uses futhorc runes); however a Frisian background is not apparent, either.

³⁶ See below p. 106 for further references.

³⁷ Edition of the runic inscription, which features some exceptional runic characters, in Khlelev (2001), cf. also Houghton (2010: 115) and Kilpiö & Kahlas-Tarkka (2001: 41–44), who date the inscription sec. viii or ix; for the MS, cf. CLA (11: 1605), Gneuss (2001: 129 [no. 841]) and the bibliography provided by Kilpiö & Kahlas-Tarkka (2001: 44). Prof. Houghton of the University of Birmingham was so kind to send me a series of screenshots of Khlevov’s (2001) article, which was published on a CD-ROM and proved difficult to obtain.
sian A. i[K:203] (also known as the “Vespasian Psalter”), for instance, features a dry-point letter <t> added to the ink gloss OE gas ‘ghost, spirit’ (Pulsiano 2001: 737) glossing L. spiritus ‘ghost, spirit’ (Psalm 50:19). Such inconspicuous dry-point additions are not readily detected: It must be assumed that Sweet (1885: 258) did not notice the additional dry-point t and as a consequence marks the unusual form OE gas with an asterisk in his edition. While it can be argued that this t represents OE language material and hence constitutes an OE gloss (or at least part of it) in dry-point, I do not count this in as evidence of dry-point glossing activity in the “Vespasian Psalter”, but I think that this type of entry is more fruitfully termed “dry-point emendation”. After all, it can be argued that the extra <t> does not gloss the L. text, but it emends the original gloss gas, about whose form we can only speculate. It may well be that the lack of the final <t> in the original gloss may be due to a simple scribal error.

Interestingly, Toon (1991: 91) also reports dry-point compilation marks from the “Vespasian Psalter” [K:203] on ff. 12r–26r, consisting of single letters taken continuously from the Roman alphabet. He assumes that the marks “take on meaning as notes made before the text was written and that helped a scribe lay out a plan for having the book copied, as he or she guessed how much space was needed for the text of the psalms” (Toon 1991: 91). They are reminiscent of the compilation notes that Schipper reports from the “Benedictional of St Æthelwold” [G:301] (cf. p. 51 below).

A runic dry-point entry whose inner connection with the base text is difficult to assess has been edited from Exeter, Exeter Cathedral 3501 [K:116] (also known as the “Exeter Book”). Förster (1933: 64) mentions a runic dry-point entry incised in the top right margin of f. 125r of the “Exeter Book”, next to the riddle 62/64 with the reputed solution “ship” (Williamson 1977: 105 [no. 62]; Muir 2000: 361 [no. 64]). Förster transliterates it as “BUGRД, but he takes the view that this runic entry and other marginal notes were added long after the “Exeter Book” had been written and he suggests an early-modern date of entry, “perhaps of the 17th century” (64). Williamson (1977: 327) disagrees with Förster’s reading of the third rune and suggests ᚠᚠᚨᚱ “B UNRÐ”, instead, also stressing the slightly larger spacing after the first rune. Williamson disagrees with Förster’s view that the entry was not genuinely medieval, but sees it as Old English, implying a date of entry still in the Anglo-Saxon era. Williamson (ibid.) reports that R.I. Page suggested to him “mischievously” in private communication that the runes might stand for OE beo unreþe, which he translates as “don’t be cruel” and hence as a comment on the difficulty of the riddle. Williamson provides a photograph of the runic dry-point entry (1977: 59 [Pl. XVII]), probably photographed under grazing light conditions. The individual runes are well discernible in the picture and the assumption that we deal with runic N seems
more convincing than runic G, as one of the staves is upright with respect to the direction of writing and the other stave is slanting from top right to bottom left. Muir (2000: 708) interprets this way of writing the N rune as an error and deems it possible that the rune might in fact represent A, comparing it to similar forms on the Jelling Stone. Based on Williamson’s photograph, I cannot notice anything unusual about the form of the N rune, rather it seems mirrored along the vertical axis, which is not unusual in runic writing at all (cf. Page 1999: 41; Düwel 2001: 10 [“Wenderune”]). Muir (2000: 708) also points out that the final thorn rune is rather bottom-heavy and might as well be construed as a wynn rune <ᚹ>, but he does not present a possible reading with final -w. In any case, the actual connection between the inscription and the text of the riddle does not become apparent, even though the riddle itself contains several runes, which might have inspired the use of runes in the dry-point annotation. In view of the other examples of runic names entered in dry-point in Anglo-Saxon MSS mentioned above, a reading of the runes as a name would be imaginable, too, but no immediate reading springs to mind, unfortunately.

In addition to this runic dry-point entry, the “Exeter Book” contains several dry-point etchings, some of which were even reproduced as actual dry-point etchings in the 1933 facsimile (Chambers et al. 1933). Conner (1986: 236–237) disagrees with Förster’s late date for the dry-point sketches, based on the observation that in four of the drawings “the writing goes over the drypoint lines”, which he takes as evidence “that these drypoints and surely others in the same styles were on the parchment” before the writing was added in the third quarter of the 10th c. Conner presents a list of the dry-point drawings in the “Exeter Book” (Conner 1986: 237; enlarged in Conner 1993: 122), including “two large initial eths in the right margin of f. 80” and “two ornate initial Ps (one above the other)” on f. 95r, and he argues that their absence in his hypothesized first collational “booklet” can serve to differentiate it from the other “booklets”. However, Muir (1989: 277–279) refutes Conner’s observation by reporting previously unnoticed dry-point etchings in Conner’s hypothesized first “booklet”, some of which may represent letter forms: “perhaps including eth and wynn” and others “most closely resembling an O and a P” on f. 47v.38 Interestingly, Alger (2006: 153) also reports a previously unnoticed beginning of a dry-point alphabet plus several worn letter-like dry-point etchings on f. 49v of the “Exeter Book”. The

38 Muir (1989) includes some facsimile pictures that were probably photographed under grazing light conditions to highlight the dry-point drawings and writings: foliate and vine and tendril patterning on f. 24r (Pl. 21), initial Ps and pointing hands on f. 95r (Pl. 22), dry-point marks, perhaps representing another robed figure, “too indistinct for identification” (Conner 1993: 122) on f. 96v (Pl. 23a), a robed figure on f. 87r (Pl. 23b), a foliate rosette on f. 64v (Pl. 23c) and head and wings of an angel on f. 78r (Pl. 23d).
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crude forms of the letters lead Alger to the conclusion that the glossator was merely practising letterforms, which are made up of mixed Insular and Caroline minuscules. None of the commentators can make perfect sense of the dry-point annotations vis-à-vis the base text. They do not seem to gloss anything as such, but the fact that even after Förster’s, Conner’s and Muir’s thorough searches for dry-point material, Alger (2006) was still able to find previously unreported etchings seems worth noting.

Another case of a runic dry-point inscription whose linguistic status as OE is uncertain and whose inner connection to the base text remains unclear is presented by St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 188. Nievergelt (2009a: 65–68) describes a runic dry-point inscription that he deciphers as ᚖᚳᚨᚹ, illustrated by a photographic picture of the entry from the bottom margin of p. 77, shot in grazing light conditions (2009a: 67). According to Nievergelt, the incision is very neat and distinct and the reading of the individual runes is quite certain. Since the second rune presupposes futhorc usage, the inscription is probably to be interpreted as “ECÆW”, but Nievergelt cautions that the status of runic usage in St. Gallen is difficult to assess and hence the third rune could possibly have been meant to represent A and the fourth rune might have been meant to represent thorn rather than wynn. In any case a L. or OHG interpretation of the inscription seems unlikely out of graphematic and phonological considerations. Due to the fact that other St. Gallen MSS are known to contain OE (in one case, St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 1394, Part IX[32/K:A44], even in dry-point), Nievergelt is inclined to interpret the inscription as OE ecg-ǣ(w), a supposed hapax legomenon composed of ecg “sword” and ǣ(w) “law” referring to the text of MAXIMUS TAURINENSIS’s Homily 114 on the same MS page concerned with military service. No specific lemma in the text can be tied to the inscription, so the runic entry would have to be understood as a very general comment on the text as a whole.

Another runic dry-point entry, which may represent a general comment on the base text, is reported from the “Blickling Psalter” (New York, Pierpont Morgan Library 776 [G:862]) by Pulsiano (2002: 190):39

In the Blickling Psalter, in the bottom margin of f. 82r, appear scratches in a large, sprawling hand, easily passed over, but which appropriately spell in runes the word “psalter” (as ᴬsالت爷).

Unfortunately, Pulsiano does not provide a precise description of his find or a drawing of this interesting entry. The linguistic status of this entry is difficult to assess and a detailed runological examination would be in order. It has to be

39 M. J. Toswell, from the University of Western Ontario, kindly drew my attention to Philip Pulsiano’s last, posthumously published, article.
assumed that the initial question mark in Pulsiano’s transliteration is meant to indicate at least one further undecipherable rune, for which a runic p would be a likely candidate.\textsuperscript{40} Syncope of the medial vowel (i.e. \textit{-tr}) is not compatible with L. \textit{psalterium}, and also in OE it is attested only once in the \textit{DOEC} 2009, in the form \textit{saltre} (dat. sg.) from the very late “Eadwine Psalter”,\textsuperscript{41} glossing L. \textit{psalterio} (Psalm 143, referring to the instrument, not to the Book of Psalms). Both syncope of the medial vowel and the ending \textit{-ie} are reminiscent of ME forms (cf. MED “\textit{sautri(e (n.)}”), however the \textit{-l} is not typical for ME, where forms in \textit{-u} or \textit{-w} dominate by far, though the former does occur. The lack or presence of initial \textit{p-} cannot help in dating the entry, either, although forms with initial \textit{p-} are more common in OE than in ME. Lacking a runological dating, I am inclined to assume that this dry-point runic entry may be of a late date, perhaps even eME.

Derolez (1954: 8) reports dry-point MS runes from London, British Library Cotton Domitian A. ix [K:151], f. 11\textdegree.\textsuperscript{42} In the originally blank space below a tabular representation of the Anglo-Saxon futhorc, runic dry-point \textit{f u h o (?), runic dry-point a b c d e f g h i k l m n o p} and a solitary runic dry-point \textit{g} have been added in a “rather careless way”, as Derolez puts it. The runes were probably inspired by the runes given on the page. The date of their entry is unknown, but they must have been entered before the antiquary Robert Talbot (1505[?–1558) added explanations of the rune names in the same blank space in sec. xvi. The fact that Talbot wrote right across the dry-point writing may point either to the possibility that he did not see the dry-point runes or that he chose to ignore them. They are easily visible in the facsimile given by Derolez (1954: Pl. 1); in fact, they are so easily visible that one may wonder whether their edges have been smudged or whether they were originally entered in (now faded) ink, pencil or crayon, leaving a dry-point-like appearance.\textsuperscript{43}

Kassel, UB 2° Ms. theol. 65 [13/K:121\textsuperscript{*}] also features an alphabet – consisting of 20 symbols, mainly in Anglo-Saxon runes, but also including some non-runic

\textsuperscript{40} In OHG editions, the question mark can also stand for a scratch that may or may not present a letter. Uncertain letters, on the other hand, are indicated by a dot <.> (cf. p. 56).
\textsuperscript{41} Cambridge, Trinity College Library R. 17. 1, sec. xii; the interlinear gloss is very late, sec. xii\textsuperscript{med} (Ker 1957: 135–136 [no. 91]).
\textsuperscript{42} Fol. 11 is a single leaf, originally the ending of a now lost MS, sec. xi, with additions sec. xii, cf. Ker (1957: 188–189 [no. 151]).
\textsuperscript{43} Incidentally, Derolez (1954: 178) also noticed dry-point writing in Bern, Burgerbibliothek Cod. 207: “A couple of letters (XA?) were scratched with a dry point, but seem to have no relation to the following runes.” The MS was probably written in Fleury, sec. viii/ix, and contains several interesting runic alphabets, some of which feature Anglo-Saxon runes. However, in view of the MS’s origin and provenance, Anglo-Saxon background for the dry-point material seems unlikely.
symbols – representing the letters a to u, scratched into its back cover. The MS also features an interesting runic dry-point inscription on its front cover that seems to mix runic and Roman writing. It is probably meant to give a terse indication of the MS’s contents as the name _iosepi_ is entered three times (once only partially), referring to _PSEUDO-HEGESIPPUS_, whose _De bello Iudaico_ is contained in the MS. The MS itself was written in (Northern?) Italy, sec. vi, and presumably passed through England to Fulda, probably in connection with Boniface’s missionary activities. Wiedemann (1994: 96) mentions a date sec. viii/i× for the runic inscriptions. The MS also features some of the oldest OE dry-point glosses that we know, which is why the MS is included in the _Catalogue_ below.

For some reported dry-point material, there is no edition available that I am aware of. Ó Cróinín mentions dry-point glosses in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preussischer Kulturbesitz Ms. Hamilt. 553 [G:790] – an illuminated Roman Psalter, nicknamed “Salaberga Psalter”, originating from Northumbria, perhaps Lindisfarne, sec. viii” (Gneuss 2001: 118). All the information that is available to me at the moment is given in Ó Cróinín (1994: 16): “There are a few dry-point glosses (fol. 12v lower margin; 13vb small-cap ò, between tramlines; 35v centre; not noted by Lowe [(CLA 8: 1048)] or Boese [(1966: 270)], but they do not reveal anything of the manuscript’s early history.” Unfortunately, I could not find any further information on the subject. Since the MS originates from Anglo-Saxon England, there is at least the possibility that this material might be OE, although Ó Cróinín’s phrasing would not suggest it.

James (1912: 316) reports “an old scribble in large letters made with a dry point” on f. 1r of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 422 [K:70] without providing a reading. Some letter forms of the scribble are visible in the digital facsimile provided by “Parker Library on the web”. The MS containing _Salomon and Saturn_, sec. xmed, and a missal, sec. ximed, is described by Ker (1957: 119–121 [no. 70]), but he does not mention the scribble, which may or may not be an indication that the scribble is in L. Its position and size suggest that it is probably not a text gloss.

---


45 Facsimile drawing and short discussion in Lehmann (1925: 16). Derolez (1954: 414) agrees with Lehmann’s reading, which hinges on a mixture of runic ᛖ ‘e’ and Roman ‘P’ – disguised as runic ᚲ ‘w’ – forming a peculiar bind rune. The fact that the alphabet on the back cover also features ᛖ ‘w’ where we would normally expect ᛖ ‘p’ gives further credence to this interpretation.

46 I contacted Prof. Ó Cróinín via email to establish whether the dry-point glosses are in Latin or in some vernacular. He was so kind to reply, but he could not specify, unfortunately: “That seems to be all I have!” (personal communication, March 11, 2013).

2.3.3 Dry-Point Annotations to the “Old English Bede”

Wallis (2013a, 2013b) presents an interesting case of dry-point annotations in a copy of the OE translation of Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* preserved in Oxford, Corpus Christi College 279B, Part II [K:354] (O). This early 11th-c. copy of the “Old English Bede” was revised by a corrector – presumably of sec. xi – who added short “interventions” to the OE text, usually consisting merely of a few letters added in dry-point, of which Wallis records “at least eighty-nine in Book 3” (2013b: 161). Wallis makes a careful attempt at classifying the different types of relationship between the dry-point annotations and the original text.

The largest group of dry-point annotations is concerned with a number of grammatical emendations to the text, such as pronouns in the accusative case following the preposition OE *mid*. The corrector – working in dry-point – adds the dative ending of the demonstrative pronouns above the forms, only replacing the letters that have to be changed to arrive at the dative form. Wallis (2013b: 173) quotes the example OE *mid þa gyfe* ‘with the gift’ (f. 26v), above whose demonstrative pronoun the corrector added the letters *ære* in dry-point in order to turn the acc. form of the OE pronoun from *þa* (f. acc. sg.) into *þære* (f. dat. sg.).

In a second, smaller group of annotations, lexical substitutions are made in dry-point. Thus, for instance, the reading *hiwan* ‘retainers’ in the relative clause *þe se cyning ne cuðe ne his hiwan* ‘which neither the king nor his retainers knew’ is emended to the contextually quasi-synonymous *hired* ‘household’ by means of a drypoint superscript *red* on f. 42v. Wallis (2013b: 181) surmises that “*hiwan* was losing popularity to *hired* in the course of the eleventh century”.

In a third group Wallis sorts textual annotations, in which Anglian spellings are modified to comply with West Saxon spelling conventions. The spelling *Pehta* ‘Pict’ (with Anglian smoothing) in two instances of Book 3, for instance, triggered the addition of dry-point <o> above the <eh>, transmuting the form into *Peohta*, displaying breaking. Incidentally, a third appearance of the same word form remains unamended. In other places, readings that are impaired by cramped lettering are confirmed in dry-point (Wallis 2013b: 186), and in two instances past participle forms are prepended by prefixal *ge-* (188).

Wallis also identifies a number of dry-point emendations which she takes as evidence that variant readings may have been incorporated from other exemplars of the translation of Bede’s History in dry-point. MS O reads *7 þær wæs* ‘and there was’ and features a superscribed <o> above the Tironian note. This
emendation can be made sense of before the backdrop of the readings provided by MSS T and B oder wæs ‘the other was’.

These are interesting finds that leave us hungry for more. If dry-point emendations were added to OE MSS in 11th-c. England, it may well be that other (perhaps even well-known) MSS of OE texts feature similar annotations that have so far gone unnoticed due to their difficult visual nature. However, I shall not include these emendations as dry-point glosses proper in the present Catalogue. They can certainly be called “glosses” in Wieland’s (1983) sense, but in the traditional terminology of OE glossography they do not qualify as glosses.

Their “comment” on the text, if you like, is of an altogether different kind. Yet, such annotations are closely related to dry-point glosses and it is to be hoped that similar observations will soon be collected from other MSS to put this usage of the stylus into perspective.

2.3.4 Dry-Point Glosses of Uncertain Linguistic Status

The “Echternach Gospels” – Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 9389 [G:893], written around AD 700 in Northumbria or an Insular centre on the Continent – have long been suspected of featuring an OE gloss, at times even two OE glosses.

Several articles have been published on the topic, but no detailed linguistic study successfully arguing that any of the glosses are OE has been published to date. CLA (5 [1950]: 578) reports a single, supposedly OE dry-point gloss bigine glossing L. incipientes (Jn 8: 9) on f. 194r. Muller (1985: 67–69) edits 10 dry-point glosses from the MS, of which he identifies 2 as OHG (including the gloss bigine that CLA thought to be OE) and 8 as L. In a first draft of his edition (Muller 1983), which Muller himself later considered to be obsolete (cf. Muller 1985: 69, n. 226), Muller had thought the above-mentioned gloss bigine and another dry-point gloss, which he read as scip (Muller 1983: 388), to be OE. Muller later (Muller 1985), however, argues convincingly that bigine ought to be considered OHG and the other gloss to be L. s cip, meaning L. s[cilicet] cip ‘read “cip” [instead of coep]’, which he assumes to be a (partial) emendation of the text’s original L. coepimus (Lk 5:5). Hence, while Muller (1983: 389) initially agreed with CLA

48 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10 (T) and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41 (B).
49 Wallis (2013b: 161–164) provides an insightful discussion of the vagueness of the term “gloss” in Wieland’s (1983) and Stork’s (1990) conceptualization, concluding that she also prefers to categorise the dry-point material found in O “as ‘annotations’ or ‘corrections’, rather than as ‘glosses’”.
50 An online digital facsimile of the MS is available at “Gallica: Bibliothèque numérique”. URL: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b530193948>.
51 The gloss is placed in between the columns next to ll. 17/18; the gloss is surprisingly clearly visible in the online digital facsimile.
that the form *bigine* was OE, two years later (1985: 69) he is in favour of OHG (["[d]och liegt eine Deutung aus dem Althochdeutschen näher")\(^52\).

Ó Cróinín, however, who is apparently not aware of Muller’s updated (1985) edition and instead refers to Muller’s retracted (1983) edition, repeats CLA’s claim that the gloss *bigine* is OE:

The Echternach Gospels have not usually been included in discussions of manuscripts containing Old English and Old High German glosses, although E. A. Lowe had pointed out (CLA V 578) the presence of one such OE dry-point entry (f. 194r incipientes gl. *bigine*). (Ó Cróinín 1999: 87)\(^53\)

Ó Cróinín (1999) also edits an additional 9 or 10 L. dry-point glosses, which Muller (1985) does not mention, but Ó Cróinín also repeats Muller’s retracted (1983) reading *scip* without specifying its supposed linguistic status. Ó Cróinín does not explicitly discuss any of the forms, but he appears to be in favour of OE, at least for the gloss *bigine*.

Glaser (1997: 17–18) edits 12 dry-point glosses from the “Echternach Gospels”, 10 of which had not been edited before, and she only cautiously refers to them as “volkssprachig”.\(^54\) \(BS\kappa\) (1478) – presumably based on Glaser & Moulin-Fankhänel (1999: 108) – refers to 12 dry-point glosses and reports the language of all the vernacular glosses in the “Echternach Gospels” as “unbestimmt”.\(^55\) The majority of German scholars mentioning the dry-point glosses in the “Echternach Gospels” is undecided: “altenglische oder althochdeutsche Stilusglosse” (Ebersperger 1999: 110);\(^56\) “wohl alle deutsch […] (englisch in einigen Fällen nicht ausgeschlossen)” (Seebold 2001: 36);\(^57\) “[a]ltenglisch in einigen Fällen aber doch nicht völlig ausgeschlossen” (Köbler 2005: 511);\(^58\) “Glossen in beiden Sprachen […] (wohl auch) im Echternacher Evangeliar” (Bulitta 2011: 166);\(^59\) no gloss in particular, however, is explicitly declared to be OE. That means that the inclusion of the “Echternach Gospels” as an OE dry-point gloss MS in our current *Catalogue* really only hinges on the conflicting statements about the linguistic attribution of the gloss *bigine*.

---

52 I. e. ‘however, an interpretation as OHG is closer to the mark’.
53 In fact, I think it was Bischoff and not Lowe who actually identified the dry-point gloss (cf. p. 233 below), though I do not have sufficient evidence on this point at the moment.
54 I. e. ‘vernacular’.
55 I. e. ‘indeterminate’.
56 I. e. ‘OE or OHG dry-point gloss’.
57 I. e. ‘probably all of them German […] (English cannot be ruled out in some cases)’.
58 I. e. ‘OE not completely ruled out in some cases’.
59 I. e. ‘glosses in both languages [i.e. OHG and OE] […] (probably also) in the Echternach Gospels’.
The reading *bigine* (with Insular <\(\xi\)> for the gloss in question is confirmed by *CLA* (5: 578), Muller (1983: 389), Muller (1985: 69), Glaser (1997: 18), Ó Cróinín (1999: 87) and Glaser & Moulin-Fankhäuser (1999: 108).\(^{60}\) Nievergelt & De Wulf (2015) point out the existence of a further letter after <e>, perhaps <c>. Muller offers hand-drawn reproductions of the dry-point material (1983: 386 and 1985: 70) and he hints at the possibility that there might be an abbreviation stroke on top of <n>,\(^{61}\) but his reproductions do not document that mark and none of the other editors mention it; Nievergelt & De Wulf (2015) clearly reject the notion after having autopsied the dry-point writing.

*CLA*’s (5: 578) and Muller’s (1983: 10) initial (but later retracted) identification of the form *bigine* as OE and the subsequent unassertive treatment of that gloss in OHG scholarly literature is motivated, at least partly, by the fact that the form *bigine* does not fit OHG expectations; especially the single -n- of the form is suspicious, but it is only rarely attested in OE, too. Since the gloss is formally incongruent with its lemma *incipientes*, some kind of abbreviation or merograph would have to be pre-supposed. Muller (1985: 69) tentatively (and in apparent disbelief) expands to OE *biginnende*; Nievergelt & De Wulf (2015: 92–94) reconstruct OHG *biginnag* or OE *beginag* ‘beginning’ while stressing that their reading somewhat hinges on the final <c>, which remains uncertain.

From the point of view of OE phonology, retention of i in unaccented syllable would be compatible with the early date of the glosses in the “Echternach Gospels”, which are generally dated sec. viii (e.g. *BStK* 1478 [no. 774b]). Although PGmc. *bi-* (Orel 2003: 44–45) was generally reduced in unstressed positions to OE *be-*, and remained high front only in nominal formations where the stress came to rest on it, such as OE *biggeng* ‘practice’ (stressed on the first syllable) vs. OE *begangan* ‘to practice’ (stressed on the second), retention of i is in fact attested in very early texts (Campbell 1959: § 369). From the point of view of lexicography, however, it is important to note that among the various prefixal variants of *-ginnan, be-ginnan* is by far the least common in OE, with OE *in-ginnan* and OE *onginnan* being far more typical (as was already pointed out by Muller 1985: 69). Moreover, *bi-ginnan* with prefixal *bi-* is never attested in an early OE text and only rarely in the whole corpus, anyway: Out of 200 forms of OE *beginnan* recorded in the *DOEC* 2009, only two forms show the prefix *bi-*: it is attested once in the continuous gloss of the “Rushworth Gospels” (Oxford,

---

\(^{60}\) Both Glaser & Moulin-Fankhäuser (1999: 107, n. 14) and Ó Cróinín (1999: 87, n. 14) independently report that Prof. Thomas Toon was also working on the MS around 1988, but apparently no publication resulted from it.

\(^{61}\) Muller (1985: 69): ‘Vielleicht steht über dem n ein Abkürzungsstrich.’ I.e. ‘Perhaps there is an abbreviation stroke above n.’
Bodleian Library Auctarium D. 2. 19 [K:292], with OE *biginnes* glossing L. *coep eritis* in Lk 3:8), probably added sec. x, and once in two late copies (sec. xiv and sec. xvi) of a royal L. grant with OE bounds (Sawyer 1968: no. 556; dated A.D. 951, OE *bigan*). The two late copies may safely be ruled out as evidence, as the prefix *bi-* is in accordance with ME usage (*MED* s.v. “biginnen”) and hence not necessarily original. With the “Rushworth Gospels”, on the other hand, it is interesting to note that the “Lindisfarne Gospels” (British Library Cotton Nero D. iv [K:165]), which are assumed to have been copied from the same exemplar, show OE *begines*. Incidentally, OE *biginnes* is the only form of the verb *beginnan* in the “Rushworth Gospels”; the far more common synonym is OE *onginnan*, occurring more than two dozen times in the *Gospel of Luke* alone (cf. Tamoto 2013).

Summing up, there is no unequivocal evidence that the form *bigine* cannot be OE; yet, bearing in mind that the OHG cognate of the verb shows prefixal *bi-* (*AWB* s.v. “bi-ginnan”, not including this particular gloss in its apparatus of forms) and that the other 11 vernacular glosses in the “Echternach Gospels” are “mehr oder weniger sicher” OHG (Glaser 1997: 18), I am not inclined to accept *bigine* as an OE form at the moment. CLA’s and Ó Cróinin’s appraisals of the gloss as OE are not provided with verifiable analyses. Muller (1985) argues in favour of OHG; Nievergelt & De Wulf (2015: 103) are reluctant to decide either in favour of OHG or OE, they rather propose some continental West Germanic context, other than OHG. Therefore, the “Echternach Gospels” are not included in the *Catalogue* below, as they cannot confidently be said to feature an OE dry-point gloss until a detailed analysis to that effect is published.

München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 6402 (*BStK*: 1060–1062 [no. 536]) features a large number of dry-point additions, consisting of letters, doodles or unidentifiable scratches. The main part of the MS was perhaps written in Verona, sec. viii or ix; the first part of the MS (ff. 1–18) was added in Freising, sec. viii⁴/₄, where the MS remained until the secularization of 1803 (cf. *BStK*: 1061; Nievergelt 2009: 180). Nievergelt (2009: 180–187) lists over 60 very difficult dry-point additions, including names and L. glosses, but for most of them only individual letters are decipherable to him. Only one dry-point gloss added in a partial vowel substitution cipher (*a=b; u=x*) is sufficiently legible for Nievergelt to attempt an interpretation. His reading is OHG(?) *inxbxnxixlij* glossing L. *inhabitare* ‘to dwell in’. Undoing the substitutions, Nievergelt (2009: 182) interprets the gloss tentatively as OHG *inbuan uįįį* ‘wants (3rd pers. sing. pres. ind.) to dwell in’. The reading of the last three letters is doubtful, however, and Nievergelt cautions that the interpretation of the second word is therefore highly specu-

---

62 I.e. ‘more or less certainly’ OHG.