More importantly for our concern, however, Nievergelt also points out that OE background is at least imaginable for the first word *inbuan*, because the form of this infinitive, which glosses the infinitive *inhabitare* of the L. base text (Juvenecus, Evangeliorum libri quattuor I, 301), would be the same in both OHG and OE. The evidence is inconclusive at the moment, as none of the other dry-point fragments supplies enough information to corroborate either interpretation. No OE dry-point glosses have been associated with Freising so far and since the MS also features 22 OHG ink glosses, I do not think that the MS ought to be considered for inclusion in the Catalogue, based on the present evidence. Further work on these difficult glosses may perhaps provide sufficient data to readdress the issue one day.

2.4 Non-English Dry-Point Glossing

2.4.1 Dry-Point Glossing in Latin

Dry-point writing in medieval MSS is not only known from the Anglo-Saxon sphere. From the European Middle Ages there is also evidence for dry-point glossing in Latin, Old High German, Old Saxon, Old Irish and Old Slavonic. If we bear in mind that the vast majority of written output in medieval Western Europe was produced in Latin, it comes as something of a surprise that the scholarly literature on OE and especially on OHG glosses by far exceeds that on L. glosses. It is probably just because there are so many extant medieval written documents in Latin left to study that the glosses in them are only rarely studied in their own right. Goossens (1974: 32) remarks: “More than anything else a thorough investigation of the Latin gl. belongs to the urgent requirements but so far that study has not even been started”, and Wieland (1984) pithily calls L. glossing “the stepchild of glossologists”.

Important work has been done in the field of L. glossing, though: Wieland (1983) and Stork (1990) present two detailed studies of the L. glossing in two MSS of Arator, Prudentius and Aldhelm, and McCormick (1992) offers a highly interesting edition of more than 600 dry-point glosses in L. and OHG as well

---

63 See below, p. 56, for the meaning of dots added below letters in OHG gloss editions.
64 The simplex *buan* ‘to dwell’ is attested in both OHG (AWB s.v. ‘buan’) and OE (DOE s.v. ‘būan’); the prefixed verb *inbuan* is (so far) only attested in OE. I can find two attestations in the DOE, both glossing L. *inhabitare* – once in the Durham Ritual and once in the Lindisfarne Gospel of Matthew. It is at least imaginable that these are spontaneous word formations, whose probative value in the light of OHG nominal formations like *inbūo* ‘inhabitant’ is debatable.
as Tironian notes, dating to the mid-9th c. from the “Palatine Virgil” (Vaticano, Vatican Library MS Pal. lat. 1631).

Schipper (1994) edits L. dry-point writing from the so-called “Benedictional of St Æthelwold” (London, British Library Additional 49 598 [G:301]), produced in AD 971−973 in Winchester, which is considered to be “the most lavishly produced manuscript which has survived from Anglo-Saxon England” (Schipper 1994: 17, quoting Michael Lapidge). Short L. phrases of one to four words are added to 13 top margins of that codex. Schipper (1994: 23) deems it possible that further pages had similar notes, but they may have been cut off during rebinding. These notes clearly do not function as glosses, because they were added before the text was written, as Schipper (ibid.) concludes from an instance of dry-point writing that is right behind the text now. After a detailed analysis of the collation of the codex, Schipper identifies the dry-point notes to be “compilation notes” that is “rough indication of what benedictions were to be inserted and where” (Schipper 1994: 27). Schipper describes the physical appearance of the dry-point notes as falling into two altogether different groups, namely dry-point notes that were entered with a blunt stylus, leaving nothing but an indentation in the parchment, on the one hand, and dry-point notes that were entered with some sort of metallic stylus, whose metallic residue has since “oxidized to a faint dark reddish colour” (Schipper 1994: 21). Schipper includes photographs of eight of these notes that show the difference in their appearance nicely. The oxidized notes contrast quite strongly with the parchment’s surface and hence it comes as something of a surprise that no-one had noticed them before Schipper took an interest in them (cf. Schipper 1994: 18).65 The “Benedictional of St Æthelwold” may be taken as evidence that at least sometimes the stylus was used in Anglo-Saxon England for writing specifically because it did not leave easily visible traces.66

Searching the world-wide web for the expression “scratch glosses”, I came across Prof. Sarah Larratt Keefer’s CV on her institutional website at Trent University (Peterborough, ON), in which she mentioned a paper in preparation on “The Scratch Glosses of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 146 [K:37]: the Sam-

---

65 I have not seen (let alone autopsied) the “Benedictional of St Æthelwold”, but judging from Schipper’s description and the photographs presented in Schipper (1994: 24), I wonder whether all of the compilation notes really were entered in dry-point. Some of them are extremely distinct and not reminiscent of dry-point writing at all. I think there is the possibility that the “oxidized”, red notes may in fact have been produced by some sort of colouring writing implement, perhaps minium(?).

66 A quite similar case is reported from the “Vespasian Psalter” [K:203] by Toon (1991: 91). Rather than words taken from the texts, however, Roman letters are added in dry-point, but they seem to have served a similar function during the compilation of the MS (cf. p. 40 above).
son Pontifical” (sec. xi\textsuperscript{in}, cf. Ker 1957: 50–51 [no. 37]). I was intrigued, wondering whether the glosses might be OE, and contacted her via email to inquire about the dry-point glosses. She kindly informed me that they were in Latin and that she would not go ahead with the proposed article on them.\footnote{Larratt Keefer (personal communication, February 13, 2013).} As far as I can tell, none of these glosses have been published so far.

L. dry-point glosses are sometimes also mentioned and even edited as a by-product by scholars whose main interest is in the vernacular glossing of a specific MS.\footnote{Cf. Meritt (1933: 307, n. 7) and Page (1979: 33).} However, especially with early editions it is not clear how the editors dealt with L. dry-point glossing. At least for some MSS, it seems that the L. dry-point glossing was simply ignored as soon as it turned out to be non-OE. So the lack of reports of L. dry-point glossing must not be taken as direct evidence that there are no L. (or further, previously unnoticed vernacular) dry-point glosses in a particular MS.

Recent gloss scholarship has stressed the importance of the inclusion of L. glosses in the study of OE glosses (cf. Page 1992: 85; Gwara 1999: 822). If we want to understand the OE glosses as more than just lexical material, the focus has to be on functional and hence contextual aspects of the glossing, as exemplified by Page (1982) and by Gwara’s numerous publications on the extant MSS of Aldhelm’s \textit{Prosa de virginitate}. Since the L. glossing often already existed in the MSS at the time when the OE glosses were added, their presence has to be recorded if we want to fathom the intentions behind the vernacular glossing.

I have tried to include that little information on L. glossing that was available to me for the MSS in the \textit{Catalogue} presented below, however, not being a Latinist and not having autopsied the MSS themselves, I would like to stress that the information given on the L. glossing in the respective MSS is highly selective.

### 2.4.2 Dry-Point Glossing in Old High German

The existence of OHG dry-point glosses in L. MSS has been known at least since the early 19\textsuperscript{th}c.\footnote{Cf. for example Docen (1806: 286 [no. XII]) on glosses in München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 6277 (cf. BSTK: 1036–1037 [no. 518]): "die teutschen Glossen sind hier zahlreicher, grösstentheils am Rande geschrieben, hie und da auch wohl mit einem Griffel eingeritzt", i.e. ‘the German glosses are more numerous here, mostly added marginally, every now and then apparently scratched in with a stylus’. It is interesting to note that the dry-point and pencil glosses in this MSS were edited repeatedly by Steinmeyer (StSG 2: 163), Bischoff (1928: 158–159), Nievergelt (unpublished) and Ernst (2007: 421–506). Each time, further OHG glosses could be deciphered so that the number of reported...} Yet dry-point glosses played only a marginal role in the study of OHG glossography until late in the 20\textsuperscript{th} c., when dry-point glosses could no
longer be ignored as an important source of OHG, as Glaser (1996: 51) puts it. By that time, OHG ink glosses had been investigated very thoroughly and edited comprehensively (yet not exhaustively) in Elias von Steinmeyer and Eduard Siever’s monumental *Die althochdeutschen Glossen (StSG)*, published between 1879 and 1922, as well as in numerous further publications and editions. In 1973, Bergmann (1973) compiled a preliminary list of 1,023 OHG gloss MSS that had been identified until then. He numbered the MSS consecutively, and his numbers (nicknamed “Bergmann-Nummern”, i.e. ‘Bergmann numbers’) have since become an important reference system in OHG (and OS) gloss studies.

Bergmann continuously updated and maintained his list, and by 2005, when Bergmann’s (1973) list had been turned into a full-blown 3,000-page catalogue (*BStK*), a large number of additional OHG gloss MSS had been identified. As a consequence, the numbering scheme was continuously expanded and letters were introduced to allow for a meaningful internal differentiation of the numbering logic, so that MSS from the same repository could be arranged in meaningful groups (e.g. 710, 710a, 710b, ... 710z, 710aa, 710ab, etc. for various MSS from München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek). In addition to that, changes in the treatment of MS fragments and MS parts entailed a number of modifications to the numbering scheme (through splitting of former units and fusion of formerly separate entries). *BStK*, as published in 2005, listed 1,309 entries, but the numbers have kept rising at a steady pace since.

An impressive amount of palaeographical, lexicographical and glossographical work is continuously done in the field of OHG glossography, too. Major dictionaries include Starck & Wells (1971–1990) and Schützeichel (2004) and the current state-of-the-art handbook on OHG glosses is *BStH*, which was published in 2009. Incidentally, Schützeichel (2004: 12: 9–32) even includes a number of OE dry-point glosses in a special section of the *Althochdeutscher und altsächsischer Glossenwortschatz*, devoted to OE glosses that are encountered alongside OHG glosses (i.e. glosses from [1/K:287*], [12/K:A41], [13/K:121*], [14/K:98*] and [34/K:400]).

---

70 Gloses gradually rose from 10 to 30 to 49 to 87 (cf. Ernst 2007: 425). Ernst (2007) also edits 5 L. dry-point glosses, 1 dry-point text emendation and about two dozens of yet undeciphered dry-point traces of uncertain linguistic status from that MS.

71 A major update of *StSG* can be found in Köbler (1993); for the most comprehensive overview of the relevant literature, cf. *BStK* and *BStH*.

72 The numbers presented here include both OHG and OS gloss MSS, as they are both combined in *BStK*. Only a comparatively small number of OS gloss MSS have been identified so far, and I shall subsume the OS gloss under the label “OHG” in the following calculations in order not to complicate things even further.

72 Schützeichel (2004) does not distinguish the manner of entry for his gloss citations. A number of glosses are quoted, however, which are not included in either Ker (1957) or...
When Glaser (1996) for the first time dedicated a whole monograph specifically to OHG dry-point glosses, she included a preliminary list of 70 OHG dry-point gloss MSS as a first overview of the state of OHG dry-point gloss research up to the mid-1990s. Apart from a few samples edited by StSG and Meritt (1934, 1961), Glaser’s list mainly consists of MSS that had been identified as OHG dry-point gloss MSS by Bernhard Bischoff during his work for Lowe’s CLA in the 1920s and 1930s. Editions based on Bischoff’s findings were published only gradually in loose succession by himself (e.g. Bischoff 1928) and – after a summarizing description of his gloss discoveries had been published by Stach (1950) – by scholars who heavily relied on Bischoff’s notes (e.g. Stach 1951, Hofmann 1963, Mayer 1974 and others).

By editing dry-point glosses from five MSS from Freising in Bavaria, Glaser (1996: 637) shows convincingly that even MSS whose dry-point glosses have been edited before may yield substantial further dry-point gloss harvests upon close inspection. Both Nievergelt (2007) and Ernst (2007) could edit large numbers from well-known gloss MSS. Mainly due to Nievergelt’s subsequent efforts, the number of known OHG/Os dry-point gloss MSS has been steadily rising (cf. Fig. 1) since Glaser counted 70 OHG dry-point gloss MSS in 1996:73 85 OHG/Os dry-point gloss MSS were known in 2004,74 118 in 2009,75 146 in 2011,76 155 in 201277, 179 in 201378 and 202 in 201579. That also means that the percentage of OHG/Os dry-point gloss MSS has been constantly rising within the corpus of OHG/Os gloss MSS: from about 7% in 2004/2005 (85 out of 1,309) to roughly 13.8%80 of all OHG/Os gloss MSS in 2015 (ca. 202 out of ca. 1,465).

its updates, such as glosses from Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 2685 (s. v. “blædre”; cf. BStK: 1415–1417 [no. 741] and Bulitta 2011: 168), from Trier, Bibliothek des Priesterseminars 61 (s. v. “brandhāt”; cf. BStK: 1684–1687 [no. 877]) or from Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preussischer Kulturbesitz Ms. lat. 4° 676 (s. v. “cine”; cf. BStK: 219–221 [no. 44 (I)] and Bulitta 2011: 169; the MS is currently held in Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska Berol. Ms. lat. 4° 676). As far as I could establish, none of them are entered in dry-point and they predominantly seem to be OE remnants in OHG glossaries. They ought to be checked on the occasion of an update of Ker’s Catalogue, though.

76 Nievergelt (2011: 313) cites 147, but that tally was later corrected to 146 in Nievergelt (2012: 381).
78 Nievergelt (2013: 387).
80 The calculated percentage may only serve as a rough estimate: Firstly, by the time these numbers appear in print, they are outdated already; secondly, the distinction between dry-point glosses and pencil glosses is not always made consistently in the secondary literature (cf. Nievergelt 2015: 294) and further autopsies will affect the numbers; and
Glaser (1996) set a new standard in the edition of dry-point glosses by discussing in great detail the exact visual appearance of the individual dry-point glosses and by expounding the difficulties that are involved in deciphering dry-point material. The manner of presentation has since become standard in OHG dry-point gloss editions (e.g. Nievergelt 2007, Ernst 2007). Such a typical edition entry consists of:

1. a general indication where the gloss is placed on the MS page, i.e. folio/page, line or relative placement in the margin;
2. a sufficiently long quotation of the L. base text, allowing for enough context to make sense of the lemma, indicating textual deviations in that particular MS from the standard text editions, typesetting the lemma in italics;
3. a G. translation of the L. base text, typesetting the presumed lemma of the base text in italics;
4. a detailed transcription of the lemma followed by a detailed transcription of the interpretamentum;81
5. comments on the precise placement of the interpretamentum with respect to the lemma and comments on uncertain readings and possible alternative readings;

thirdly, the numbers encompass both OHG and OS gloss MSS, which are treated as one corpus in the relevant statistics (however, the vast majority of MSS contain OHG glosses). The online OHG dry-point gloss MSS directory, continuously updated and maintained under the supervision of Dr. Oliver Ernst (cf. Nievergelt 2012: 379) currently lists only 161 OHG dry-point gloss MSS (retrieved in August 2016), but is undergoing continuous updating. The developments have become so dynamic that it is difficult to keep track of the rapid influx of news in this field. URL: <http://de.althochdeutscheglossen.wikia.com/wiki/Griffelglossenhandschriften>.

81 Line breaks before, within or after the lemmata and interpretamenta are indicated by a vertical bar <|>, abbreviations are not expanded and emendations to the text are preserved as such.
Terminology and Scope

6. a detailed linguistic commentary, entailing (a) lemmatization, (b) exhaustive morphological discussion of the respective forms with respect to case, number, person, declension class, conjugation class, mood, voice, tense etc., (c) bibliographical cross-references to relevant dictionaries, grammars or word studies, (d) a discussion of the semantic equivalence of lemma and interpretamentum and (e) references to equivalent lemma/interpretamentum pairs.

Since dry-point writing can sometimes offer variable degrees of legibility, a small set of symbols and diacritics is generally used to indicate such considerations (cf. Glaser 1996: 100). In OHG dry-point gloss editions, uncertain readings are customarily indicated by adding dots underneath doubtful letters, such as \(<i>\) for an uncertain reading of \(<i>\). This is not to be confused with an expunction mark (cf. p. 83 below). If not even an attempt at a reading seems possible to the editor, a dot \(<.>\) is written in lieu of the undecipherable letter. If the number of undecipherable letters cannot be specified, three dots – i.e. a horizontal ellipsis – are put in curly brackets \(<{[...]}>\) (e.g. in Nievergelt 2007, 2009a) or square brackets \(<[...]>\) (e.g. in Ernst 2007). Sometimes, the editor cannot even decide whether the scratches are letters or just suspicious-looking creases in the parchment surface. In such cases, one or two question marks are used to indicate the possible presence of one \(<.?>\) or several \(<.??>\) further letters or scratches.

Since Nievergelt’s (2007) and Ernst’s (2007) in-depth analyses of the physical properties of dry-point glosses, it has also become customary to classify the physical nature of the dry-point writing (i.e. cutting the surface vs. mere indentation or presence of pigment or rust residues vs. entry without any traces of discolouring). Since dry-point writing usually does not offer the same palaeographical detail as ink writing, such observations are crucial in distinguishing layers of dry-point gloss activity. Both Nievergelt (2007: 47–59) and Ernst (2007: 71–73) present classificatory systems of dry-point glosses based on their physical properties (see above p. 27). Nievergelt (2007: 70–74) also discusses the special difficulties that dry-point writing presents to the human eye due the often only minute contrast differences that are created by the impressions on the parchment surface.

Since editions that follow Glaser’s model are much more refined than the list-like editions that were customary during the nineteenth and the better part of the 20th c., they are necessarily much longer. Where a traditional gloss edition (such as StSG, Napier 1900, Meritt 1945 or even Gwara 1992) would have one line, consisting of a lemma-interpretamentum pair, with perhaps a footnote, the edition of an averagely complex gloss in Glaser (1996), Nievergelt (2007) or Ernst (2007) will easily occupy a page. The OHG dry-point gloss Rotlahh on f. 176v of München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 6272 (BSTK: 1033–1034 [no. 516])
may serve as an extreme example. The interpretamentum is entered in the right margin and, hence, the corresponding L. lemma of the base text (Hieronymus, Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Mathaeum) is difficult to identify. Meritt (1934: 232) interprets this dry-point entry as two separate glosses, even though there is no space in between, namely OHG rot glossing L. roseo and OHG tuhh-glossing L. limbo. He duly lists the lemmata and the interpretamenta in two half-lines with minimum space requirements, so that another two dozens of lemma-interpretamentum pairs can be fitted onto the same page. Meritt relegates some observations about his readings to two short footnotes (1934: n. 61 and n. 62): the first footnote gives a deviating form for the first lemma in the critical edition consulted by Meritt, which reads L. rufo instead of L. roseo (i.e. PL 208: 24), and the second footnote suggests the expansion OHG tuhhil for the partial second interpretamentum OHG tuhh-, also referring to two instances of that word in StSG. In summary, the edition of this dry-point entry takes up two half-lines and two short footnotes.

In Ernst (2007: 317–322 [no. 39]) the edition of the same dry-point entry runs for five full pages. After describing the appearance of the gloss in detail and discussing readings by former gloss scholars (including Meritt), Ernst presents two different interpretations of the gloss, based on the allocation of the gloss to two different lemmata in the base text. Pairing up the OHG gloss with L. clamidem coccineam or perhaps roseo limbo (as Meritt suspected), it can be interpreted as a compound or as a nominal group meaning ‘red fabric’ or ‘red coat’. However, in the context of Christ’s crucifixion, pairing the OHG gloss up with either L. spineam (which may be corroborated by that word’s physical proximity on the MS page and by a possible signe-de-renvoi, consisting of a vertical dry-point bar on top of L. spineam) or L. calamum (which also features a signe-de-renvoi, consisting of the Greek letter ϕ, though that may perhaps point to a partly legible dry-point entry in the left margin), the gloss could be interpreted as referring to some kind of plant, perhaps ‘buckthorn’ (based on L. spineus ‘thorny’, referring to Christ’s crown) or ‘reed’ (based on L. calamus ‘reed’, which the soldiers gave to Christ as a mocking symbol of his power). Ernst’s exhaustive treatment of the gloss – of which I have only sketched the bare outlines – shows great erudition and makes for a highly informative read, yet it ultimately leaves us in a state of informed ignorance: we still do not know what the gloss actually means. The range of possibilities has been limited drastically, yet several candidates seem almost equally eligible and it is clear that lexicographers have an easier job incorporating Meritt’s edition rather than Ernst’s in their work.

82 Ernst (2007: 316) presents a diplomatic transcript of that passage showing the position of several suspected signes-de-renvoi.
It is to be expected that further OHG dry-point MSS will be identified in the near future and, as Stricker (2009: 1655) points out, it may safely be assumed that the glosses to be found in them will change our knowledge of OHG substantially.

2.4.3 Dry-Point Glossing in Old Saxon

OS dry-point glosses have been reported from four MSS so far (cf. Nievergelt 2013: 387). Two MSS were already known in 2005 when BStK was published, namely Düsseldorf, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Ms. B 80 (BStK: no. 104) and Düsseldorf, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Ms. F 1 (BStK: no. 105). Two further MSS have been identified since. Firstly, Prof. Dr. Nievergelt (2011: 312) reports the existence of ca. 500 OS and OHG glosses (a unspecified number of them entered in dry-point) – in Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár CLMAE 7; an edition remains yet to be published. Secondly, Prof. Dr. Nievergelt tells me that Essen, Münsterschatzkammer Hs. 1 (BStK: no. 149), whose dry-point glosses had not yet been completely identified, contains some 50 still unedited OS dry-point glosses. In BStK, where both OHG and OS gloss MSS are combined, the OS gloss MSS clearly play a subsidiary role. Recent developments show, however, that further OS dry-point gloss finds are likely to be made, perhaps even in the near future.

2.4.4 Dry-Point Glossing in Old Irish

Dry-point glossing in OIr is reported from several MSS, but to date no comprehensive overview of the extent or status of dry-point glossing in Celtic literacy is available and a direct connection between Celtic and OE dry-point glossing practices cannot be discerned. Ó Cróinín (1999: 94) edits dry-point glosses from Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 9382 (CLA 5: 577), 7 of which “may be Irish”. Ó Néill’s edition (1998, 2000) of the dry-point glosses in the so-called “Codex Usserianus Primus” – Dublin, Trinity College Library MS 55, an early 7th-c. gospel book – lists 3 OIr glosses, 120 L. dry-point glosses and 14 other dry-point symbols.

Ó Néill (1998: 2) also mentions three further MSS that supposedly feature dry-point glossing in OIr, namely Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS F. iv. 24, f. 93 (CLA 4: 457), St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 904 and Oxford, Bodleian Library Auctarium F. 3. 15, but I have not been able to find printed editions of the (potentially OIr) dry-point material of those MSS. Such unverified reports have to be treated with caution.

---

83 Andreas Nievergelt (personal communication, November 11, 2013).
great caution; in the case of the Turin MS, for instance, *CLA* (4: 457) suggests that the dry-point material is L. rather than OIr.

The glosses in the Codex Usserianus Primus are dated to the 7th c. by Bischoff (1954: 197) and, according to Ó Néill (1998: 26, n. 24), the glosses in the Oxford MS date to the second quarter of the 12th century. Therefore, Ó Néill sees these two MS witnesses as evidence that there might be an unbroken tradition of dry-point gloss activities spanning five centuries, which leads him to the conclusion “that other Irish witnesses to dry-point glossing remain to be identified” (1998: 2).

### 2.4.5 Dry-Point Glossing in Old Slavonic

A comparatively small corpus of Old Slavonic dry-point glosses has been identified so far in three MSS (cf. Nievergelt 2007: 64–65, n. 11), namely Zürich, Zentralbibliothek Ms. C 78 (cf. Nievergelt 2003; Nievergelt & Schaeken 2003; BStK: 1920–1922 [no. 1019b]), Prague, Metropolitní Kapitula U SV. Vita A CLXXIII (cf. Patera 1878) and München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14 008 (cf. BMS 1: 90–91). Nievergelt (2007: 65, n. 11) notes that the authenticity of the dry-point material in the Prague MS has been put into question in connection with the suspected forgeries of Old Slavonic and OHG ink glosses in a number of Prague MSS by the Czech philologist Vaclav Hanka (1791–1861). Nievergelt deems forgery of the dry-point glosses to be very unlikely, arguing that the large number of undecipherable dry-point glosses (over 94) would not be in line with forgery.

### 2.4.6 Dry-Point Glossing in East Asia

Pre-modern dry-point glossing is not limited to the European Middle Ages, but it is also reported from East Asian MSS. More than 3,000 Japanese MSS bearing dry-point glosses have been identified since Prof. Yoshinori Kobayashi discovered the phenomenon in 1961. The oldest specimens of this so-called *kakuhitsu* writing identified so far date to AD 749 and the most recent specimens date to AD 1910, spanning more than eleven centuries of continuous dry-point practice. In 1993, Kobayashi and a colleague of his, Prof. Yasukazu Yoshizawa, discovered similar dry-point writing in 16 MSS from Dunhuang (China), now kept in the

---

84 A short bibliography on the topic (which, considering the rapid development of this field, is unfortunately slightly dated) can be found at the project website “A Dig and an Investigation and a Study of Stylus-Impressed Writing in Every Place of Western Japan. Development and a Study of an Instrument for Decoding Stylus-Impressed Characters”, URL: <http://kaken.nii.ac.jp/d/p/09410111/1999/6/en.en.html>. Nievergelt (2007: 63, n. 6) also lists a number of publications on the subject.

85 *kakuhitsu* is the Romanization of the Japanese word for 'stylus', kanji: 角筆.