2. Terminology and Scope

2.1 Vernacular Glossing in Anglo-Saxon England

2.1.1 Additions in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts

Many extant medieval MSS do not only feature a main text (or several main texts in sequence), but also additional written material that can range from a couple of dots in the margins to a complete poem added on a previously empty part of a page. In the traditional terminology of OE glossography, only a particular sub-group of additions is referred to as “glosses”, namely words or short phrases that directly translate or comment on a particular phrase of the (commonly L.) base text. The present study takes the traditional approach and restricts the use of the term “glosses” to additions that are themselves made up of linguistic material, thereby excluding prosodic marks, construe marks and doodles. These other additions are worthy of study, and codicologists, palaeographers and art historians ought to look out for them, but the present study does not deal with them.\(^1\) This approach is in line with the terminology of the traditional study of OE glossography (e.g. Napier 1900, Ker 1957, Meritt 1968, Page 1973, Gwara 2001) and it is in line with the usage of the term Glossen in German scholarly usage (\(\text{BS}\text{tK}:\ 101–109;\ \text{Henkel}\ 2007:\ 727\)), summarized by Gretsch (1999b: 209) as “additions [to L. texts] of translations, synonyms or explanations (usually consisting of no more than a single word)”. This traditional notion is somewhat at odds with the much more liberal approach to Anglo-Saxon glossing taken by Wieland’s (1983) influential study on the L. glossing in Cambridge, University Library Gg. 5. 35 [K:16]. Wieland proposes a much broader definition of “glosses” that also includes non-linguistic additions, such as symbols and “anything on a page which is not text proper, but which is intended to comment on the text” (Wieland 1983: 7), explicitly including illustrations and drawings, too. Wieland’s more generous interpretation of the traditional notion of “glosses” to some extent reflects the needs of L. gloss scholars to subsume the many complex layers of additions that we encounter in many medieval MSS beside the L. main text under a convenient umbrella term. Wieland’s broad interpretation of the term “glosses” also seems to have been directly inspired by Robinson’s (1973) term “syntactical glosses”, which Robin-

\(^1\) A few examples of such additions are discussed below on account of their being entered in dry-point.
son applies to what I think would be more appropriately termed construe marks (cf. Wieland 1983: 2). Construe marks are symbols or letters that are added to words of L. texts to indicate a particular word order that is easier to parse by the reader. The symbols and letters do not represent linguistic material themselves, as their only function is the indexation of a particular word order, which in turn is linguistic in nature, of course. Wieland’s broad definition of “glosses” has gained currency in Anglo-Saxonist studies (cf. for instance Stork 1990) and at ISAS 2013 in Dublin, several non-linguist Anglo-Saxonist colleagues expressed their surprise that I did not include dry-point doodles in my Catalogue.

I do not think, however, that this re-interpretation of the well-established term “glosses” is helpful from the point of view of glossography and I can only agree with Korhammer (1980: 22), who rejects the use of the term “glosses” in connection with construe marks. By broadening the definition of the term “gloss” to include non-linguistic additions, we lose an effective means of referring to the different types of additions in medieval MSS, such as marks (i.e. syntactic marks, compilation marks, individual marks of unclear functional status etc.), doodles, names, pen trials, scholia, glosses etc. There is no apparent need to re-interpret the term “glosses” to include all of them, as they are functionally and formally so different that the only property that they share is the fact that they were added later. Hence, “additions” is a more appropriate umbrella term if we want to refer to them all at once.

Among the additions that are themselves made up of linguistic material, glosses are functionally distinguished by representing an explanatory comment on the L. base text. Names, pen trials and compilation marks are not considered in the Catalogue given below: Names may have been meant as owner’s marks or as mere commemorative inscriptions featuring the writer’s or somebody else’s name; “pen trials” (or L. probationes pennae) is a somewhat misleading umbrella term for additional entries that cannot directly be connected to the base text; and compilation marks were added by the scribes during the preparation of the MS. They do all constitute important and interesting evidence for a MS’s history and may provide highly relevant data for onomastic, literary, historical, palaeographical or codicological studies, but their contributions to medieval MSS typically fulfil an arguably different role than glosses.

2.1.2 Types of Old English Glosses

OE glosses are known to us from more than 200 MSS and they are extant in three different settings, which have often been understood as stages in the accumulation of glossographic knowledge during the Middle Ages (cf. Gretsch 1999b: 209–210).
The first of these settings is the so-called occasional glossing. Occasional glosses are individual OE interpretamenta added (sometimes seemingly randomly) to L. lemmata in a coherent L. text.\(^2\) The density of occasional glossing can vary quite considerably in between MSS: Some MSS were furnished with several thousand OE and L. glosses; from others we only know of a handful of OE glosses. Unfortunately, we cannot generalize about the scriptorial context in which such occasional glosses were added to MSS, as we know rather little about this process. For some occasional glosses, we can assume that they were added spontaneously by a reader who tried to overcome a certain linguistic difficulty in the L. text. Perhaps that reader, let us assume he was a monk for the moment as this seems to be the most likely setting,\(^3\) could ask a teacher or a fellow monk about the meaning of a particular word or phrase and after receiving that necessary piece of information decided to add it to the MS, perhaps as an *aide-mémoire* for himself or for the benefit of subsequent readers.

Some rare examples of such a process can be gleaned from the Leiden family of glossaries. The glossary preserved in St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 913 [K:A29], p. 143, for instance, reads: “larum hragra adrianus diciit meum esse”, which might be translated as: ‘larum [that is in OE] a heron; Hadrian says it is a seagull’. Bischoff & Lapidge (1994: 288) demonstrate convincingly that this reference can only be to Bishop Hadrian, who taught in Canterbury around AD 700. He hailed from North Africa and was more closely familiar with the Mediterranean fauna as described in Leviticus 11:16, where this particular piece of L. vocabulary occurs. It may be inferred that Hadrian passed his first-hand knowledge of what L. *larus* exactly referred to on to his pupils in Canterbury. One of them perhaps noted this down, most likely directly into a copy of the Bible from where it was later culled and incorporated into the Leiden family of glossaries.

For other occasional glosses, however, it can be shown that they were copied wholesale from other MS witnesses of the same text. A well-studied group of MSS where this can be demonstrated is the so-called “Digby Group” (cf. Gwara 1998b). Occasional glosses in a MS, therefore, do not necessarily represent the spontaneous interaction of a reader with the text.

A second setting for OE glosses can be seen as an intensification of occasional glossing. In some MSS, glossing was undertaken more consistently, so that for some passages or even for most parts of the MS every or nearly every L. word was supplied with an interlinear translation. These so-called continuous interlinear glosses formed a kind of text themselves, which was, however, heavily

\(^2\) Glosses to base texts other than L. are very rare, but ME glosses on OE texts (cf. Franzen 1991) and OE glosses on OE texts, which were later incorporated into the OE text at some stage (cf. Bammesberger 1984), are attested.

\(^3\) From what I can gather, the typical Anglo-Saxon scribe/glossator was male.
influenced by the original L. syntax. Continuous interlinear glosses are especially frequently found in psalters (cf. Pulsiano 2001), but they are also known from other texts, such as Boethius, De consolatione philosophiae or Benedict’s Regula. So far, no dry-point glosses have been discovered in the context of continuous glosses. It may well be that dry-point writing was never used for this purpose.  

A third setting, the glossary, represents the abstraction of the occasional or continuous OE glosses from the context of the original L. text. The “Épinal Glossary”, which is dated to AD 700 (cf. Bischoff et al. 1988: 13), shows that from an early date both L. and vernacular glosses were culled from occasionally or continuously glossed Anglo-Saxon MSS and compiled in lists of lemma/interpretamentum pairs. These glossaries must have been reworked repeatedly, presumably to improve their usability as reference books (cf. Lendinara 1999b: 207). In some glossaries, we can still see the original order in which they were culled from the base text, forming so-called “batches”. In others, so-called “alphabetical glossaries”, the lemmata are sorted according to their first letter or first few letters, which probably indicates that an existing glossary was reworked by culling in succession all glosses whose first letters matched the right combination. In a third group of glossaries, the so-called “class glossaries”, the lemmata from a semantic field were arranged as groups of glosses. This may have been useful for teaching purposes. Class glossaries do not seem particularly apt to serve as reference books, because the reader would have to know the word field of a particular word before he would be able to look it up in a class glossary.

No OE dry-point glosses have been discovered in the context of glossaries. There is some evidence from OHG glossography, though, that dry-point glosses were added as occasional supplements to existing glossaries in rare instances. Therefore glossaries should not be ruled out categorically as candidates for further dry-point finds, but there is no evidence at the moment that the use of dry-point writing was customary in Anglo-Saxon glossaries.


5 The above-mentioned “Épinal Glossary” contains both types, namely parts that represent batches of glosses, which are listed in the order they were encountered in some unknown exemplar, and parts, in which the L. lemmata are ordered according to their first two letters, i.e. in so-called AB order (Ker 1957: 151–152).
2.1.3 The Form of Occasional Glosses in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts

In casual usage, the term “gloss” often only refers to the added L. or vernacular element itself. Typically, however, a gloss consists of two constituting elements: Firstly, the added piece of information itself, which is referred to as the interpretamentum, and secondly, the word or phrase of the L. text that is being commented on or translated by the interpretamentum, the so-called lemma. Both the interpretamentum and the lemma may consist of a single word form or a short phrase. Inked interpretamenta are often easily spotted, as they are usually placed above the line of the base text as an interlinear gloss or outside the text block in the margins of the MS page as a marginal gloss. The identification of the corresponding lemma, on the other hand, is not always straightforward: If the interpretamentum is added interlinearly, it is usually placed right above its lemma. However, if the interpretamentum is added marginally, the connection between the interpretamentum in the margin and the lemma in the text block is not always directly indicated by the physical proximity on the MS page. While marginal interpretamenta added to the inner or outer margin of the MS are often added at about the same height on the page as the line in which the lemma is to be found, interpretamenta placed in the top or bottom margin do not offer similar clues. It is sometimes possible to guess the corresponding lemma on account of semantic considerations (especially if the gloss represents a synonymous lexical gloss), but this is not directly possible if the attribution to several lemmata on the same page would make equal sense.

Marginal glosses can sometimes fall prey to the cutting of the book blocks during post-Anglo-Saxon re-binding of the codex. If the interpretamenta are not cut off completely, those in the left outer margin will lose letters at the beginning of the interpretamentum and those in the right outer margin will lose letters at the end of it, accordingly. Interpretamenta in the top and bottom margin may be cut in half, sometimes still allowing for educated guesses. Those in the inner margin are usually safe from such procedures; however, if the binding is very tight and the opposing page partly obstructs the view of the glosses, they can be difficult to autopsy.

Sometimes the reader is guided by so-called signes-de-renvoi, characteristic symbols made up of strokes and dots, which are added next to both the interpretamentum and the lemma to render their connection explicit. As far as I could establish, this has not yet been reported for OE dry-point glosses, though. Signes-de-renvoi are often not recorded in lexically orientated gloss editions since they do not convey any meaning of their own. However, from the point of view of more recent approaches to glossography, they should always be specified in editions.
In general dry-point glosses are not fundamentally different from their inked relatives. They, too can be added interlinearly or marginally with the same difficulties of association with the correct lemma of the L. base text. One property, however, that results from the manner in which they are added to the MSS, namely without ink, sets dry-point glosses off from ink glosses quite markedly.

2.2 Writing without Ink in Anglo-Saxon England

2.2.1 Stylus and Wax Tablets in Britain

The notion of hand-writing taking place without a colouring agent in the MS context would seem foreign from a modern perspective. While it is possible to apply dry-point writing to present-day paper, it is not a form of writing that we are accustomed to. Hence, most people will not take notice of dry-point writing on a piece of paper, unless it is pointed out to them explicitly. As a consequence, it is not readily clear to the modern mind why writing should take place without any pigment left behind on the page. Non-colouring writing implements have seen a revival ever since hand-held personal digital assistants started to be furnished regularly with plastic-tipped styli in the late 1990s. However, those styli were never intended to be used on paper. It can be assumed that the presence of the styli in the office world may have led to the spontaneous creation of such writing, and especially doodles, in isolated cases, but I am not familiar with any reported systematic use of non-colouring writing in the present era. In that respect, the medieval situation was markedly different. Bischoff (BMS 1: 88) points out that the medieval stylus had similar functions as today’s pencil: it was used for taking notes by professionals and students alike, it was used for ruling the MS page and it was used by illuminators to make first draughts on the MS page. The main writing medium of the stylus, however, was not parchment, but wax.

Wax tablets were one of the many cultural imports introduced to Britain after the Roman invasion in the 1st c. AD, and extant Romano-British wax tablets have been found in more than twenty archaeological sites throughout Britain so far, despite the fact that their organic material could only endure in favourable, i.e. water-logged, conditions. Some of these finds are of remarkable size, such as those from Vindolanda, a Roman fort near Hadrian’s Wall, where fragmentary and completely intact specimens of more than 1,400 writing tablets have been unearthed since the 1970s. Editions of the remaining legible text of more than 750 of these tablets have been published since the early 1980s (cf. most recently

---

6 Cf. also John Pearce’s “Progress Report” at the website “A Corpus of Writing-Tablets from Roman Britain.” URL: <http://www.csad.ox.ac.uk/RIB/RIBIV/jp5.htm>.
in Bowman et al. 2010). There is no archaeological evidence that the writing tablet continued to be in use after the Romans withdrew from Great Britain in the 5th c., although the notion seems likely. Certainly after the re-establishment of Christianity in Great Britain, both from Ireland and the Continent, in the late 6th c., stylus and wax tablets must have been household items again, at least in the monastic context. The Rule of St Benedict, for instance, while condemning the personal possession of styli and wax-tablets (Ch. 33), places the abbots under the obligation to provide their brethren with stylus and wax-tablet (Ch. 55) – “ut omnis auferatur necessitatis excusatio” – that is in order to keep the monks from claiming that they were not able to do God’s service for lack of appropriate tools. It is reasonable to assume then that most monks, even those who did not adhere to Benedict’s Rule, either had styli on them at all times or did not have to look far to get hold of a stylus. The presence of styli in the scriptoria is also well-established by their manifest use in the process of preparing the MS page for later writing, and the details of pricking and ruling (commonly in dry-point) are usually studied with great care by codicologists.

The active use of the stylus must have been familiar to all literate members of an Anglo-Saxon monastic institution, as their first writing lessons were confined to the use of the writing tablet during their trivium studies (cf. Savage 2006 [1911]: 63–64; Brown 1994; Brown 2008: 179). The use of stylus and wax tablet is well documented in Anglo-Saxon and early Irish literature, too (cf. Wattenbach 1896: 51–89 and Fisher 1921: 194). Aldhelm, for instance, composed a riddlic poem on the wax tablet around AD 700, from which we can gather the interesting information that the tablets were commonly bound in leather. The “Benedictional of St Æthelwold”, London, British Library Additional 49 598 [G:301], written in the late 10th c., features a miniature of Zechariah writing in a large wax tablet using a stylus (cf. Brown 1994: 9 [Fig. 6]). And from Anselm’s (Archbishop of Canterbury from 1093 until 1100) biographer Eadmer, we know that it was Anselm’s custom to compose his treatises on wax tablets before they were committed to parchment (cf. Southern 1962: 30–31; Clanchy 1993: 119).

---

7 The translation reads: ‘My origin was from (the wax of) honey-bees, but my other outer part grew in the woods. Stiff leather provided me with my shoes. Now the iron point cuts into my comely face with its wandering movements, and carves furrows in the manner of a plough; but the holy seed for the crop is brought from heaven, and it produces abundant sheaves from its thousand-fold harvest. Alas, this holy harvest is destroyed by fierce weapons!’ (translation by Lapidge & Rosier 1985: 76).

8 For the actual use of the stylus in the creation of the “Benedictional of St Æthelwold”, see below p. 51.
Archaeological finds from the Anglo-Saxon period attesting to the use of wax tablet and stylus are also numerous.\(^9\) Styli, ranging in material from bone to silver, have been found in various archaeological contexts.\(^10\) From the site of the former priory at Blythburgh in Suffolk, a fragment of a writing-tablet made from bone is preserved in the British Museum, dated to sec. viii. While the wax has perished, both the upper surface and the surface of the recess that contained the wax show runic letters, which are set in irregular rows. They are assumed to be “trial letter forms not intended to make much sense”, perhaps added by a person “attempting Latin verbal forms” (Webster & Backhouse 1991: 81 [no. 57]). The 14\(^{th}\)-c. York Tablets (cf. Brown 1994), featuring both L. and ME writing in anglicana cursive, on the other hand, provide an example of physical evidence for the continued use of the wax tablet in the later phases of the Middle Ages.\(^11\)

We find a very detailed 11\(^{th}\)-c. French description of a wax tablet by BALDRICUS OF BOURGEUIL (edited in Mabillon 1709: 51), in which the wax tablet is said to accommodate about eight hexameters – with the wax tablet held in landscape orientation. The French author emphasizes the fact that his wax tablet features green wax, as opposed to black wax, to help his eyes. From this description Todd (1846: 10) concludes that black must have been the common colour of the wax.\(^12\)

---

\(^9\) Incidentally, they are also well-attested from archaeological sites in Ireland. An early example of wax tablet usage in Ireland is provided by the Springmount Bog Tablets, dated to the 7th c. (Hillgarth 1962: 184 and Fig. 2), which still features early cursive Insular writing in the partly intact wax. A late example of an Irish wax tablet is provided by the Maghera Bog Tablet, dated to the 14th c. (Todd 1846, with facsimiles).

\(^10\) Webster & Backhouse (1991) list the following examples, each of them presented in a photograph: one copper-alloy stylus, sec. vii/viii, and two copper-alloy styli, sec. viii/ix, from Brandon (Suffolk) (86–87 [nos. 66 (r–t)]); an iron stylus, sec. vii, and two copper-alloy styli, sec. viii/ix from Barking (East London) (90 [nos. 67 (i–k)]); a silver stylus, sec. vii/ix, and a copper-alloy stylus, sec. viii/ix, from Flixborough (Lincolnshire) (100 [nos. 69 (v–w)]); two copper-alloy styli, sec. vii/viii, from Jarrow (Tyne and Wear) (140 [no. 105 (d)]); a copper-alloy and silver stylus, sec. vii/viii, a copper-alloy stylus, sec. viii, and a bone stylus, sec. vii/ix, from Whitby (North Yorkshire) (142–143 [nos. 107 (c–e)]); and two copper-alloy styli, sec. vii/ix from Bawsey (Norfolk) (231 [no. 188 (b–c)]). It is questionable whether the copper-alloy stylus, sec. vii, from Whitby (143 [no. 107 (d)]) really was used as a stylus, as it is comparatively narrow and suspiciously bent; Peers & Radford (1943: 64 [no. 76]) consider it to be an example of a group called “‘styliform’ [hair] pins”, distinguished by the lack of intermediate mouldings, with “the flat head being used for parting the hair and for the application of pomade”. Peers & Radford (1943: 65 [Fig. 15]) show drawings of five bronze styli (nos. 80–84) and a flat bronze stylus head (no. 85), as well as a photograph of two of them (1943: plate XXVII (c) [nos. 80–81]), all of them from Whitby.


\(^12\) An observation, which is also borne out by the list of late antique and medieval wax tablets presented in Büll (1977: 809–812).
What we can also conclude from *Baldricus’s* description, however, is that notes written on a wax tablet were not generally considered easy to read. A few simple experiments I made with a modern-day replica of a Roman wax tablet could confirm the crucial role that light plays with regards to the legibility of the wax grooves. The stylus does not leave easily visible traces in the dark wax, and Brown (1994: 1) describes her reading of the York Tablets as relying on “a battery of photographs taken under every conceivable angle of raking light.” There is an interesting parallel to dry-point writing in that respect and the training acquired during the many years of experience learning to write on wax tablets and, perhaps more importantly, learning to read from wax tablets may well have schooled the medieval eye to cope more easily with dry-point writing in MSS.

There is evidence that the use of stylus and wax tablet continued to be widespread until early modern times both in the British Isles and on the European mainland. In France, for instance, wax tablets remained in active use at the fish market of Rouen until ca. 1862 (cf. Büll 1977: 786 and 845 [Ill. 619 and Ill. 620]).

2.2.2 Dry-Point Writing in Medieval Manuscripts

We do not know when the practice of writing in dry-point in MSS developed, but a number of Anglo-Saxon MSS are known to contain dry-point glosses in OE that are dated to the 8th c. In the case of the “Maihingen Gospels” [1/K:287*], the dry-point glosses may perhaps even be dated to the first half of that century. With the “Épinal Glossary” marking the beginning of extant OE literacy in the MS context around AD 700 (cf. Bischoff et al. 1988: 13; Toon 1992: 427), we can assume that dry-point writing was part of vernacular literate culture from an early date on.

Dry-point glosses form a sub-group within the wider field of glosses and they are set apart from other glosses only by the manner in which they were physically entered on the writing medium. In medieval MSS – as well as in the case of most present-day writing that we encounter on a daily basis – writing usually consists of letters that are formed on a suitable writing surface by depositing coloured particles. The most common agent that was used to apply such particles to the parchment surface of Anglo-Saxon MSS was ink, a water-based suspension of ground carbon or iron salts, which was applied by means of a quill by a trained scribe. After the water had evaporated, the dark-coloured particles remained in place and allowed the reader to distinguish the individual

---

13 The replica of a Roman wax tablet is produced by the sheltered workshop “Samariter-stift” in Neresheim (D), product line “NASEWEISS”. Their “Römisches Schreibtäfelchen” measures 120×70×12 mm, is equipped with black wax and accompanied by a pointed brass stylus. URL: <http://www.naseweiss-spiele.de>.
letter forms by forming a strong contrast with the surrounding pale yellowish parchment.

In dry-point writing no such colouring particles are deposited on the parchment, instead the letters are formed by deforming or bruising the parchment surface by means of a stylus or some other non-colouring hand-held device, such as an awl or a knife. Glosses written in this fashion are sometimes referred to as “scratched glosses”\(^\text{14}\) or “stylus glosses”,\(^\text{15}\) but the majority of the publications concerned with the topic prefers “dry-point glosses”. It can be argued that the term “dry-point gloss” is more precise than the other two in that the term “stylus gloss” implies that dry-point writing could only be created by means of a stylus, but there is the possibility that other handheld objects (e.g. knives) may have been in use as well for the same purpose, and the term “scratched glosses” in turn implies that the deformation left behind by the writing instrument always consists of a “scratch” – that is a tear or rupture of some kind. As Nievergelt (2007: 48) and Ernst (2007: 52), however, convincingly argue with regard to OHG dry-point writing, it is useful and necessary to distinguish between dry-point writing that consists of a mere indentation of the parchment surface and dry-point writing that effectively tears the uppermost layers of the parchment surface apart. The neutral term “dry-point gloss” seems to be the lowest common denominator by merely stating that some sort of pointy writing utensil was used that did not leave any visible deposit on the parchment surface, but merely a three-dimensional change in the parchment itself.\(^\text{16}\)

Bearing in mind how common the use of the stylus must have been in the monastic context – with the stylus both in use as a wax tablet writing instrument and a MS preparation tool – the stylus is admittedly the most likely candidate responsible for the extant dry-point writing that we know of. Since the material used in the fabrication of Anglo-Saxon styli ranges from relatively soft materials (such as ivory or bone) to rather hard materials (such as iron and brass) the impressions left behind by the various writing implements do not constitute a visually uniform appearance. Moreover, in addition to the stylus, other pointy or sharp utensils could potentially have been used for writing – such as awls (used for punching the prick-marks), quill-knives (used for preparation and repair of

---

\(^{14}\) It is predominantly the older literature that seems to prefer the term “scratched glosses”, but it remains a common alternative: cf. Napier (1900), Meritt (e.g. 1933), Page (e.g. 1973), Morrison (1987), Gwara (1997a).

\(^{15}\) Perhaps sometimes in imitation of German Griffelglossen [Griffel = stylus]; only rarely even “dry-stylus glosses” (e.g. Falileyev 2006: 576).

\(^{16}\) In hyphenating the term “dry-point” I follow Toon (1991), Rusche (1994), Schipper (1994), Ö Neill (1998), Falileyev & Russell (2003) and others as well as the OED (s.v. “dry-point”), but other spellings such as “drypoint” (cf. Gwara 1996b) and “dry point” (cf. Meritt 1961) are found in the literature, too.
the writing quills) and pen-knives (used for all kinds of everyday and MS-related purposes). Meritt (1945: viii) already points out that dry-point glosses could be classified into two groups, namely “those in which the point of the writing implement merely indented the surface of the parchment and those in which it tore the parchment.” Thus, a detailed characterization of the dry-point writing becomes an important tool for the dry-point gloss researcher.

Nievergelt (2007: 47–60), working on OHG dry-point material, presents a classification based on the physical properties of writing in MSS that allows for a differentiated categorization by taking the various types of dry-point writing into account, too. His most basic distinction is that between conventional ink or pencil writing, on the one hand, and dry-point writing, on the other hand; that is between writing that consists of some sort of discolouration of the MS surface (termed type “A”) and writing that merely deforms the MS surface three-dimensionally without any residue of a colouring agent (termed type “B”). In addition to these two broad categories, he defines a third group that shows both characteristics (termed type “AB”), both discolouring and deforming the MS surface. Deformational writing (i.e. type “B”) can be distinguished further according to the physical property of the dry-point writing utensils. Cutting tools and sharp styli will tend to cut the parchment surface (termed type “B.1” in Nievergelt’s taxonomy) and blunt styli will tend to deform the parchment surface without cutting it (termed type “B.2”). Dry-point traces left behind by different writing utensils often show markedly different visual characteristics. Ernst (2007: 52) suggests that glosses that are easily visible to the naked eye are usually of the cutting type (i.e. type “B.1”), while the deforming type (“B.2”) often requires beneficial lighting conditions for the writing to be set off visually on the parchment surface.

Nievergelt (2007: 47–59) convincingly shows that we have to understand dry-point writing as a tiny yet three-dimensional object in the semi-soft parchment surface. This three-dimensional object can have a range of optical properties depending on the nature of the deformation it represents. A tiny ridge may or may not be formed along the movement of the indentation, depending on the pressure applied by the writer, on the physical properties of the parchment itself and on the sharpness of the writing implement. By using an appropriate light source held at the right angle, the upper parts of the grooves created by the stylus or the knife may cast a tiny shadow onto the surrounding parchment and thus offer the eye a visible object, whereas diffuse light tends to blur out the edges and effectively prevents the eye from perceiving individual letter forms. Some dry-point glosses are even on the verge of being invisible in normal light conditions that one encounters in the library reading rooms. Especially type “B.2” writing offers very little contrasting contours in diffuse light and since the
visibility of dry-point glosses depends so heavily on the nature of the deformation or the physical tearing of the writing surface by the writing implement, there is no single-best way to make dry-point writing visible on the MS surface. While some dry-point glosses are easily visible in normal, ambient light, others can only be detected during careful autopsy of the MS surface with changing light angles.

Unfortunately, researchers working in a typical MS reading room are rather limited in their possibilities to change the angle of the incident light. For practical and conservational reasons the MSS have to rest firmly on the designated foam wedges. Holding a weak, yet focussed electric torch in one hand and wielding it carefully around the MS surface at a low angle often produces a considerable improvement in the legibility of dry-point writing. However, the diffuse artificial light of the reading room can interfere disadvantageously with the light emitted by the handheld torch. Depending on the reading room, it may then be helpful to find a spot near a natural daylight window or to find a comparatively dark corner of the room where the adverse artificial light is the least disruptive. Dry-point glosses that are added to the inner margin of the MS page often turn out to be especially difficult to autopsy, because the researcher is limited in modifying the incidence of light during decipherment due to the physical obstruction presented by the opposing MS page. Dry-point writing in the inner margin of MSS is therefore even more likely to go unnoticed (cf. Nievergelt 2007: 76–78).

The sketchiness of our understanding of OE dry-point glossing has also been severely aggravated by the fact that dry-point writing is usually not readily visible during casual perusal of a MS. Unless a researcher specifically looks out for dry-point writing, there is a good chance that most of the dry-point writing will go unnoticed. The strong contrast offered by ink writing automatically causes the human perception to mask out less extreme contours. As soon as researchers are prepared to see dry-point writing and know what to expect visually, chances of seeing such material increase dramatically.

2.2.3 Deformational Writing Outside the Manuscript Context

Outside the MS context, a sizable corpus of deformational writing from the Anglo-Saxon period has come down to us in the form of inscriptions. Both letters of the Roman alphabet and runes were carved into physical objects made of rock, metal, bone or wood throughout the Anglo-Saxon period.\textsuperscript{17} However,
I have not been able to establish a direct link between that type of epigraphic deformational writing and dry-point writing in Anglo-Saxon MSS. An indirect reflex of the Anglo-Saxon practice of inscribing runic letters onto objects may be present in runic dry-point additions to Anglo-Saxon MSS, though. It is striking to see that a number of dry-point additions from different Anglo-Saxon MSS are in fact composed of runes (cf. below). It is conceivable that at least some of these short inscriptions may have been added in imitation of the Anglo-Saxon practice of inscribing objects in runes, especially since several of the MS specimens seem to represent personal names, which is reminiscent of a whole number of Anglo-Saxon runic inscriptions, such as the Hartlepool name-stones, the Chester-le-Street stone or the Thames scramasax, in which personal names are added without any explicit description of the role that the named person plays with respect to the object itself (cf. Page 1999: 50, 58 and 113). It is to be hoped that further discoveries of similar runic entries in Anglo-Saxon MSS will allow us to arrive at a clearer picture of this phenomenon; for OHG dry-point runic writing in continental MSS, see Nievergelt (2011a).

An interesting example of Insular deformational writing outside MSS, whose purpose was probably not epigraphic but veritably practical, is presented by the Derrynaflan Paten inscriptions (cf. Brown 1993). The Derrynaflan Paten – a large decorated silver dish used for holding the bread in eucharistic services – was found during metal-detecting activities at the ecclesiastical site of Derrynaflan, County Tipperary (IE) in 1980. It forms part of a hoard of valuable liturgical metalwork, now kept in the National Museum of Ireland in Dublin. During conservation works on the Paten, a series of half-uncial letters was discovered on the rim, on the rivet-stud cups and on the frames carrying the filigree panels set upon the rim. They are believed to have served as assembly marks for the 8th-c. artisan or artisans that built it. Interestingly, the lettering on the rim and on the (remaining) rivet-stud cups match, but the letters on the frames “do not conform in a straightforward fashion, entailing ambiguity as to the proposed original assembly” (Brown 1993: 162). A detailed palaeographical analysis of the letter forms allowed for a dating to the second half of the 8th c. Surprisingly, the rim also features a tiny L. inscription, which is only approximately 1 mm high. Brown (1993: 165) assumes that “[t]he scribe must, presumably, have been working blind at that scale”, but the writing even features wedges, giving the minute inscription a “degree of formality”. Brown’s reading is only partly successful and the microscopic enlargements that she provides (Brown 1993: 166) make one wonder whether the inscription was ever intended to be read; she deciphers omne et ig(itur) or omne et g(ratia) and O creator ... n ... omnium. Brown (1993: 165) finds some parallels in Bald’s Leechbook and in Lacnunga, where the writing of religious texts on patens is advised in spells against “fever”, “elfin
tricks” and “temptations of the devil”, respectively. If the Derrynaflan Paten inscriptions are considered in this context, the legibility of the inscription may not have been considered necessary by the scribe; instead, the spiritual gesture alone may have served his or her purpose. Apart from two photographic details of the L. inscription, Brown (1993: 166) supplies a hand-drawn facsimile of the L. inscription as well as hand-drawn facsimiles of the letter forms and symbols found on the rim, the frames and the cups (Brown 1993: 162–163).

2.2.4 Ink, Pencil, Dry-Point

The extant amount of dry-point writing in Anglo-Saxon MSS that we know of clearly indicates that dry-point writing enjoyed a different status than ink writing in Anglo-Saxon England. No passages of any sizeable length in dry-point writing have been discovered so far in Anglo-Saxon MSS. The only sizeable amount of dry-point writing that we know from medieval MSS can be associated with the practice of glossing L. texts in L. or in a vernacular language. However, even in this context, dry-point writing clearly is not used to the same extent as ordinary ink writing: Even the MSS with the largest number of edited dry-point glosses feature no more than ca. 600 dry-point glosses, while some Anglo-Saxon MSS feature more than 5,000 OE ink glosses and many thousand L. ink glosses on top of that. Clearly, dry-point writing was the exception, writing in ink the rule.

Motivations behind dry-point writing remain something of a puzzle: Why should glossators choose to write without ink and produce writing that is so difficult to see? As pointed out above, there is no documented example of a continuous OE gloss in dry-point, nor are there examples of glossaries written in dry-point. The observation that dry-point writing in connection with OE glosses was restricted to the domain of the occasional gloss points to the possibility that glossing in dry-point may have been more of a spontaneous activity whereas a dedicated or planned activity, such as writing a continuous interlinear gloss or a glossary, would by default have been carried out in ink. Since our knowledge of dry-point writing is still highly incomplete, however, we have to be careful about drawing too general conclusions as long as we cannot even estimate what fraction of the overall picture we have uncovered so far.

It has been argued that dry-point writing may have been employed to preserve the neatness of the costly MSS, e.g. in the “Maihingen Gospels” [1/K:287*], produced in 8th-c. Echternach:

Bei der Lektüre einzelner lateinischer Passagen müssen Echternacher Mönche auf sprachliche Schwierigkeiten gestoßen sein. Um sich den Sinn dieser Stellen besser
If so, the preference of the stylus over the quill would have been motivated by the great respect that the glossators had for the aesthetic integrity of the written text. A similar interpretation is discernible in Meyer (1966: 224): “als Beschreibstoff diente der Griffel auch […] zum Eintrag von Notizen und Glossen, die nicht besonders hervortreten sollten,” or in Graham (2009: 17): “Possibly the drypoint glossator sought to avoid having the gloss interfere with or distract attention from the main text, as an ink gloss might.” In opposition to such conclusions, Rusche (1994: 196) argues that “this is refuted by the prevalence of ink glossing in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, even those considered works of art such as the Lindisfarne Gospels.” Rusche’s observation is correct, insofar as Aldred’s glossing of the “Lindisfarne Gospels” was indeed carried out boldly in ink. However, we must be careful when we consider Anglo-Saxon motivations, as they are not readily available and understandable to us. What may be one monk’s conviction in 8th-c. Echternach does not have to be shared by Aldred in 10th-c. Durham. It must be assumed that Aldred deliberately added his continuous OE gloss in ink, as he was most definitely convinced that he proceeded with God’s and St Cuthbert’s approval, as he states in his colophon: “Aldred presbyter indignus et misserrimus mið godes fultu’mæ þ sancti cuðberhtes hit of’ glóesade ón englisc.” Aldred’s glossing in ink, however, cannot be taken as evidence for the attitude of every Anglo-Saxon glossator from the 8th through to the 11th c., either. It may well be that in some cases considerations of concealment really played a role when writing in dry-point, but it would have to be argued for individual gloss hands in individual MSS.

18 I. e. ‘While reading individual passages in Latin, the monks of Echternach must have chanced upon linguistic difficulties. In order to memorize these passages more easily, they did what every student would do even today: they added the translation of difficult expressions inconspicuously to the book in their native tongue. Since they were afraid of desecrating – with their additions – the artfully calligraphed text that was considered divine, they took the stylus and scratched the words as dry-point glosses unnoticeably into the parchment.’

19 I. e. ‘The stylus also served as a writing utensil to enter notes and glosses that were not supposed to stand out particularly.’

20 Quoted from Nees (2003: 341); i. e. ‘And Aldred, unworthy and most miserable priest, glossed it in English with the help of God and St Cuthbert’ (Nees’s translation).
Another strand of argument is centred on practical considerations. The mere availability of the stylus as a writing implement may have been reason enough to use it in a MS context, too, even if it was not as easily readable as ink, or as Page puts it: “In a society where ink was not readily available, it was easier to make notes with dry-point” (2001: 241). Rusche suggests that dry-point writing perhaps predominantly took place outside the scriptorium (where quill and ink would have been ready to use):

Ink was neither rare nor expensive in the Middle Ages, but it had to be mixed before use, and any surplus would soon dry out. Also necessary was an inkhorn or some other vessel to hold the ink, a quill and a knife for sharpening the nib. While these materials were readily available in the scriptorium, a monk in another part of the monastery, such as the library, classroom or cell, had to rely on the only writing instruments that were always at hand: a wax tablet and a stylus. (Rusche 1994: 196)

This is an interesting thought experiment and I cannot think of a way to falsify the ideas behind it, but there is no way to corroborate them, either. We do not know when and where dry-point glossing was practiced during the daily routine of the monastery. We also do not know what the profile of the typical dry-point glossator might have been. Rusche surmises that the predominance of lexical dry-point glosses might be in line with a student “struggling to understand the Latin text” (1994: 199). The hypothesis that practical notions may have played a role in the choice of the stylus as writing implement seems plausible to me, yet the extant corpus of dry-point glosses would have to be investigated carefully for patterns of functional tendencies in the extant dry-point glossing first. Studies that consistently classify a specific corpus of dry-point glosses according to functional criteria remain yet to be published.

A model for such functional criteria is presented by Richter (1996: liv–lv) who classifies the OE ink glosses of London, British Library Royal 6. B. vii [K:255] according to an elaborate functional scheme, allowing him to draw conclusions about the status of the MS as a library copy, rather than a classroom book. It would surely be interesting to apply such functional criteria to dry-point gloss MSS to fathom to what extent the functional “profiles” of the glossing differs firstly between the MSS, secondly between the glossing hands and thirdly between ink and dry-point glosses.

Such profiles would have to take L. glossing into consideration, too, though, as Gwara (1999: 822) convincingly argues, and he therefore finds fault with Richter’s study that seemingly ignores the presence of thousands of L. glosses besides the 502 OE glosses in the same MS. Vernacular glossing did not take place in a vacuum; rather, it was an additional layer of annotation in a particular MS that hence must always be studied in its immediate context. Especially
so, since Richter tries to show that the difficulty of L. words does not correlate with their likelihood of being glossed in OE. He provides an example of such an arguably “easy” item of L. vocabulary in the word L. *frigidus* glossed with OE *cól*, and he observes that other (unfortunately unspecified) “difficult” items remain unglossed (Richter 1994: lx). Deciding which L. words would be considered as “difficult” and which ones as “easy” by an Anglo-Saxon readership is a precarious enterprise in itself. If we think of the situation in which the particular items of OE glossing were added, however, it is beyond doubt that the presence of L. glosses in the MS surely would have influenced the necessity for further glossing. Hence, that context has to be taken into consideration, too. If we look at the passage surrounding the L. word *frigidus* in London, British Library Royal 6. B. vii [K:255], f. 46r we find the surrounding passage to be glossed quite frequently in L.:

```latex
```

The addition of the two OE ink glosses happened in this heavily glossed surroundings and it is important to note that the two glosses are part of the same noun phrase, quoted from Vergil’s Eclogue VIII, 71: “In the meadows the cold snake is burst by incantation.” Ignoring the thousands of L. glosses that surround the OE glosses and ignoring the details of the L. text in the assessment of the OE glossing, then, makes all statements about the function of an individual gloss that is added in the middle of a heavily glossed text tenuous, at best. Here, I think, it can be argued that the comparatively easy L. word *frigidus* was glossed because it forms a noun phrase with the far-away and much less “easy” L. word *anguis*, which happens to be glossed in three other MSS of the same text, too (if this can be taken as an indicator of difficulty).

As far as I know, no functional studies have been carried out on OE dry-point glosses. Where the function of dry-point glosses (as opposed to ink glosses) is concerned, questions about the visibility and, more importantly, legibility of dry-point glosses back in the Anglo-Saxon period have to be addressed, too. Rusche thinks that the difficult visual appearance was inherent in the manner of writing without ink: “Scratched glosses were probably no easier to read when they were first made than they are now” (1994: 195). Page, though, expresses some doubts about this assumption:

---

I suspect that comparatively modern binding methods, where the book is put in a press to secure it firmly, could well have evened out depressions in a parchment surface. I have no evidence for it; only a general knowledge of what earlier modern binders might do in the interests of neatness rather than of scholarship. And of course very few Anglo-Saxon manuscripts retain early bindings. Further, any centuries of variations in temperature and humidity could have affected the characteristic detail of a parchment surface. (Page 2001: 221)

The bookbinders’ interests of neatness that Page refers to are well attested by codices whose margins have been cut off to form a perfectly even body of the book, sometimes even accepting loss of text or illuminations (let alone marginal glosses). It is easily possible that the compression applied during binding would have had a detrimental effect on the microscopic structures that had been produced by the dry-point writing. Jakobi-Mirwald (1993: 19a) reports that the dry-point glosses in Fulda, Hochschul- und Landesbibliothek Bonifatianus 2 [12/K:A41] have become “kaum noch verifizierbar”22 after the MS was restored in 1978; although she does not explicitly state what procedures were applied in the restoration process, it can be assumed that pressing may have been involved. Moreover, parchment, being an organic fabric, reacts quite markedly to humidity by swelling up and to extreme dryness by becoming warped and stiff. As far as I know, no scientific experiments considering the influence of such processes on dry-point writing have been carried out.23

Even if Page’s suspicion that dry-point writing deteriorates over time should turn out to be right, it is still quite certain that dry-point writing was not perfectly visible, even in Anglo-Saxon times. The ambient lighting situation must have played an important role back in the day, just as much as it does in the 21st c.24 It may be safely assumed, though, that the Anglo-Saxon reader would

22 I. e. ‘barely verifiable anymore’.
23 It goes without saying that such experiments would have to be carried out with modern stand-in MSS, produced in a similar fashion to Anglo-Saxon exemplars. Some primitive tests that I carried out with dry-point writing in modern paper books and in a pile of artisan parchment did not reveal a detrimental effect of pressing on dry-point readability, however it is easily possible that similar experiments on parchment would yield a different result.
24 To demonstrate this point at ISAS 2013 in Dublin, I added an admittedly nonsensical dry-point gloss <[>] above the word “Isidore” in the entry for [12/K:A41] to each of the 200 copies of the Handlist of MSS known to contain OE dry-point glosses that I handed out to the members of the audience. At the end of my talk, I invited the audience to look for the dry-point gloss, knowing perfectly well that the dry-point writing would turn out to be virtually invisible in the artificially lit auditorium. The gloss was, however, (and still is on the left-over copies that I have) plainly visible to the naked eye, whenever the Handlist is inspected in natural daylight.
perhaps at least sometimes have been at liberty to choose a suitable seat to al-
low the daylight to shine benevolently on the MS page at the right angle. Such
liberties can often no longer be taken by the modern researcher, as in most
present-day repositories the workstations for the study of medieval MSS are
clearly demarcated; whether the ambient light happens to be right thus becomes
mainly a matter of coincidence. Whoever entered the dry-point writing in me-
dieval times, though, must have been working on the MS in a suitable spot, as it
does not seem plausible that dry-point writing would have been employed, had
it not been plainly legible at the moment of writing.

Clanchy raises the interesting point that medieval ink writing may have been
an activity restricted to the warmer parts of the year in connection with two ac-
counts by the 11th-c. Anglo-Norman chronicler Ordericus Vitalis (Clanchy 1993:
116 and 119). In one instance, Ordericus interestingly relates that he wanted to
make a copy of a life of St William when he was in Winchester in wintertime,
but “the winter cold prevented [him] from writing”, so he made “a full accurate
abbreviation on tablets” (quoted from Clanchy 1993: 119). If this was not only
a peculiarity of Ordericus’s writing habits, but represents a general, positive
medieval attitude towards stylus writing during inclement temperatures, it is at
least imaginable that dry-point glossing may have been a practical alternative
to ink glossing during the cold season, too. If so, dry-point glossing may have
been practiced in wintertime especially frequently, but I cannot think of a way
how to validate this interesting proposition.

The stylus was not the only alternative to quill and ink in Anglo-Saxon MSS:
Pencils, for instance, were also used in the ruling of late Anglo-Saxon MSS.
However, their use for that purpose became only widespread towards the very
end of the Anglo-Saxon period (cf. Ker 1957: xxiv–xxv). Pencil writing is rather
the exception in Anglo-Saxon MSS, too, but from four MSS with OE dry-point
glosses, pencil writing is reported:

– Cambridge, CCC 173 [4/K:40] features OE glosses in ink and in dry-point.
Ker (1957: 59) mentions that some of the glosses are entered in pencil, too, but
neither Meritt (1936, 1945) nor Page (1973, 1979, 1982) mention this manner
of entry. Page (1973: 210) notes: “Some [glosses] are in ink, some dry-point,
and the two often overlap.” Perhaps that “overlap” is in fact pencil writing
(see below).
– Cambridge, CCC 223 [5/K:52] features OE glosses in ink, dry-point and pen-
cil. Based on Meritt’s description of the pencil writing (“a coloring matter
which is now a faint purple”, 1945: 28), the actual deposit could either consist
of coloured chalk – similar to the deposit created by a present-day crayon – or perhaps minium.25

- Cambridge, UL Kk. 3. 21 [11/K:24] is reported to feature the words byrnstan beoffan sunu ælfnoð ælrices sunu æt hrocanlea written twice, once in sprawling pencil, and once in ink, on the originally blank leaf at the end of the last quire of the MS (Ker 1957: 37).

- London, BL Additional 40000 [15/K:131] may perhaps feature some glosses in faded pencil writing, as mentioned by Ker (1957: 163), but there is no mention of pencilling in Meritt’s (1961: 42 [no. 4]) edition.

Similar to dry-point glosses, OE pencil glosses have not yet been studied in detail, but they do not seem to be nearly as common as dry-point glosses.26 If pencil or crayon glosses fade or smudge, they may, however, sometimes leave a dry-point like appearance behind and hence may erroneously be identified as “pale” ink glosses. Consequently, they are perhaps often not distinguished correctly from dry-point glosses in the literature.27 Further research, focussing specifically on the physical properties of pencil and dry-point writing, is called for.28

25 In the digital facsimile available from “Parker Library on the web”, both the pencil and the dry-point glosses are virtually invisible (cf.n. 4 on p. 111).


27 Vaciago (1993: 6–7 [no. 19]), for instance, does not mention the fact that some of the glosses in Cambridge CCC 223 [5/K:52] are entered in pencil; Ker’s observation that the glosses in London, BL Additional 40000 [15/K:131] might have been entered in pencil is also not included (1993: 13 [no. 51]). For a seminal overview of OHG pencil glossing, cf. Nievergelt (2009a: 233–234), who lists 17 OHG pencil gloss MSS. Incidentally, German glossographic terminology distinguishes “Schwarzstift”, “Braunstift” and “Rötel” (perhaps best translated as ‘black crayon’, ‘brown crayon’, and ‘minium’) and refers to them as the group of “Farbstifte” (i.e. ‘coloured pencils’).

28 Perhaps, some of the dry-point compilation notes that Schipper (1994) discussed were entered by means of something other than a mere stylus, too (see below, p. 51).
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.

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. 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.


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.\textsuperscript{32} 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.

\textbf{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.\textsuperscript{33} Interestingly, six of the names also form part of a long list of names added – presumably as a \textit{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 \textit{Gospels} and it was certainly the high status of the MS that ultimately led to its use as a \textit{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’.\textsuperscript{34}

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 \textit{Catalogue} presented below, as they do not qualify as glosses as outlined above.

\textit{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

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32} Cf. Puliano (2002) for some very interesting examples.
\item \textsuperscript{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.
\item \textsuperscript{34} URL: <https://lichfield.ou.edu/st-chad-gospels/features>.
\end{itemize}
the MS belonged to Minster-in-Thanet Abbey at some stage. The MS itself is written in uncials (cf. also Lowe 1960: 21), “probably in a Kentish centre, to judge by the script” (CLA 2: 257), sec. viii\(^1\) 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. 30\(^v\), 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.l8 [G:841] (also known as the “Codex Fossati-ensis”, sec. viii\(^a\) or ix\(^a\), originating perhaps from Northumbria). The inscription is placed between the columns of the final page of the Gospel of John on f. 213\(^r\).\(^37\)

*CLA* (2: 183) reports a short entry in Insular dry-point writing on the lower margin of f. 41\(^r\) of London, British Library Cotton Caligula A. xv [G:311], reading *liofric sacerđ 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. viii\(^2\).

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 kui non habit in consilio impiorum et in uia peccatorum*) are reported from f. 1\(^r\) of Wolfenbüttel (D), Herzog August Bibliothek Cod. Guelf. 17 Weissenburg, which contains commentaries of the Psalms, sec. ix, 1\(^{st}\) half (Düwel 1999: 40). They are barely visible (some of them even decipherable) along the top margin of f. 1\(^r\) 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 17\(^{th}\) 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. 1\(^r\) 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 Khlevov (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 “BUGRD”, 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 ᚦᚢᚾᚾᚦ “B UNRÞ”, 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 ethos 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. 47r. 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. 49r of the “Exeter Book”. The

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. 96r (Pl. 23a), a robed figure on f. 87r (Pl. 23b), a foliate rosette on f. 64r (Pl. 23c) and head and wings of an angel on f. 78r (Pl. 23d).
Terminology and Scope

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 decipheres as ᚖᚹᚨᚹ, 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 ā(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):

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 ?saltrie).

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. Syncope of the medial vowel (i.e. -tr-) is not compatible with L. psalterium, and also in OE it is attested only once in the DOEC 2009, in the form saltre (dat. sg.) from the very late “Eadwine Psalter”, glossing L. psalterio (Psalm 143, referring to the instrument, not to the Book of Psalms). Both syncope of the medial vowel and the ending -ie are reminiscent of ME forms (cf. MED “sautil(e (n.)”), however the -l- is not typical for ME, where forms in -u- or -w- dominate by far, though the former does occur. The lack or presence of initial p- cannot help in dating the entry, either, although forms with initial 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. 11v.42 In the originally blank space below a tabular representation of the Anglo-Saxon futhorc, runic dry-point f u þ 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 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.43

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

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).
41 Cambridge, Trinity College Library R. 17. 1, sec. xii; the interlinear gloss is very late, sec. xii ned (Ker 1957: 135–136 [no. 91]).
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]).
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/ix 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. viiiii (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.

Facsimile drawings in Lehmann (1925: 16) and Derolez (1954: 271); for a discussion of individual symbols, cf. Derolez (1954: 271–272). Facsimile drawing and short discussion in Lehmann (1925: 16). Derolez (1954: 414) agrees with Lehmann’s reading, which hinges on a mixture of runic ᴩ ‘e’ and Roman ‘P’ – disguised as runic ᴩ ‘w’ – forming a peculiar bind rune. The fact that the alphabet on the back cover also features ᴩ ‘w’ where we would normally expect ᴩ ‘p’ gives further credence to this interpretation. 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 assorts 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 was ‘the other was’.\footnote{48}

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.\footnote{49}

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.\footnote{50}

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. 194. 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...
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*K (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 <₃>) 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-Fankhänel (1999: 108). 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>, 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 L. 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-Fankhänel (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.'
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[48x554]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 *beginnes*. 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),62 I am not inclined to accept *bigine* as an OE form at the moment. *CLA*’s and Ó Cróinín’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 (*BSK*: 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. vii vi/iv, where the MS remained until the secularization of 1803 (cf. *BSK*: 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(?)*inhxbnxįįįį* glossing L. *inhabitate* ‘to dwell in’. Undoing the substitutions, Nievergelt (2009: 182) interprets the gloss tentatively as OHG *inbuan uįįίί* ‘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.
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 1, 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 gll. 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 as OE.

---

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 DOEC, 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).

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.

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.\textsuperscript{67} 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.\textsuperscript{68} 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.

\subsection*{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.\textsuperscript{69} 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

\textsuperscript{67} Larratt Keefer (personal communication, February 13, 2013).

\textsuperscript{68} Cf. Meritt (1933: 307, n. 7) and Page (1979: 33).

\textsuperscript{69} 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 Griffl 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
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]).

glosses 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.

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

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.

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 2012, 77 179 in 2013 and 202 in 2015. 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% 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. “blādre”; 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;\(^\text{81}\)
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>.

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.
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. rufum 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.83 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

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 a 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.
British Library, dating from the early 5th to the 10th c. Yoshizawa & Kobayashi (1999: 5) think that the dry-point writing in these Dunhuang MSS was entered by students who were taking notes during a lecture. They also think that these notes may ultimately help to verify the pronunciation of Classical Chinese and give insights into the methods of Buddhist teaching. Yoshizawa even invented an apparatus specifically for the study of dry-point writing, called *kakuhitsu scope*, “which consists of a special lamp, a metallic case, reflectors and filters, and enables the characters to be read and photographed” (Yoshizawa & Kobayashi 1999: 4).

In Korean, dry-point writing is known as *kakp’il* writing (*kakp’il* meaning ‘stylus’ in Korean). The existence of *kakp’il* writing in Korean MSS was only discovered in the year 2000, again by the Japanese scholar Kobayashi. According to King (2010: 219), Kobayashi’s discovery “revolutionized thinking on the history of writing in both Korea and Japan, and has forced scholars to go back and re-examine virtually every single Koryó-era [AD 918–1392] hanmun (Literary Sinitic) [i.e. Classical Chinese] text of a canonic Buddhist or Confucian nature for the presence of kakp’il [dry-point] kugyŏl markings [i.e. annotations that render Chinese more easily understandable for Koreans].” The interest in glossing in general and dry-point glossing in particular has since been rising in East Asia, and King reports that “kugyŏl studies have become the ‘final frontier’ of Korean historical linguistics” (*ibid.*).

Since Asian MSS are composed of paper, rather than parchment, the typical Asian stylus looks quite different from the typical European stylus. Asian styli are usually made of wood, bamboo or ivory (never brass, iron or silver) and have a length of about 24 cm. They are 6–10 mm thick and have a pointed end used in writing. Yoshizawa & Kobayashi (1999: 4) report that some of the styli found in Japanese shrines, temples, palaces or museums still showed fibrous remains at their tips, which could be shown to be microscopic scraps of Japanese paper through chemical analysis.

### 2.4.7 Dry-Point Writing in Post-Conquest England

It appears that the use of the stylus as writing implement in English MSS was also known in the post-Conquest ME period. Oxford, Corpus Christi College 198 (*Geoffrey Chaucer, Canterbury Tales, AD 1410×1420*) contains scribbles

---

86 A digital facsimile of the MS is publicly available from “Early Manuscripts at Oxford University”. For unknown reasons, the facsimile pictures are slightly out of focus and quite grainy. A sprawling dry-point scribble is visible slanting upwards in the margin of f. 146, but I can only recognize some smudged edges of letter-like strokes. URL: <http://image.ox.ac.uk/show?collection=corpus&manuscript=ms198>.
that “have mostly been pumiced away in the cleaning process. A few survive in dry point, nearly all illegible” (Manly & Rickert 1940: 98). Unfortunately, Manly & Rickert do not provide examples of scribbles that were still legible, which would allow some tentative conclusions as to what the nature of the connection of these scribbles with the base text might be. In addition to these scribbles, the MS bears a dry-point signature *Burleon* f. 146, which is associated by Manly & Rickert with a prominent London family who had personal ties with Chaucer. Manly & Rickert think the signature represents an owner’s mark, “which looks as old as the text” (1940: 98).

To what extent dry-point writing was still practiced in post-Conquest England has not been investigated systematically so far. Clanchy (1993: 118–120) does not mention dry-point writing in his portrait of ME stylus usage. Hunt (1991), who is aware of the Anglo-Saxon dry-point practices (cf. 1991: 9), does not report any dry-point finds in the numerous post-Conquest MSS that he investigated. We cannot make any statements about the falling out of use of Anglo-Saxon dry-point annotation practices, however. Whether the late use of the stylus in a Chaucerian MS context represents a continuation of the OE practice or whether we have to assume a polygenetic origin, is difficult to assess, as the lack of reports in the literature does not necessarily imply the lack of existence of similar notes in other ME MSS. Since the stylus is still used in connection with wax tablets at the time, the transfer from the context of the wax tablet to the context of MSS seems in any case always a possibility without any need for an Anglo-Saxon model.