with yet undeciphered interpretamenta, hoping that others may decipher them some day (e.g. Gwara 1996b: 145).

Gwara’s industrious work on the glossed *Pdv* MSS also produced a number of previously unedited ink glosses and Gwara continued to make OE dry-point discoveries during his continued work on the MSS over many years. The lonely OE dry-point gloss in London, Lambeth Palace MS 200 [23/K:--] may serve as an example: No vernacular glossing is reported from that MS in Gwara (1993) and (1997c), but Gwara (1999) and (2001) report a single OE dry-point gloss, which must have leapt to Gwara’s eyes sometime in between. Consequently, the MS must be treated as an OE gloss MS and ought to be furnished with a Ker number in due course.

### 3.7 Minor Contributions by Other Researchers

Over the years, several scholars added their share to our knowledge of OE dry-point glossing by publishing reports of new finds.

Craster (1923) edits *De raris fabulis* from Oxford, Bodleian Bodley 572 [26/K:313] and deciphers 8 dry-point glosses, 6 of which he considers to be OE; the other two he identifies as Brittonic. He does not discuss the forms and simply lists them alongside their lemmata. The Bodley MS had been known to be a gloss MSS by virtue of some 140 Brittonic ink glosses noticed as early as the 17th c. by Gerard Langbaine, Provost of Queen’s College, Oxford, who catalogued the MS ca. AD 1650 in a hand-written catalogue (preserved in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Langbaine 5). Langbaine mentions both Brittonic and OE glosses in the MS (“alicubi etiam Saxonica”, i.e. ‘occasionally also in Old English’), but there are no OE ink glosses in the MS. Hence, Craster (1923: 136) concludes that Langbaine’s description could only refer to the demonstrably OE dry-point glosses that Craster edits. If so, Langbaine’s report would be the earliest report of OE dry-point glosses that I am aware of at the moment. It would also mean that Langbaine thought the presence of dry-point glosses to be so common that he did not feel it was necessary to point out this circumstance. On the other hand, it may also be the case that Langbaine erroneously identified some of the Brittonic ink glosses as OE.

Robinson (1965: 304–305) mentions 10 previously unedited dry-point glosses from London, BL Royal 5. E. xi [19/K:252]. He discusses one of the glosses in detail, giving the L. context in full. The other 9 glosses are listed as lemma/interpretamentum pairs in a footnote.

Toon (1984) presents a list of MSS from the British Library, which he explicitly searched for dry-point glosses. Toon reports having deciphered dry-point gloss-
es from several MSS (see below), but he does not edit his findings, except for a handful of previously unedited dry-point glosses from British Library Royal 5. E. xi, f. 9v [19/K:252] (cf. Toon 1984: 324–325). He prints a kind of diplomatic transcript of this MS page and indicates the OE interpretamenta above their L. lemmata, including readings from other MSS. I tried to establish whether he published his other findings somewhere else, but I have not been able to identify any printed editions of this material so far.

Morrison (1987) edits 10 dry-point glosses in Gregorius, Regula pastoralis from Paris, BN lat. 9561 [30/K:369] and deciphers 9 glosses that were mentioned as undecipherable by Meritt (1957). He also lists some further undecipherable glosses that he noticed. He explicitly adheres to Page’s (1979: 29) directive about how to edit dry-point gloss material; he lists: folio number, line number, L. context with lemma typeset in italics, a reference to PL 77, the OE interpretamentum and a short commentary on legibility issues (if present). He states that he deciphered the glosses during three brief visits to the MS room in early Spring and Summer of 1985. Interestingly, he stresses that he “relied exclusively on day-light”, without specifying whether this was a conscious decision or due to some specific practical exigency.

Rusche (1994) edits 160 dry-point glosses and gloss fragments to 153 lemmata from New Haven, Beinecke Library 401 [24/K:12] (Aldhelm, Carmen de virginitate). He distinguishes six hands by considering the physical nature of the glosses carefully and dates them on palaeographic grounds. He concludes that the ink glosses to the same lemma as dry-point glosses probably post-date those in dry-point, because the dry-point glosses would not have been added if the ink glosses had already been there. Rusche’s (1994) edition follows the traditional layout, by giving folio number and line number, L. lemma, OE interpretamentum with letters A to E denoting the hands of the glossators and a reference to Ewald’s (1919) critical edition of Aldhelm’s Carmen de virginitate. Discussion of individual glosses is relegated to endnotes. Parallel glossing from other MSS is not indicated systematically.

McGowan (1998), on the one hand, reports 11 previously unedited OE dry-point glosses from London, BL Royal 13 A. xv [21/K:266]. The 7 OE dry-point glosses that he reports from London, BL Royal 5 E. xi [19/K:252], on the other hand, had already been published by Gwara (1993 and 1996b), when McGowan noticed them “under afternoon natural light conditions” (McGowan 1998: 166, n. 3) in 1997. Gwara’s readings differ for 4 of those 7 glosses; sometimes signif-