6. Characterization of the Known Corpus of Old English Dry-Point Gloss Manuscripts

In what follows, I shall first present some statistics that may allow us to fathom the status of dry-point writing within the domain of OE glossing. Then I discuss the commonalities among the 34 OE dry-point gloss MSS just catalogued by investigating this corpus for patterns concerning the origins of the MSS, the dates of the MSS, the glossed contents of the MSS, potential times and places at which the dry-point glosses may have been entered, the co-occurrence with vernacular ink glosses, the co-occurrence with other vernacular dry-point glosses and the co-occurrence with so-called construe marks. Such patterns may tell us something about the physical and intellectual contexts in which dry-point glossing in OE would take place and it allows us to identify other Anglo-Saxon MSS that may be interesting candidates for further investigation due to their similarities.

6.1 Numbers and Ratios

Based on our Catalogue we can count 34 MSS known to contain OE dry-point glosses at the moment. To understand more about the status of dry-point glossing in Anglo-Saxon England, it may prove interesting to see how common the practice is within the extant corpus of Anglo-Saxon MSS. Overall, about 1,200 MSS and MS fragments have been identified so far that have either Anglo-Saxon origin or Anglo-Saxon provenance before AD 1100 (cf. Gneuss 2001: 3). Although, dry-point glosses have also been edited from three MSS that do not belong in this group – because they are considered purely Continental (both concerning origin and provenance) and their OE glosses are assumed to have been added on the Continent¹ – we can still assume that the number of 1,200 MSS roughly outlines the absolute maximum of surviving MSS that may be potential OE dry-point gloss carriers in the first place. If we subtract the three purely Continental MSS, we can calculate a ratio of (ca. 31 / 1,200=) 2.5 %. This means about one in every forty Anglo-Saxon MSS features OE dry-point glosses.²

¹ This is the state of our present knowledge about [1/K:287*], [12/K:A41] and [32/K:A44]. Interestingly, Ker (1957: 348) does not relegate the “Maihingen Gospels” [1/K:287*] to the Appendix, even though he presumes Continental origin.

² As with all numbers that are to follow, we have to treat the results of that estimate with great care. Both the numerator and the divisor eventually will have to be corrected.
The majority of Anglo-Saxon MSS that have been identified to date do not contain any writing in OE, however, because Latin was the dominant literary language of the time. Hence, to fathom the status of dry-point writing in the context of OE literacy, it may be more appropriate to take no account of the MSS that show no traces of vernacular writing in OE for the moment. Ker’s (1957, 1976) and Blockley’s (1982, 1994) tally of MSS containing OE may serve as a further point of comparison, then: They count 427 MSS in the main part of their Catalogue and another 45 MSS in their Appendix, adding up to 479 MSS containing OE. To make dry-point gloss MSS numbers comparable with these numbers (though it hardly makes any difference), we have to add the two MSS from our Catalogue which are not yet included in Ker’s numbering system (i.e. [23 / K:–] and [33 / K:–]), to arrive at 481 MSS. We can then say that about (34 / 481≈) 7 % of all MSS containing OE feature OE dry-point glosses.

It is perhaps even more informative to calculate the ratio of OE dry-point gloss MSS within the corpus of OE gloss MSS, but for lack of a comprehensive catalogue of OE gloss MSS, this turns out to be an intricate enterprise. If we share the same notion of “gloss MSS” as the definition that BS/rK operates with, we have to include MSS with glossaries, MSS with continuous interlinear glosses and MSS with occasional glosses. If we start out with the numbers presented in Vaciago’s (1993) Handlist, we find that 157 MSS contain either occasional or continuous OE glosses. Updating these numbers with the two MSS in our Catalogue that were not yet known to Vaciago (1993), we arrive at 159 MSS. There are conflicting statements about the number of OE glossaries in the literature: Between 1981, when Gneuss’s Preliminary Handlist appeared, and 2001, when Gneuss published his much expanded and updated Handlist, the number of Anglo-Saxon MSS and MS fragments rose from 947 items to ca. 1,200. It is likely that findings of future codicological and palaeographical studies will cause this number to be increasing further at a slow rate, but major changes are not to be expected. A comparatively more substantial increase in the number of OE dry-point gloss MSS, however, seems possible, since dry-point glosses have not been investigated systematically so far. It is unlikely that our known corpus of OE dry-point gloss MSS at the moment coincides with the actual number of MSS that have dry-point glossing in OE.

3 Ker’s numbering scheme does not correspond to the actual number of MSS. Ker’s (1957) original Catalogue counts from no. 1 to no. 412 in the main part (=412). There are, however, the “starred” nos. 6*, 7*, 95*, 97*, 98*, 110*, 116*, 121* and 287* (=+9) and two numbers that have been skipped, namely nos. 44 and 368 (=−2). The (1957) Appendix counts 39 MSS (=+39). In Ker (1976), nos. 413–421 (=+9) are added in the main part and nos. 40–45 (=+6) in the Appendix. Blockley (1982) can be ignored for our purposes, because these addenda are repeated in Blockley (1994), in which nos. 422 (erroneously printed as “442”) to 428 (=+7) are added in the main part, while the Appendix remains unchanged. It can be argued that no. 428 in Blockley (1994: 84–85) actually forms part of Ker’s no. 6, and hence ought to be ignored for now (=−1), resulting in 412+9−2+39+9+6+7−1=479.
Ker’s index (1957: 523–524) counts 63 L./OE glossaries⁴ and Cameron (1973: 248–254) counts 59 L./OE glossaries.⁵ For the sake of convenience, I shall follow Ker’s count just now. By virtue of the fact that they also feature occasional or continuous glosses, 13 of Ker’s glossary MSS are already included in Vaciago’s (1993) Handlist and have to be subtracted.⁶ Thus, we arrive at (157+2+63−13=) 209 OE gloss MSS in comparable fashion to BStK. We can now calculate a ratio of (34/209≈) 16.3 % for OE dry-point gloss MSS within the corpus of OE gloss MSS. That means about one in six OE gloss MSS (including occasional glosses, continuous glosses and glossaries) features OE dry-point glosses. Despite the fact that large numbers of OHG dry-point gloss MSS have been identified in recent years, OE dry-point gloss MSS still constitute a larger fraction within the corpus of OE gloss MSS (≈16.3 %) than OHG dry-point gloss MSS do within the corpus of OHG gloss MSS (≈11–13 %).⁷

So far, dry-point glossing in OE is known only in the form of occasional glosses and it may well make sense to calculate a ratio of known dry-point gloss MSS within the corpus of known occasional gloss MSS. Again, we can start out from Vaciago’s (1993) Handlist, in which 133 of the listed 157 MSS contain occasional OE glosses.⁸ We then add the two missing MSS from our Catalogue to arrive at a ratio of (34/135≈) 25 %. That means one in four MSS with occasional OE glosses features dry-point glosses. When it comes to occasional OE glossing, writing in dry-point seems to have been a valid alternative to writing in ink in Anglo-Saxon England.

---


⁵ The differences arise (α) from [K:8] and [K:239], which are not included by Cameron (=−2); (β) [K:A16] and [K:A26], which are treated as one item by Cameron (=−1); (γ) [K:A24], [K:A27] and [K:A38], which are treated as one item as well (=−2); (δ) Cameron (1973: 252 [no. 43] = Leiden, Bibliotheek Der Rijksuniversiteit BPL 191), which is not catalogued by Ker or Blockley (=+1); hence 63−2−1−2+1=59.

⁶ Ker nos.: 2, 8, 146, 198 (i.e. [17/K:198]), 207, 210 (i.e. [18/K:210]), 227, 249, 256, 295, 304, 360 and 371.

⁷ The number of known OHG dry-point gloss MSS has been increasing very quickly and the latest numbers have not been published. Therefore, I have to rely on estimates for the moment.

⁸ I tried to count them as carefully as I could and I identified 125 occasional-only gloss MSS, 32 continuous-only gloss MSS and 8 MSS that feature both occasional and continuous glosses: 125+8=133 occasional gloss MSS.
6.2 Origins of the Manuscripts

The origins are not established with equal confidence for all OE dry-point gloss MSS. In general, we can say that about two thirds of the 34 OE dry-point gloss MSS originated in Great Britain and about one third originated on the Continent.

*Canterbury, Christ Church*

- London, BL Royal 15 B. xix [22/K:268] Sec. x² or x<sup>ex</sup> Canterbury CC
- London, BL Royal 6 A. vii [20/K:254] Sec. x<sup>ex</sup> Canterbury CC
- Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibl. mun. 189 [2/K:7] Sec. x / xi Canterbury CC
- Cambridge, CCC 326 [7/K:61] Sec. x / xi Canterbury CC
- Cambridge, Trinity College O. 2. 31 [10/K:95] Sec. x / xi Canterbury CC
- London, BL Cotton Cleopatra C. viii [16/K:145] Sec. x / xi Canterbury CC
- London, BL Royal 5. E. xi [19/K:252] Sec. x / xi Canterbury CC
- Salisbury, Cathedral 38 [31/K:378] Sec. x<sup>ex</sup> Canterbury CC, StA?

*Canterbury, St Augustine’s*

- Cambridge, Trinity College O. 2. 30 [9/K:94] Sec. x<sup>med</sup> Canterbury StA
- London, Lambeth Palace 200 [23/K:--] Sec. x² Canterbury StA
- Oxford, Bodleian Digby 146 [27/K:320] Sec. x<sup>ex</sup> Canterbury StA

---

9 For reasons of clarity and comprehensibility, I shall not quote the sources for the attributions and datings made in this and the following sections. All the information given and all the claims made are exclusively based on the sources quoted in detail in the *Catalogue* above. Hence, readers are kindly advised to consult the *Catalogue* to trace back individual pieces of information. Dates and origins quoted for Anglo-Saxon MSS that are not part of the *Catalogue* are taken from Gneuss (2001) and Ker (1957) and its subsequent updates.
Origins of the Manuscripts

Abingdon / Canterbury / Worcester?

- “Yale Fragment” [24/K:12] Sec. ix in (viii ex?) Canterbury?, Worcester?
- Cambridge, UL Kk. 3. 21 [11/K:24] Sec. x or x med. Abingdon (?)
- Cambridge, CCC 57 [3/K:34] Sec. x / xi Abingdon, Canterbury CC?

Cornwall

- Oxford, Bodleian Bodley 572 [26/K:313] Sec. x²/⁴ Cornwall, Lannaled?

Broadly Placed in England

- Würzburg, UB M. p. th. f. 79 [34/K:400] Sec. viii¹ S England
- St. Paul i. L., Stiftsbibliothek 2/1 [33/K:–] Sec. viii, first half N? England
- Paris, BN lat. 9561 [30/K:369] Sec. viii¹ or vii med. S England
**Sphere of the Anglo-Saxon Mission on the Continent**

- Köln, EDDB 213  
  [14/K:98*]  
  Sec. viii\[^{in}\]  
  Lindisfarne, Echternach?

- St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 1394  
  [32/K:A44]  
  Sec. viii\[^{in}\]  
  Germany?

- Augsburg, UB Cod. I.2.4° 2  
  [1/K:287*]  
  Sec. vii\[^{1}\]  
  Echternach, Northumbria?

**Italy**

- Kassel, UB 2° Ms. theol. 65  
  [13/K:121*]  
  Sec. vi  
  N Italy

**N and NE France**

- Fulda, HLB Bonifatianus 2  
  [12/K:A41]  
  Sec. vii\[^{1}\]  
  Luxeuil, Mainz?

- London, BL Cotton Vespasian D. xiv  
  [18/K:210]  
  Sec. ix\[^{3/4}\]  
  N or NE France

- Cambridge, CCC 223  
  [5/K:52]  
  Sec. ix\[^{3/4}\]  
  N France, Saint-Berthin?, Arras?

- Oxford, Bodleian Rawlinson C. 697  
  [28/K:349]  
  Sec. ix\[^{3/4}\]  
  NE France

**Brittany**

- Cambridge, Fitzwilliam 45–1980  
  [8/K:7*]  
  Sec. ix\[^{ex}\]  
  W France, Dol-de-Bretagne?

- Oxford, Bodleian Auctarium D. 5. 3  
  [25/K:293]  
  Sec. ix/x  
  Brittany(?)

- London, BL Additional 40 000  
  [15/K:131]  
  Sec. x\[^{in}\]  
  France, Brittany?, SW France??

Within the Insular group, Canterbury emerges as the most frequent place of origin by a margin: 8 MSS are associated with Canterbury, Christ Church and
3 MSS with Canterbury, St Augustine’s, all of them produced in the late 10th or early 11th c., presumably in the wake of the Benedictine Reform. Canterbury origin is also discussed in connection with Cambridge, CCC 57 [3/K:34], which was produced at about the same time, but Abingdon origin still seems to be favoured in the literature. Cambridge, UL Kk. 3. 21 [11/K:24], whose production falls into that era as well, is also suspected to originate from Abingdon, mainly based on an inscription referring to Abingdon’s surroundings. For the 9th-c. “Yale Fragment” [24/K:12] both Canterbury and Worcester origin are considered to be possible on palaeographic grounds, and London, BL Royal 13 A. xv [21/K:266], sec. x, has also been associated with Worcester. Partly Cornish and partly Welsh origin has been conjectured for Oxford, Bodleian Bodley 572 [26/K:313], sec. x, but more recent literature prefers Cornish origin. Four 8th-c. MSS, the 9th-c. “Cotton Bede” [17/K:198] and two 11th-c. MSS are only vaguely placed in (Southern) England. Equally uncertain is the origin of Paris, BN lat. 9561 [30/K:369], sec. viii, which may have been produced in an unidentified Southern English centre or possibly even on the Continent, though the presence of OE glosses and its subsequent St Bertin provenance renders Continental origin perhaps a little less likely, as the MS would have had to travel back and forth.

For three 8th-c. MSS a close connection with the Anglo-Saxon mission on the Continent can be discerned, placing them arguably in between Great Britain and the Continent. For both Köln, EDBB 213 [14/K:98*] and Augsburg, UB Cod. I.2.4° 2 [1/K:287*] it has been argued that they were either produced in Northumbria or in Echternach by a scribe trained in a Northumbrian centre. It seems that the palaeographical literature prefers the first interpretation for the former and the second interpretation for the latter at the moment. St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 1394, Part IX, of which only a fragment is extant [32/K:A44], may have been written in a German centre with active Anglo-Saxon traditions.

Within the Continental group, Kassel, UB 2° Ms. theol. 65 [13/K:121*], sec. vi, is quite exceptional both for its great age and its Northern Italian origin. It is also connected to the Anglo-Saxon mission on the Continent; however, the MS was not produced in its context, but rather became part of it after some extensive travelling. Fulda, HLB Bonifatianus 2 [12/K:A41] is assumed to have been produced in Luxeuil or a centre under its influence in sec. viii. Legend also connects it to the Anglo-Saxon mission on the Continent by interpreting the cuts in the MS’s cover as tangible evidence of Boniface’s fatal encounter with the Frisians.

---

10 The “Cotton Bede” [17/K:198] has also been associated tentatively with Canterbury, St Augustine’s, but this is hotly debated and several other origins are advocated in the literature (cf. p. 149).
The remaining six MSS were produced in France and they all reached Great Britain at an early date. Three 9th-c. MSS are placed in Northern France\textsuperscript{11} and three late 9th-c. and early 10th-c. MSS, strikingly all containing the *Gospels*, are associated with Brittany.\textsuperscript{12}

### 6.3 Dates of the Manuscripts

By far the oldest known OE dry-point gloss MS is Kassel, UB 2° Ms. theol. 65 [13/K:121*], which is dated to the 6th c.\textsuperscript{13} It predates all other MSS in the *Catalogue* by more than a century, as there is no known OE dry-point gloss MS from the 7th c. Next, there is a group of eight MSS that are now predominantly held in Continental libraries, from the 8th c. The 9th c. is represented by seven MSS, while the majority of 16 OE dry-point gloss MSS is to be dated to the 10th c., with a large subgroup of 6 of those bordering on the 11th c. Finally, two early 11th-c. MSS represent the most recent group of OE dry-point gloss MSS.

In the following list, the MSS are ordered in chronological order based on the datings culled from the literature. More general estimates, such as “first half” are ordered after more precise estimates of the same period.

#### 6th Century

- Kassel, UB 2° Ms. theol. 65 [13/K:121*] Sec. vi N Italy

#### 8th Century

- Köln, EDDB 213 [14/K:98*] Sec. viii\textsuperscript{in.} Lindisfarne, Echternach?
- St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 1394 [32/K:A44] Sec. viii\textsuperscript{in.} Germany?
- Augsburg, UB Cod. I.2.4° 2 [1/K:287*] Sec. viii\textsuperscript{1} Echternach, Northumbria?
- Fulda, HLB Bonifatianus 2 [12/K:A41] Sec. viii\textsuperscript{1} Luxeuil, Mainz?

\textsuperscript{11} [5/K:52], [18/K:210] and [28/K:349].

\textsuperscript{12} [8/K:7\textsuperscript{*}], [15/K:131] and [25/K:293].

\textsuperscript{13} For most MSS, the dates given in the literature are conflicting. For a quick overview of datings, the *Catalogue* above may be consulted. The dates quoted here are usually from Gneuss (2001), CLA or Ker (1957) – in that order of precedence.
Dates of the Manuscripts

- Würzburg, UB M. p. th. f. 79  [34/K:400]  Sec. viii¹  S England
- St. Paul i. L., Stiftsbibliothek 2 / 1  [33/K:–]  Sec. viii, first half  N? England
- Paris, BN lat. 9561  [30/K:369]  Sec. viii¹ or viii³  S England

9th Century

- “Yale Fragment”  [24/K:12]  Sec. ix*¹ (viii*²?)  Canterbury?, Worcester?
- London, BL Cotton Vespasian D. xiv  [18/K:210]  Sec. ix¹/⁴  N or NE France
- Oxford, Bodleian Rawlinson C. 697  [28/K:349]  Sec. ix³/⁴  NE France
- Cambridge, Fitzwilliam 45–1980  [8/K:7*]  Sec. ix*²  W France, Dol-de-Bretagne?
- Oxford, Bodleian Auctarium D. 5. 3  [25/K:293]  Sec. ix / x  Brittany(?)

10th Century

- London, BL Additional 40 000  [15/K:131]  Sec. x²  France, Brittany?, SW France??
- Oxford, Bodleian Bodley 572  [26/K:313]  Sec. x²/⁴  Cornwall, Lannaed?
- Cambridge, UL Kk. 3. 21  [11/K:24]  Sec. x³ or x³med.  Abingdon(?)
- Cambridge, Trinity College O. 2. 30  [9/K:94]  Sec. x³med.  Canterbury StA
Several observations can be drawn from the list. There are about as many MSS from the 9th c. as there are from the 8th c. in our Catalogue, even though MS production in Anglo-Saxon England was at a pronounced low in the 9th c.: Less than two dozen MSS that were produced in 9th-c. England have been identified so far, and the reasons for this are not yet fully understood (cf. Gneuss 2001: 4). It may be that the social upheaval caused by the arrival of the Vikings decisively hampered book production. After all, their raids started in AD 793 and picked up considerable force after that, which may well account for very low numbers of extant MSS from 9th-c. England, while at the same time Continental book production resulted in ca. 7,000 extant MSS today (cf. Bischoff 1998 and 2004). The availability of resources (both with regard to
Fittingly, only two MSS (if the “Yale Fragment” is ascribed to the late 8th c. it is even only one MS) with an English origin from our Catalogue are dated to that era. The gap was evidently filled by the importation of French MSS, most likely during the re-development phase initiated by the Benedictine Reform movement. For obvious reasons, these MSS would have received their OE ink and dry-point glossing only after their importation to Great Britain and it would be highly interesting to know where these MSS passed through during that stage. The most important centres of the Reform were Glastonbury, Worcester, Winchester and Canterbury, but unfortunately, the provenance of all seven French MSS before the end of the Anglo-Saxon era is completely obscure.

The large group of MSS from the second half of the 10th c. can clearly be associated with the efforts of the Benedictine reform movement at Canterbury, where Dunstan was Archbishop from AD 959 to 988. In fact, Canterbury origin from that period is so over-represented that one may seriously wonder if the presence of all these MSS in the Catalogue testifies to Canterbury being something of a centre of dry-point glossing at the time. However, there is no data available that would allow for a diagnostically conclusive interpretation of that high number of Canterbury MSS. The lack of a chronological index as well as indices to origin and provenance in Gneuss (2001) make it very difficult to quantify such clusters analytically, for the time being.

6.4 Contents of the Manuscript Parts Glossed in Dry-Point

6.4.1 Gospels

If we classify the 34 OE dry-point gloss MSS from our Catalogue according to their contents, we can see that there are 4 biblical MSS that are glossed in dry-point, namely:

- Augsburg, UB Cod. I.2.4° 2 [1/K:287*] Sec. viii¹ Echternach, Northumbria?
- Cambridge, Fitzwilliam 45–1980 [8/K:7*] Sec. ix± W France, Dol-de-Bretagne?

materials – such as cowhides – and personnel – such as tanners and scribes) may have undergone a sharp decrease, causing the costs for MS production to rise considerably. Then again, the Vikings perhaps only added to a pre-existing problem, as Gneuss (ibid.) points out: If we take King Alfred’s analysis from his preface to the OE translation of Gregory’s Pastoral Care at face value, the levels of learnedness in England had reached a dangerously low level, even before the Vikings tipped the balance in further disfavour of MS production.
They all contain the *Gospels* of the four evangelists, except for the fragmentary Oxford MS, in which the *Gospel of John* is missing. The *Gospels* were of paramount importance in late Anglo-Saxon Christian culture and it is the text of which the most Anglo-Saxon copies have come down to us: Gneuss (2001: 166) lists some 80 Anglo-Saxon MSS of the *Gospels* (about one third of which are only extant in the form of fragments or excerpts, though). The rather small number of 4 OE dry-point gloss MSS may be indicative of relatively low dry-point glossing activity in them. It is interesting to note, however, that Anglo-Saxon *Gospels* are not commonly glossed in OE, anyway. Apart from the 4 dry-point gloss MSS listed above (of which only 3 have occasional OE ink glosses), merely another 2 MSS are reported to feature OE ink glosses and in both cases it is an interlinear gloss: One of them is the famous “Lindisfarne Gospels” (London, British Library Cotton Nero D. iv [K:165]), written in Lindisfarne, sec. 687–689, and glossed in Chester-le-Street by Aldred, sec. x⁷/₄ (Ker 1957: 215–216). The other is the equally famous “Rushworth Gospels” (Oxford, Bodleian Library Auctarium D. 2. 19 [K:292]), written in Ireland, sec. viiex. or ixex, and continuously glossed in N or W England by Farman and Owun, sec. x² (Ker 1957: 352). Among the MSS occasionally glossed in OE ink, ink-and-dry-point gloss MSS even outnumber the ink-only gloss MSS. It seems likely that the majority of the other more than seventy MSS have not been searched exhaustively for dry-point glossing.

The Old Testament attracted even less glossing: There is no documented example of an Anglo-Saxon Old Testament with OE dry-point glosses, of which Gneuss (2001: 157) lists 5 complete MSS and 13 fragments and excerpts. Three of

---

15 In this Section, I will use the term “Anglo-Saxon MSS” as denoting the Gneussian notion of MSS “written or owned in England up to 1100” (cf. Gneuss 1981; Gneuss 2001). Anglo-Saxon MSS, then, do not form a palaeographically (or even historically) uniform group; instead, they simply constitute the corpus of known MSS which were at some stage available in an Anglo-Saxon context. I heavily relied on Gneuss’s (2001: 149–184) “Index I: Authors and texts” for the following assembly of Anglo-Saxon MS copies of L. texts; unfortunately, the index, which seems to have been compiled manually, does not always exhaustively list all catalogued MSS of a particular text (cf. for instance below p. 222, n. 31, p. 224, n. 37 or p. 225, n. 39).
them are glossed in OE ink, however. Oxford, Bodleian Bodley 572 [26 / K:313] comprises, among various other items (some of which are glossed in dry-point), the Book of Tobias, but there are no vernacular glosses reported from it.

6.4.2 Patristic Literature

Three 8th-c. MSS and one early 9th-c. MS among the OE dry-point gloss MSS contain patristic literature:

- Fulda, HLB Bonifatianus 2 [12 / K:A41] Sec. vii1 Luxeuil, Mainz?
- Paris, BN lat. 9561 [30 / K:369] Sec. vii1 or viii2med. S England
- Würzburg, UB M. p. th. f. 79 [34 / K:400] Sec. vii1 S England
- London, BL Cotton Vespasian D. xiv [18 / K:210] Sec. ix1/4 N or NE France

Isidore’s Synonyma were moderately popular in Anglo-Saxon England with 7 MS witnesses of the L. text listed in Gneuss (2001: 169). It therefore comes as something of a surprise that no less than three MSS of Isidore’s Synonyma (namely the Fulda MS [12 / K:A41], the Würzburg MS [34 / K:400] and the London MS [18 / K:210]) feature OE dry-point glosses, thus making the Synonyma one of the most-often glossed texts in OE dry-point, second only to the Gospels.

16 All three MSS with Vulgata texts that are glossed in OE ink only contain Vulgata excerpts:
- Cambridge, Trinity College Library B. 10. 5 [K:83]; sec. vii1; Northumbria?
- London, BL Cotton Vespasian D. vi., ff. 2–77 [K:207]; sec. x3med. (or x3); Canterbury StA
- London, BL Royal 7 C. iv [K:256]; sec. xi1; Canterbury CC
The Trinity MS features two OE ink glosses in St Paul’s, Epistulae; the Vespasian MS over 1,100 occasional OE ink glosses to Proverbs. The Royal MS features a continuous OE ink gloss to excerpts from Ecclesiasticus.

17 An Anglo-Saxon copy of Isidore, Synonyma with OE ink glosses is preserved in:
- London, British Library Harley 110 [K:228]; sec. x4ex; Canterbury CC
No OE glosses are reported from:
- St Petersburg, Russian National Library Q. v. I. 15 [G:845]; sec. vii2; SW England
- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 448, ff. 1–86 [G:114]; sec. x1 or x4med; S England (or Worcester?)
- Salisbury, Cathedral Library 173 [G:752]; sec. x4ex; Continent
A partial OE translation of the Synonyma is contained in (cf. Szarmach 1999):
- London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. iii [K:186]; sec. xi4med; Canterbury CC
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In comparison to the extant number of MSS, the *Synonyma* even outstrip the *Gospels* by a margin.

The Fulda MS [12 / K:A41] comprises several pieces of early dogmatic writings and symbola, including a copy of a creed traditionally ascribed to Ambrose and a copy of a treatise by Faustus Reiensis, both with one edited OHG dry-gloss each. The copy of Isidore’s *Synonyma* at the end of the MS contains four edited OE dry-point glosses. The Würzburg MS [34 / K:400] features a large number of dry-point traces, 27 of which have been identified as OE glosses to Isidore’s *Synonyma*, and the Cotton MS (Part II) [18 / K:210] consists of a selection of Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae* and of a copy of Isidore’s *Synonyma*, in which at least 33 L. lemmata are glossed in OE dry-point.

The Paris MS [30 / K:369] contains a copy of Pseudo-Isidore’s, *De ordine creaturarum* and of Gregory’s *Pastoral Care* (*Regula pastoralis*), the latter of which is glossed in OE in dry-point. More than a dozen L. copies of the *Pastoral Care* are listed in Gneuss (2001: 166), and King Alfred’s OE translation of it is preserved in no less than six MS witnesses. Curiously, this abundance is not reflected in the vernacular glossing of these MSS: The Paris MS [30 / K:369], with about 77 OE dry-point glosses (presumably there are more, but they have not yet been edited), and Oxford, St John’s College 28 with merely two OE ink glosses, are the only two OE gloss MSS of Gregory’s *Pastoral Care*. It is surprising that this book, which King Alfred considered to be so crucial that he had copies sent to all corners of his dominion, did not spur more interest. A glance at OHG findings shows a significantly higher glossing activity, as Ernst (2007: 508–513) lists no fewer than 42 MSS of Gregory’s *Pastoral Care* with OHG glosses, at least

---

18 The other extant Anglo-Saxon copies of Gregory’s *Pastoral Care* are:
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 13 089, ff. 49–76 [G:898.5]; sec. viii\textsuperscript{med.} or viii\textsuperscript{v}; Northumbria, Wearm.-Jarrow?
- London, British Library Cotton Otho A. i [G:346]; sec. viii\textsuperscript{v} (abridged); Mercia or Canterbury?
- Kassel, UB 2’ Ms. theol. 32 [G:833]; sec. viii; S England
- Worcester, Worcester Cathedral Library Add. 3 [G:771]; sec. viii (fragment); unknown
- London, British Library Harley 5431, f. 140 [G:439.6]; sec. ix; Wales?
- Oxford, St John’s College 684 (with OE ink glosses) [G:684]; sec. x\textsuperscript{med.} or x\textsuperscript{v–vi}; Canterbury StA?
- Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 708 [G:590]; sec. x\textsuperscript{vii}; Canterbury CC
- Glasgow, University Library Hunterian 431, ff. 1–102 [G:261]; sec. x/xi or x\textsuperscript{med.}; unknown
- Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibl. municipale 63, ff. 1–34 [G:800]; sec. xi\textsuperscript{v} (excerpt); England
- Cambridge, Corpus Christi 361 [G:99]; sec. xi\textsuperscript{v+} or xi\textsuperscript{ii}; England?, Malmesbury?
- Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 783 [G:598]; sec. xi\textsuperscript{iv}; Normandy
- Salisbury, Cathedral Library 157 [G:742]; sec. xi\textsuperscript{v+}; England?
- Shrewsbury, Shrewsbury School 21 [G:755.5]; sec. xi/xii; Normandy

19 Cf. Ker (1957: nos. 19, 30, 87, 175, 195 and 324).
12 of which feature OHG dry-point glosses. One may wonder how this stark difference can be explained. Perhaps the availability of Alfred’s translation rendered the study of the L. original less important in (late) Anglo-Saxon England, which resulted in fewer glosses in the text. Further quantifications would be necessary to give these thoughts further credence, though, which are beyond our focus just now. Certainly, the corpus of Anglo-Saxon MSS of Gregory’s *Pastoral Care* listed in Gneuss (2001) ought to be investigated more closely for dry-point glossing first.

### 6.4.3 Sentential Literature

In several respects, Isidore’s *Synonyma* border on the sententious and the respective MSS might equally fittingly be grouped with a MS that contains several collections of *sententiae*, namely:

- Cambridge, Trinity College O. 2. 31

It combines Prosper’s *Epigrammata*, the so-called *Disticha Catonis* and Prudentius’s *Dittochaeon*, all of which contain at least one OE dry-point gloss.

In Prosper’s *Epigrammata* contained in the Trinity MS [10 / K:95], some OF and OE glosses in ink have been added, too. Prosper’s *Epigrammata* are preserved in five Anglo-Saxon MSS, two of which contain occasional OE glosses and one of which (a fragment) even features a continuous interlinear gloss.

---

20 In BStK the following OHG dry-point MSS with Gregory’s *Pastoral Care* are listed: nos. 205, 207, 330, 488, 518, 552, 652, 677, 693, 735, 928 and 1010. Further MSS, e.g. St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 216 (BStK: no. 204; cf. Nievergelt 2011: 316) or München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 21 525 (BStK: no. 677; cf. Nievergelt 2012: 382), have been identified since.

21 Provided the single dry-point gloss to Prudentius, *Dittochaeon* really is OE and not OF (see below).

22 The other Anglo-Saxon copies of Prosper’s *Epigrammata* glossed in OE are:
   - London, British Library Harley 110 [K:228]; sec. xvi; Canterbury CC
   - London, BL Cotton Tiberius A. vii, ff. 165–166 [K:189]; sec. xi (fragment); W France
   No glosses have been edited from the other two Anglo-Saxon copies of Prosper’s *Epigrammata*:
   - Cambridge, University Library Gg. 5. 35 [G:12]; sec. ximod; Canterbury Sta
   - Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 114 [G:114]; sec. xi/xii; S England or Worcester?
The Disticha ascribed to Cato are preserved in four Anglo-Saxon MSS, two of which are glossed in OE.\textsuperscript{23} In addition to that, OE translations of parts of the Disticha are known from three MSS.\textsuperscript{24}

Whether Prudentius’s Dittochaeon (or Tituli historiarum) can be counted among the L. texts for which OE glosses have been recorded at all is uncertain. MS copies of Prudentius’s Dittochaeon are well-attested from Anglo-Saxon England, with 10 MSS listed in Gneuss (2001).\textsuperscript{25} Curiously, none of them is glossed in OE ink, though. Even from the copy of Prudentius’s Dittochaeon preserved in Cambridge, CCC 223 [5/K:52], which comprises several texts of Prudentius and from which more than 100 dry-point glosses as well as ink and pencil glosses from various parts of the MS have been edited, no ink or dry-point glosses have been reported. The only gloss that has been edited from the copy of the Dittochaeon in the Trinity MS [10/K:95] could arguably be OE or OF (cf. p. 130). From the point of view of lexicography OF is more likely; from the point of view of glossography it can be argued, however, that no stylus activity in French is known from that particular MS, whereas several OE dry-point glosses have been edited. Further close inspection of that part of the MS may bring additional evidence to light one day.

\textsuperscript{23} The other Anglo-Saxon copy of Ps.-Cato’s Disticha is:
- Oxford Bodleian Library Rawlinson G. 57, ff.1–5’ [K:350]; sec. xi or xii; unknown
No glosses have been edited from the other two Anglo-Saxon copies of Pseudo-Cato, Disticha:
- Cambridge, University Library Gg. 5. 35 [G:12]; sec. x\textsuperscript{med}; Canterbury StA
- London, British Library Vespasian D. vi, ff. 2–77 [G:389]; sec. x\textsuperscript{med} (or x\textsuperscript{2}); Canterbury StA?

\textsuperscript{24} Cf. Ker (1957: nos. 89, art.2; 159, art. 4; 209, art. 3).

\textsuperscript{25} The other Anglo-Saxon MSS of Prudentius, Dittochaeon – all of them without any edited glosses to that particular text – are:
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 8085, ff. 2–82 [G:889.5]; sec. ix\textsuperscript{2/3} or ix\textsuperscript{med}; France, Loire region?
- Cambridge, CCC 223 [5/K:52]; sec. ix\textsuperscript{3/4}; N France, Saint-Bertin?, Arras?
- Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 144/194 [G:120]; sec. x\textsuperscript{i} (text incomplete); England?
- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 448 [G:114]; sec. x\textsuperscript{i} or x\textsuperscript{med}; S England or Worcester?
- Oxford, Bodleian Library Auctarium F. 3. 6 [G:537]; sec. xi; unknown
- Cambridge, University Library Gg. 5. 35 [G:12]; sec. x\textsuperscript{med}; Canterbury StA
- Durham, Cathedral Library B. IV. 9 [G:246]; sec. x\textsuperscript{med}; unknown (prov. Durham)
- Oxford, Oriel College 3 [G:680]; sec. x\textsuperscript{a}; Canterbury CC
- Oxford, Bodleian Library Auctarium F. 2. 14 [G:535]; sec. x\textsuperscript{2} or xi; Sherborne?
There is a typing error in Gneuss’s (2001: 177) index entry on Prudentius, Dittochaeon: <600> ought to read <680>, as the reference is to Oxford, Oriel College 3.
6.4.4 Christian Poetry

By far the largest group of text types glossed in OE dry-point is made up of literary works by early Christian Poets. Among those, in turn, it is ALDELM’s works that were glossed most extensively in OE dry-point. ALDELM’s *Prosa de virginitate (Pdv)* has come down to us in 12 Anglo-Saxon MSS, all of which are glossed in OE. In 5 of them, only OE ink glosses have been detected so far. 6 of them feature both OE ink and OE dry-point glosses and from one of them, London, Lambeth Palace 200 [23/K:–], a single OE dry-point gloss has been edited so far.

- “Yale Fragment” [24/K:12] Sec. ix\(^{in}\) (viii\(^{ex}\)?) Canterbury?, Worcester?
- Cambridge, CCC 326 [7/K:61] Sec. x/xi Canterbury CC
- London, BL Royal 5. E. xi [19/K:252] Sec. x/xi Canterbury CC
- London, Lambeth Palace 200 [23/K:–] Sec. x\(^{2}\) Canterbury StA
- Oxford, Bodleian Digby 146 [27/K:320] Sec. x\(^{ex}\) Canterbury StA
- Salisbury, Cathedral 38 [31/K:378] Sec. x\(^{ex}\) Canterbury CC, StA?
- London, BL Royal 6 A. vi [20/K:254] Sec. x\(^{ex}\) Canterbury CC

It is conspicuous that all seven MSS originate in Canterbury or have been associated with Canterbury. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that none of the five MSS of *Pdv* that do not feature OE dry-point glosses\(^{26}\) are assigned to Canterbury. In three of the above MSS (Royal 6 A. vi [20/K:254], Digby 146 [27/K:320] and

---

\(^{26}\) The other Anglo-Saxon MSS of *Prosa de virginitate* are:
- London, British Library Royal 5. F. iii [G:462]; sec. ix\(^{ex}\) or ix/x; Mercia (Worcester?)
- Brussels, Bibliothèque royale 1650 [G:806]; sec. xi\(^{in}\); Abingdon

From Gwara’s (2001a: 94) comments it can be inferred that Gwara did not autopsy the Brussels MS [G:806]. Hence, that MS would certainly be a suitable candidate for further scrutiny.

Incidentally, the Bodleian MS [G:545] was placed next to Cambridge CCC 326 [7/K:61] in Canterbury, Christ Church’s library, as can be deduced from their old Christ Church pressmarks *D. iiia. G. iiitus* [=CCC 326] and *D. iiia. G. vus* [=Bodley 97] (Gwara 2001a: 181).
Salisbury 38 [31/K:378]), Pdv is accompanied by Aldhelm’s Epistola ad Heaufridum, which is provided with some OE ink glosses in the case of the Royal MS [20/K:254], but no dry-point glosses have been reported for the Epistola so far. Aldhelm’s Carmen de virginitate, a poetic “contrafactum” of Pdv (Lapidge 1999: 26), was a little less popular, if we may take the number of extant MSS as a benchmark: It is preserved in 5 Anglo-Saxon MSS (cf. Gneuss 2001: 151), all of which feature OE ink glosses. Two of them combine both OE ink and dry-point glosses:27

- Oxford, Bodleian Rawlinson C. 697 [28/K:349] Sec. ix³/⁴ NE France
- Cambridge, CCC 285 [6/K:54] Sec. xiⁿ England

The Rawlinson MS [28/K:349] was in England by sec. xmed., perhaps in Glastonbury. Following Napier’s (1900) presentation, I list Aldhelm’s De octo vitiis principalibus separately in the Catalogue. It can be argued, however, that it is not actually a text of its own, but rather a text couched within the text of the Carmen de virginitate, concerned with the characterization of the eight vices. Nonetheless, if we treat it as a separate entity from the point of view of glossing, we can say that in both MSS Aldhelm’s De octo vitiis principalibus is glossed in OE both in ink and in dry-point.

Prudentius’s Psychomachia is preserved in twelve Anglo-Saxon MSS (cf. Gneuss 2001: 177), half of them are glossed in OE, including two that are glossed both in OE ink and in OE dry-point.28

27 The other Anglo-Saxon Carmen de virginitate MSS are:
   - Cambridge, University Library Gg. 5. 35 [G:12]; sec. xmed; Canterbury StA?
   - Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 49 [G:542]; sec. xmed; unknown (prov. Winchester, OM)
   - Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 5771 [G:584]; sec. x/xi; Canterbury CC
Some parts of the Cambridge MS [G:12] have been investigated very thoroughly by Wieland (1983); however, the pages of Carmen de virginitate, ff. 280r–327r, were not part of the investigation. Incidentally, all the glosses that we know from Aldhelm’s Carmen de virginitate were collected by Napier (1900: 180–185 [nos. 14–18]), who also edited a glossary added in the margins of ff. 11r–19v in Oxford, Bodleian Library Auctarium F. 2. 14 [K:295], compiled from glosses on Carmen de virginitate. Napier does not make any statements about the absence of dry-point glossing in these MSS, so it is not certain that they have ever been autopsied particularly with regard to dry-point glosses.

28 The other Anglo-Saxon Psychomachia MSS with OE ink glosses are:
   - München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 29031b [K:286]; sec. xⁿ, fragment; unknown
   - Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 23, ff. 1–104 [K:31]; sec. x² or x²c or ixⁿ; S England (Canterbury?)
   - Oxford, Bodleian Library Auctarium F. 3. 6 [K:296]; sec. xi; unknown (prov. Exeter)
   - Cambridge, University Library Gg. 5. 35 [K:16]; sec. xⁿ; Canterbury StA?
The Cotton MS [16 / K:145] contains an unknown number of OE dry-point glosses, which were only reported by Napier (1900: xxi), but have not been edited, yet. The Corpus MS [5 / K:52] features over 100 OE dry-point glosses in that text.

Another single OE dry-point gloss from another part of the same MS can be found in a copy of Prudentius’s Cathemerinon. One single dry-point gloss to that text is also reported from the heavily glossed “Boulogne Prudentius” [2 / K:7]:

- Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibl. mun. 189 [2 / K:7] Sec. x / xi Canterbury CC


²⁹ Other Anglo-Saxon MSS of Prudentius, Cathemerinon are:
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 8085, ff. 2–82 [G:889.5]; sec. ix²/³ or ixmed.; France (Loire?)
- Oxford, Bodleian Rawlinson C. 697 [28 / K:349]; sec. ix³/⁴; NE France
- Durham, Cathedral Library B. IV. 9 [G:246]; sec. xmed.; unknown (prov. Durham)
- Cambridge, Trinity College Library O. 2. 51, Part 1 [G:191]; sec. x²; unknown
- London, British Library Additional 24199, ff. 2–38 [G:285]; sec. xi² or xi/xii; unknown (prov. Bury St Edm.)
- London, British Library Cotton Titus D. xvi, ff. 2–35 [G:379.5]; sec. xi/xii; St Albans

The Rawlinson MS [28 / K:349] features OE dry-point and ink glosses in other parts of the MS (Aldhelm). Wieland (1987), based on Gneuss (1981), only lists 10 MSS, as the Paris MS [G:889.5], which had not yet been associated with Anglo-Saxon England, and the Titus MS [G:379.5], which is a border case (post-dating the Anglo-Saxon times in the narrow sense), are not included in his list.

²⁹ Other Anglo-Saxon MSS without any reported OE glossing to Psychomachia are:
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 8085, ff. 2–82 [G:889.5]; sec. ix²/³ or ixmed.; France (Loire?)
- Oxford, Bodleian Rawlinson C. 697 [28 / K:349]; sec. ix³/⁴; NE France
- Durham, Cathedral Library B. IV. 9 [G:246]; sec. xmed.; unknown (prov. Durham)
- Cambridge, Trinity College Library O. 2. 51, Part 1 [G:191]; sec. x²; unknown
- London, British Library Additional 24199, ff. 2–38 [G:285]; sec. xi² or xi/xii; unknown (prov. Bury St Edm.)
- London, British Library Cotton Titus D. xvi, ff. 2–35 [G:379.5]; sec. xi/xii; St Albans
- Oxford, Bodleian Library Auctarium F. 3. 6 [K:358]; sec. xiii; unknown (prov. Exeter)
SEDULIUS, Carmen paschale is preserved in eight Anglo-Saxon copies, two of which are glossed in OE both in dry-point and in ink:

- Cambridge, CCC 173 [4/K:40] Sec. viii2 S England, Kent?
- London, BL Royal 15 B. xix [22/K:268] Sec. x² or x²ex. Canterbury CC

Four further copies of the same text are glossed in OE ink, which means that six of eight extant Anglo-Saxon copies of that text were furnished with OE glosses.30

BOETHIUS, De consolatione philosophiae is preserved in a number of Anglo-Saxon MSS. Gneuss (2001: 158) lists 17 (18?)31 MSS in his index, of which three contain only fragments or excerpts. 93 OE dry-point glosses have been edited from one of them so far:

- Cambridge, UL Kk. 3. 21 [11/K:24] Sec. x¹ or x¹med. Abingdon(?)

This MS also features two OE ink glosses. Ink glosses in OE are also known from four other Anglo-Saxon MSS; one of them even features a continuous gloss

---

They all feature OE ink glosses to Cathemerinon, except the Auctarium MS [G:537], in which OE ink glosses have been edited from PRUDENTIUS, Psychomachia and Peristephanon only.

30 From the following copies of SEDULIUS, Carmen paschale OE ink glosses have been edited:
- Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. th. c. 4 [K:340]; sec. x¹; Worcester?
- Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland 18.7.7 [K:111]; sec. x²ex; unknown (prov. Thorney)
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 8092 [K:425]; sec. xi²¹⁴; England
- Cambridge, University Library Gg. 5. 35 [K:16]; sec. x¹med; Canterbury StA?

From two further Anglo-Saxon copies of SEDULIUS, Carmen paschale no glosses have been edited so far:
- Évreux, Bibliothèque municipale 43 [G:824.5]; sec. x; England? (prov. Lyre, Normandy)
- Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève 2410 [G:903]; sec. x²ex–x²in; Canterbury CC? (or StA?)

The OE ink glosses in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 8092 were only published in 1982 (cf. Lapidge 1982a; O’Neill 1989). Hence, it is conceivable that the other two MSS, which are located in repositories somewhat off the Anglo-Saxonists’ beaten tracks, may have not been autopsied by an OE gloss scholar, yet.

to some of its text. Judging from the extant numbers of MSS, Boethius’s *De consolatione philosophiae* was a popular text in Anglo-Saxon times. It was also one of the texts that King Alfred thought to be so important that he translated it into OE. The text of his translation is known to us from two MS witnesses, one of which was burned badly in the Ashburnham Fire of 1731; the other is merely a fragment.

**6.4.5 Canonical Literature**

The so-called *Collectio Sanblasiana*, preserved in Köln, EDBB 213 is exceptional, as it is the only Anglo-Saxon canonical collection that is glossed in OE dry-point. The dry-point glossing is very occasional, too, with one OHG, one L. and one OE dry-point gloss edited so far, but all of them must be quite ancient.

- Köln, EDBB 213 [14/K:98*] Sec. viii\textsuperscript{in.} Lindisfarne, Echternach?

The Köln MS is the only Anglo-Saxon witness of that particular Canon Law collection.

**6.4.6 Monastic and Hagiographical Literature**

A relatively small number of texts glossed in OE dry-point is concerned with monastic or hagiographical contents.

---

32 The other glossen MSS of *De consolatione philosophiae* are:
- Oxford, Bodleian Library Auctarium F. 1. 15 [K:294]; sec. x\textsuperscript{r}; Canterbury StA
- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 214 [K:51]; sec. x\textsuperscript{r} or xi\textsuperscript{in.}; Canterbury?
- Cambridge, University Library Gg. 5. 35 [K:16]; sec. xi\textsuperscript{med.}; Canterbury StA?
- Cambridge, Trinity College Library O. 3. 7 [K:95*]; sec. x\textsuperscript{r} or x\textsuperscript{r}c; Canterbury StA?
The Corpus MS [K:51] contains a continuous gloss on ff. 36-53\textsuperscript{r} and on f. 68\textsuperscript{r}. 33 The OE text is edited and translated in Godden & Irvine (2012).

34 The *Collectio Sanblasiana* is named after St. Blasien in south-western Germany, in whose Benedictine monastery the principal MS witness of this collection of canonical texts (now St. Paul im Lavanttal, Stiftsbibliothek 7/1, sec. vii\textsuperscript{med.} or viii\textsuperscript{r}) was preserved until AD 1807 (just like St. Paul im Lavanttal, Stiftsbibliothek 2/1 [33/K:--]).

35 In total seven MSS of the *Collectio Sanblasiana* are extant, but the others are not of Anglo-Saxon provenance; cf. Michael D. Elliott’s Ph.D. project website “Anglo-Saxon Canon Law”. URL: <http://individual.utoronto.ca/michaelelliot/index.html>.
Both Cambridge MSS contain a copy of St Benedict’s Regula and both these copies are occasionally glossed in OE ink. The Benedictine Rule was of great importance already before the Benedictine reform, at the height of which Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester, translated it in about AD 970 at the request of King Edgar and Queen Ælfthryth.\textsuperscript{36} L. copies of the Regula are preserved in 12 Anglo-Saxon MSS (including one fragment and a mere excerpt). OE glosses are known from four of them, however, only the copy preserved in the Trinity MS [9/K:94] is glossed in OE dry-point.\textsuperscript{37}

Although no dry-point glosses have been edited from the Cambridge copy of the Regula [3/K:34], there is also a copy of Smaragdus’s Diadema monacho-


\textsuperscript{37} The other two L. copies of Benedict’s Regula with OE glosses are:
- Oxford, Corpus Christi College 197 [K:353]; sec. x\textsuperscript{i}/4; Worcester?
- London, British Library Cotton Tiberius A. iii [K:186]; sec. xi\textsuperscript{med}; Canterbury, CC

4 OE ink glosses have been added to the L. text of the bilingual OCCC MS [K:353]= [G:672]. The Tiberius MS [K:186] contains, on the one hand, a copy of the text with a partial interlinear gloss and, on the other hand, a second partial copy of the text with an interlinear gloss. The L. text is also preserved without OE glosses in:
- Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 48 [G:631]; sec. vii\textsuperscript{ex}, viii\textsuperscript{am}, viii\textsuperscript{iii} or viii\textsuperscript{med}; Canterbury, StA(?)
- Oxford, Bodleian Library Harley 5431, ff. 4–126 [G:440]; sec. x/ixi, x\textsuperscript{ii} or x\textsuperscript{i}/4; Canterbury, StA(?)
- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 368 [G:101]; sec. x/ixi (fragment); unknown
- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178 [G:55]; sec. x\textsuperscript{ii}; Worcester(?)
- Wells, Wells Cathedral Library 7 [G:758]; sec. xi\textsuperscript{med} (fragment); unknown
- Cambridge, University Library Ll. 1. 14 [G:29]; sec. xi\textsuperscript{ii} or xi\textsuperscript{ex}; unknown
- Durham, Durham Cathedral B. IV. 24, ff.74–127 [G: 248]; sec. xi\textsuperscript{ii} or xi/xii; unknown (prov. Durham)

The Durham MS [G:248]= [K:109] is only indexed as OE translation of the Regula in Gneuss (cf. 2001: 156), but it is a bilingual copy of the text.
rum – a monastic handbook of sorts – contained in that MS and there are four OE dry-point glosses to that text. There are four extant L. Anglo-Saxon copies of SMARAGDUS’s Diadema monachorum, but Cambridge, CCCC 57 [3/ K:34] is the only copy of that text glossed in OE.\(^{38}\)

The only saint’s life glossed in OE dry-point can be found in FELIX OF CROWLAND’s Vita Sancti Guthlac preserved in London, BL Royal 13 A. xv [21 / K:266]. In total, 8 Anglo-Saxon MS witnesses preserve a L. copy of that text, four of which are glossed occasionally in OE ink.\(^{39}\)

6.4.7 Grammatical Treatises and Colloquies

OE dry-point glosses to grammatical texts are known from four MSS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>MS / K:</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek</td>
<td>[32 / K:A44]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germany?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul i. L., Stiftsbibliothek</td>
<td>[33 / K:-]</td>
<td></td>
<td>N? England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 / 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Bodley</td>
<td>[26 / K:313]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornwall, Lan-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>naled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, St John’s College</td>
<td>[29 / K:362]</td>
<td></td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{38}\) The other three Anglo-Saxon MSS of SMARAGDUS’s Diadema monachorum are:

- Cambridge, University Library Ff. 4. 43 [G:8]; sec. x\(^{3/4}\); Canterbury CC
- Salisbury, Cathedral Library 12, ff. 1–56 [G:701.5]; sec. xi\(^{ex}\); Salisbury
- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 17 [G:31]; sec. xi\(^{in}\) or xii\(^{in}\); England or France

\(^{39}\) OE ink glosses to the L. Vita Sancti Guthlacii are also edited from:

- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 389 [K:66]; sec. x\(^{2}\) or x\(^{1}\) or x\(^{ex}\); Canterbury StA

The index entry <403> on FELIX OF CROWLAND, Vita Sancti Guthlacii in Gneuss (2001: 164) ought to read <103>, as the reference is to Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 389; the index entry for the Cotton MS (Gneuss 2001: 65 [no. 344]), on the other hand, is missing.; Anglo-Saxon copies of the L. Vita Sancti Guthlacii without any reported OE glossing are preserved in:

- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 307, ff. 1–52 [G:88]; sec. x\(^{in}\); Worcester?
- Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibliothèque municipale 106 [G:804]; sec. x / xi; unknown
- Arras, Bibliothèque municipale 1029 [G:781]; sec. x\(^{ex}\) and x\(^{in}\), text incomplete; unknown
- London, British Library Harley 3097 [G:434.5]; sec. xi / xii, text incomplete; unknown
Aldhelm’s *Epistola ad Acircium* consists of several parts, one of which is a treatise on metre, commonly termed *De metris*, which is followed by Aldhelm’s famous *Enigmata*, which serves “to illustrate the various metrical principles which he [i.e. Aldhelm] had been enunciating” (Lapidge & Rosier 1985: 11). The *Enigmata* (in English sometimes referred to as *Riddles*) are preserved in five Anglo-Saxon MSS and in one Anglo-Saxon fragment. Interestingly, the *Enigmata* are also preserved in a St. Gallen fragment [32/K:A44], which was abused as binding material as early as sec. ix in St. Gallen and which can only indirectly be linked with Anglo-Saxon England via the Anglo-Saxon missionary activities on the Continent; yet, it features OE dry-point glosses.

Another MS glossed in OE dry-point that must have reached the south of the German-speaking area at an early date is preserved in St. Paul im Lavanttal, Stiftsbibliothek 2/1 [33/K:—]. It contains three grammatical treatises, one of which is the only extant copy of a L. grammar composed by an anonymous Irish grammarian, who is usually referred to as Anonymus ad cuimnAnum on account of a named dedicatee of that treatise, presumably a teacher of the Anonymus (Bischoff & Löfstedt 1992: vii). It contains dry-point glosses, at least one of which has been identified as OE, but there are other dry-point glosses that have not yet been deciphered (Bischoff & Löfstedt 1992: viii). The glosses must have been added in sec. viii, before the MS reached St. Blasien around AD 800, where it remained until the modern era.

Both Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 572 [26/K:313] and St John’s College 154 [29/K:362] contain scholastic colloquies, some of which are glossed in OE dry-point. The St John’s College MS contains Ælfric Bata’s *Colloquia* and his enlarged redaction of Ælfric of Eynsham’s *Colloquia*, both of which are glossed in OE ink and dry-point. From Ælfric Bata’s *Colloquia difficiliora*, only OE ink glosses have

---

40 The following Anglo-Saxon MSS containing Aldhelm’s *Enigmata* are glossed in OE ink:
- Cambridge, University Library Gg. 5. 35 [K:16]; sec. xi<sup>med</sup>; Canterbury Sta?
- London, British Library Royal 12. C. xxiii [K:259]; sec. x⅞ or x/xi; Canterbury CC
- Oxford, Bodleian Rawlinson C. 697 [28/K:349]; sec. ix⅛; NE France
- London, British Library Royal 15. A. xvi [K:267]; sec. ix⅜; Canterbury StA

From two further Anglo-Saxon MSS containing Aldhelm’s *Enigmata* no OE glosses have been edited so far:
- St Petersburg, National Library of Russia Q.v.I.15 [G:845]; sec. viii⅛; SW England
- Miskolc, Lévay József Library s.n. [G:850]; sec. viii (fragment); S England

41 Ælfric of Eynsham’s *Colloquia* are also preserved with an OE continuous gloss to the L. text in:
- London, British Library Cotton Tiberius A. iii [K:186]; sec. xi<sup>med</sup>; Canterbury CC

The margins of the following two MS parts – formerly belonging to the same MS – also contain parts of Ælfric’s *Colloquia* (without any reported OE glossing):
been edited so far. The Bodleian MS comprises a range of different texts and additions, among which the anonymous scholastic colloquy dubbed *De raris fabulis* is the only text that is glossed in OE, exclusively in dry-point. That text – which incidentally is also included without any edited vernacular glossing in the St John’s College MS [29/K:362] – also features some 140 Brittonic ink glosses. Some of the dry-point glosses in the Bodleian MS [26/K:313] were identified as Brittonic by the earlier literature (e.g. Craster 1923); however, more recent studies propose that all of the dry-point material is either OE or Latin (Falileyev & Russell 2003).

### 6.4.8 Historical Writing

Two dry-point gloss MSS feature historical writings:

| - Kassel, UB 2° Ms. theol. 65 | [13/K:121*] | Sec. vi | N Italy |

The 6th-c. Kassel MS [13/K:121*], the oldest OE dry-point gloss MS that we know of, contains the L. translation of *Flavius Josephus*, *De bello Iudaico*, which had originally been composed in Aramaic around AD 73, but has come down to us in a Greek version only (Broszinski & Heyne 1994: 22). The 4th-c. L. translation of it was wrongly ascribed to the early Christian author *Hegesippus* from an early date on, based on the similarity of his name to “Josephus” (*ibid.*). The L. translation by *Pseudo-Hegesippus* is also extant in three further Anglo-Saxon MSS, however, without any reported glossing, and they are of a much later date.

The “Cotton Bede” [17/K:198] contains a copy of *Beda’s Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* and is glossed quite extensively in OE dry-point: There are ca.

---

[42] Other colloquies are also contained in the following two Anglo-Saxon MSS:
- Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 865, ff. 89–96 [G:608]; sec. xi; unknown (prov. Exeter)
- Avranches, Bibliothèque municipale 236 [G:784]; sec. x/xi; unknown (prov. Mont Saint-Michel)

No OE glosses have been reported from them so far.

[43] Anglo-Saxon copies of *Pseudo-Hegesippus*, *De bello Iudaico* are preserved in:
- London, British Library Royal 14. C. viii [G:487.5]; sec. xi³⁻²; unknown
- Durham, Cathedral Library B.II.1 [G:225.5]; sec. xi/xii; unknown (prov. Durham)
400 OE dry-point glosses to the L. text and a handful of OE ink glosses to both the text and other L. additions. The glossing activity also resulted in the addition of four brief glossaries with OE interpretamenta in the same MS. In general, however, Beda’s L. Historia is only rarely glossed in OE. Of the more than 20 Anglo-Saxon MS witnesses (including fragments and excerpts), only another two MSS – one of which is a mere excerpt – show small amounts of glossing.\(^{44}\) Perhaps, analogously to Gregory’s Pastoral Care, the availability of an OE translation since King Alfred’s times, of which six copies and extracts are extant,\(^ {45}\) had an abating influence on (late) Anglo-Saxon vernacular glossing of the L. copies of the text.

### 6.5 Times and Places at Which Dry-Point Glossing May Have Been Practised

Despite the many gaps in our knowledge of OE dry-point glossing, it may still be interesting to look for patterns when it comes to the times and places at which dry-point glosses may have been entered in the MSS that have been identified up to now. In some cases, we can form at least partly educated guesses as to when and where dry-point glossing was practised. Indeed, we are inching forward on thin ice here, but there is no other data available at the moment, so we will have to do with what we have, hoping that the aggregation of factoids may form some kind of picture.

Palaeographical analyses give us reasonably firm footing when it comes to the origin of the MSS in question, but we often do not know anything about their Anglo-Saxon provenance. After all, the MSS may have travelled soon after their creation or they may have been kept nearby – used or simply stowed away for later use in the same institution where they had been produced. The predominantly chaotic dispersion of the historically-grown medieval MS collections after the Suppression of Religious Houses Act in 1539 caused many Anglo-Saxon MSS to turn up in private and institutional collections without determinable provenance. Hence, the next secure dating after their production is often the

\(^{44}\) The other glossed Anglo-Saxon copies of Bede’s Historia besides the “Cotton Bede” [17 / K:198] are:
- Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 163 [K:304]; sec. xi\(^a\); unknown (prov. Peterborough)
- London, Lambeth Palace Library 173, ff. 157–221 [K:276]; sec. xi/xii (text only in excerpt); unknown

The amount of glossing in both MSS is very small; the Lambeth excerpt of the Vision of Drihthelm (Ch. V, 12) features two short stretches of continuous OE glossing consisting of little more than a dozen interpretamenta (cf. Meritt 1945: 14 [no. 5]). The Oxford copy features no more than four OE ink glosses (cf. Napier 1900: 198 [no. 29]).

\(^{45}\) [K:23], [K:32], [K:151], [K:180], [K:351] and [K:354].
date of their surfacing in the early modern catalogues and reports. Intermediary accretions – such as glosses, scholia, names, pen trials or short texts copied into vacant spots of the codex in question – are often difficult to associate with a specific institution and their interpretation often leaves room for uncertainty. In the following lists, I simply assume (and arguably in some cases probably correctly) that the MSS for which there are no reports about their Anglo-Saxon provenance may have remained in their proposed places of origin, but there is no way to corroborate this at the moment. Dry-point glosses are usually not described palaeographically in the literature and they are never ascribed to a particular scriptorium or school. Therefore, the datings of the dry-point glosses are also culled from the literature with some serious doubts. Often editors do not explicitly date the dry-point glosses on palaeographical grounds themselves; instead, the dry-point material is dated implicitly on account of the neighbouring OE ink glosses, which may or may not represent the same or a related stratum. Yet again, there is nothing else to go on at the moment.

About one fifth of the OE dry-point gloss MSS can clearly be isolated from the other MSS on account of their ancient OE dry-point glosses dating from the 8th c. Within that group, a sub-group is likely to have never been in Anglo-Saxon England. Its OE glossing was probably added in a context where OE was spoken on the Continent. The assumption then is that they were all glossed in one of the Anglo-Saxon centres of learning on the Continent, in which OE must have played an important role in the early days of the missionary activities in Germany in early and mid-8th c.

- Augsburg, UB Cod. I.2.4° 2 [1/K:287*] Gl. sec. viii in Echternach
- Fulda, HLB Bonifatianus 2 [12/K:A41] Gl. sec. viii AS prov. unkn. (only Continent?)
- St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 1394 [32/K:A44] Gl. (sec. viii?) in AS centre in Germany?

Parts of the St. Gallen MS [32/K:A44] were used quite early (sec. ixmed.) as pastedowns in the creation of other MSS in St. Gallen, so it is likely that the MS left the unspecified AS centre where it was created soon after the dry-point glosses had been added. The Augsburg MS [1/K:287*], on the other hand, remained in Echternach until the dissolution of the religious institutions in connection with the French Revolution. If it was written there, too, as has been suggested in the literature, it may relatively safely be assumed that the OE dry-point glosses were added in Echternach. This is certainly the case for the OHG dry-point glosses in...
the same MS. The whereabouts of the Fulda MS [12 / K:A41] at the time of glossing are unknown. Its traditional association with St Boniface’s martyrdom may indicate that the dry-point additions were made in a centre of the Anglo-Saxon mission on the Continent.

The eminently ancient “Kassel Hegesippus” [13 / K:121*] originated in 6th-c. Italy and was also glossed in OE dry-point during the 8th c. Whether the MS ever was in Anglo-Saxon England is uncertain.

CLA (8: 1139) cautiously states: “Came to Fulda presumably by way of England”, before being displaced to Kassel in sec. xvii only. Ker (1957: 157), Wiedemann (1994: 96) and most other commentators take for granted that the emendations in Anglo-Saxon minuscule and the dry-point glosses must have been added in England. Bearing in mind that glossing in OE dry-point took place on the Continent, too, it is at least imaginable that the MS ended up in Fulda without taking the detour to England. The Anglo-Saxon dry-point runes on the casing were certainly only added in Fulda, as the characteristic casing itself is a typical piece of Fulda equipment (cf. Lehmann 1925: 13).

The “Würzburg Isidore” [13 / K:121*] can be safely said to have been produced in Anglo-Saxon England, presumably in Southern England, as is often stated in the literature.

Anglo-Saxon origin can be deduced from palaeographical (Anglo-Saxon minuscule script on f. 8v), art historical (initials) and codicological properties (ruling after folding) of the MS. The only strictly Southern feature, however, are the dry-point glosses (cf. Lowe 1960: 22), which show Mercian or Kentish characteristics (cf. Hofmann: 1963: 59–60). If we want to determine whether dry-point glossing was practised south of the Humber in 8th-c. England, however, it would be circular to take the Würzburg MS as evidence: What if the glosses were added only after the MS had reached the Continent? Our understanding that the MS reached Germany only in the second half of the 8th c. is also only based on the presence of the OE glosses, which are by default assumed to have been added in England. However, if the MS reached one of the Continental Anglo-Saxon missionary centres earlier in the same century, the dry-point glosses might have been added there. We need to identify other MSS whose dry-points glosses were
verifiably entered in 8\textsuperscript{th}-c. England south of the Humber before we can address this issue again.

With Northumbrian 8\textsuperscript{th}-c. dry-point glossing, the situation is quite similar. Northumbrian origin has been argued for two OE dry-point gloss MSS:

- Köln, EDDB 213 [14/K:98\textsuperscript{*}] Gl. sec. viii in Lindisfarne? in Echternach?
- St. Paul i. L., Stiftsbibliothek 2/1 [33/K:–] Gl. sec. viii AS prov. unknown (N England?)

It is possible that the OE dry-point glossing was added while they were still in the North of England. Unfortunately, both MSS preserve so little linguistic material that no dialectological evidence can be adduced to a northern place of entry for the dry-point material. The preserved \textit{i}-mutation OE ð\textsuperscript{æ} of the OE dry-point gloss \textit{braemgum} ‘boasting, clamorous (dat. pl.)’ in Köln, EDDB 213 [14/K:98\textsuperscript{*}] would go well with Anglian background (cf. Brunner 1965: 21), however, the gloss is dated so early that non-Anglian background cannot be ruled out, either. The absent palatal diphthongization of the OE dry-point gloss \textit{scel} ‘scale’ (of snakes, in the context of \textit{Virgil}, \textit{Aeneid} 8, 436) in St. Paul i. L., Stiftsbibliothek 2/1 [33/K:–] would preclude West-Saxon background (cf. Brunner 1965: 63), but Kentish – as spoken in Canterbury, which was an important hub of the Continental mission – would still be a viable candidate. Since we do not know how the MS ended up on the Continent, any place on the route (including an Anglo-Saxon centre on the Continent) may have been the place where dry-point glossing was practised. It would be of great help if the presence (or equally tellingly absence) of dry-point glossing could be ascertained in other early Northumbrian MSS to set these early specimens of glossing into perspective.

Surprisingly, no MS with OE dry-point glosses that were demonstrably added before the 10\textsuperscript{th} c. has been identified so far in a British library. In fact, there is only one MS from a British repository securely ascribed to the 9\textsuperscript{th} c. in our \textit{Catalogue}, namely Cambridge, CCC 173 [4/K:40], dated sec. viii\textsuperscript{2}.

- Cambridge, CCC 173 [4/K:40] Gl. (dry-point) sec. x in Winchester?

The glosses, however, are dated to the 10\textsuperscript{th} c. only. The assumption that the MS might have been in Winchester at the time solely depends on the entry \textit{Friðestan diaconus} prominently placed on the first folio of Part II of the codex (f. 57\textsuperscript{r}).
A “Deacon Frithestan” is known as a witness in several Winchester charters. Budny (1997: 81) cautions, however, that even if the signature can be related to the same Frithestan, we still do not know whether this necessarily means that he signed his name in Winchester, as he could have added his name (why so ever) during a journey, too.

Two other OE dry-point gloss MSS, namely the “Cotton Bede” and the “Yale Fragment”, may reach back to the late 8th c., but the exact date is a matter of dispute and the MSS may in fact belong to the early 9th c.

- “Yale Fragment” [24/K:12] Gl. sec. x^{med.−2} AS prov. unknown (Kent?)

In both cases, the dry-point glosses were probably not added before the 10th c.46 Unfortunately, very little is known about the Anglo-Saxon provenance of both the “Cotton Bede” and the “Yale Fragment” and the Kentish traces in their dry-point glosses are the only clue as to where the MSS may have been at the time of glossing.

Another 8th-c. OE dry-point gloss MS whose OE dry-point glosses are also dated to the 10th c. is Paris, BN lat. 9561 [30/K:369].

- Paris, BN lat. 9561 [30/K:369] Gl. sec. x AS prov. unknown

It probably originated in Southern England and received its OE dry-point glosses there, before it journeyed to the Continent at an unknown date.

To sum up: All the OE dry-point gloss MSS that already existed during the 9th c. either ended up on the Continent and/or did not receive their glossing in dry-point until the 10th c. Therefore, if we take the edited OE dry-point gloss evidence at face value, we have to conclude that dry-point glossing in OE was perhaps not practised in Anglo-Saxon England before the 10th c., as dry-point glossing in OE before the 10th c. is apparently restricted to MSS that are connected to the Anglo-Saxon mission on the Continent. These MSS all received their glossing during the 8th c., when the missionary activities were at their height.

46 Neither Meritt nor Ker venture to date the dry-point glosses of the “Cotton Bede” explicitly; Ker (1957: 261) states: “[a]ll the remaining OE [probably including the dry-point glosses] is probably of s. x” (Ker 1957: 261), and Meritt (1945: xi) is equally undetermined: “I think that none of the scratched glosses are later than the 10th c.”
As this state of affairs is difficult to understand, an alternative explanation ought to be falsified first: What if our knowledge of early dry-point glossing in Anglo-Saxon England is simply incomplete because the relevant MSS have not yet been searched for dry-point glosses? An observation that may lend this alternative hypothesis some credence can be made if we look at the history of the detection of the OE dry-point glosses in the Anglo-Saxon MSS prior to the 9th c. (cf. Table 3): All the early dry-point glosses reported from the Continental MSS were identified by Bernhard Bischoff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript produced prior to the 9th c.</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Discovery of OE dry-point glosses first reported by/in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augsburg, UB Cod. I.2.4° 2</td>
<td>[1 / K:287*]</td>
<td>Bischoff? (cf. CLA 8: 1215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassel, UB 2° Ms. theol. 65</td>
<td>[13 / K:121*]</td>
<td>Bischoff (cf. Stach 1950: 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul i. L., Stiftsbibliothek 2/1</td>
<td>[33 / K:–]</td>
<td>Bischoff (cf. Bischoff &amp; Löfstedt 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Yale Fragment”</td>
<td>[24 / K:12]</td>
<td>Napier (cf. Napier 1900: xxxiii, n. 2c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The OE dry-point gloss MSS prior to the 9th c. and their discovery.

When it comes to the reports first printed in CLA, I cannot adduce any evidence that it really was Bischoff who made the discovery because the articles in CLA are not explicitly attributed to individual researchers (hence the question marks in Table 3). My hunch is that Bischoff made these discoveries during his work for CLA, but I have not yet found a source that can confirm my suspicion. However, no other contributor to CLA has ever published on dry-point glosses, as far as I could establish. Bischoff, on the other hand, was acutely aware of the phenomenon of dry-point glossing and published two highly influential articles on the topic (Bischoff 1928 and 1937) during his early career. Both articles testify to the fact that he was a patient and thorough investigator who had an extraor-
ordinary eye for dry-point writing. Moreover, in their reports both Stach (1950) and Hofmann (1963) directly and exclusively rely on the notes that Bischoff ceded to them for publication. Hofmann (1963), for instance, did not identify any of the OE dry-point MSS that he autopsied; both MSS from which dry-point glosses are first reported in his article had been pointed out to him by Bischoff. Hofmann could identify further dry-point glosses from both MSS, but the initial identification of the MS is to be attributed to Bischoff.

Additional, albeit circumstantial evidence comes from the fact that all the dry-point finds from MSS prior to the 9th c. preserved in English libraries had been identified before *CLA*, Volume 2 (concerned with the libraries in Great Britain and Ireland) was published in 1935. The dry-point glosses in Cambridge, CCC 173 [4/K:40] were detected by H. D. Meritt in winter of 1933 and published in Meritt (1936).\(^47\) Those in London, BL Cotton Tiberius C. ii [17/K:198] had been known since Plummer’s (1896) edition of Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* and the dry-point glosses in the “Yale Fragment” [24/K:12] were passingly mentioned by Napier (1900) in a footnote. Bischoff was hired only in 1933 to help in the preparation of *CLA* and I suspect that the work on the MSS in the British libraries had already been completed to a great extent by that time. If so, the lack of reports of early dry-point gloss MSS preserved in English libraries might be due to the mere circumstance that Bischoff’s extraordinary talent in spotting dry-point glosses was not applied to the Anglo-Saxon MSS there.

The conclusion has to be that Anglo-Saxon MSS prior to the 9th c. preserved in British libraries ought to be revisited specifically with dry-point glossing in mind. Perhaps the restricted visibility of dry-point glosses causes a misbalance in our corpus: The eight MSS that Bischoff identified in eight different Continental libraries, all reach back to the 8th c. or earlier. There is not nearly as much evidence from British libraries and the publication of findings and (equally importantly) explicit non-findings in British MSS would complete our picture of OE dry-point glossing quite significantly.

The majority of dry-point glossing that we know of is dated to the 10th and 11th c. and the institution that is quoted most often by a margin is Canterbury, Christ Church. For one of the MSS, Cambridge, CCC 326 [7/K:61], it even seems possible to identify Canterbury, Christ Church as the place where the OE dry-point glossing took place.

---

\(^47\) Meritt (1936: 140) does not explicitly state whether he had actually discovered the dry-point glosses in Cambridge CCC 173 [4/K:40], when he worked on the MS in 1933. *CLA* (2: 123) published their report about the same dry-point glosses in 1935, and it is possible that Lowe and his team had discovered them independently of Meritt.
The MS was produced there (Bishop 1963b: 421 [no. 24]) and an ancient shelfmark on f. ii' testifies to its placement in that institution’s library. It probably remained there until the institution was dissolved in the 16th c. Around that time it passed into the possession of Matthew Parker who gave it to Corpus Christi College in Cambridge in 1575 (cf. Budny 1997: 248–249), where it remains to this day. If the MS was produced in Canterbury, Christ Church and remained there throughout the Middle Ages, it is highly likely that the OE dry-point glosses were added there, too.

All in all, about 10 MSS may have received their dry-point glossing in 10th-c. or 11th-c. Canterbury:

- London, BL Cotton Cleopatra C. viii  
  [16/K:145] Gl. sec. x
  in Canterbury CC?

- London, BL Royal 15 B. xix  
  [22/K:268] Gl. sec. x
  in Canterbury CC?

- London, BL Royal 6 A. vi  
  [20/K:254] Gl. sec. xii
  in Canterbury CC?

- Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibl. mun. 189  
  in Canterbury CC?

- London, BL Royal 5. E. xi  
  [19/K:252] Gl. sec. xi
  in Canterbury CC?

- Cambridge, Trinity College O. 2. 31  
  [10/K:95] Gl. sec. xi
  in Canterbury CC?

- Salisbury, Cathedral 38  
  [31/K:378] Gl. sec. x
  in Canterbury CC or StA

- Cambridge, Trinity College O. 2. 30  
  [9/K:94] Gl. sec. xi
  in Canterbury StA?

- London, Lambeth Palace 200  
  [23/K:–] Gl.
  in Canterbury StA?

Even though it is likely that at least some of the proposed Canterbury origins (and hence proposed provenances) will not be confirmed by future research, Canterbury would still appear to have been a centre of OE dry-point glossing activity around that time.
Abingdon is named in connection with three OE dry-point gloss MSS. Cambridge, CCC 57 [3/K:34] features additions and obits of sec. xi that can be associated with it. The dry-point glossing was added about the same time.

- Cambridge, CCC 57 [3/K:34]  Gl. sec. xi\textsuperscript{1}  in Abingdon?
- Oxford, Bodleian Digby 146 [27/K:320]  Gl. sec. x\textsuperscript{ex-\textsuperscript{med.}}  in Abingdon?

The Oxford MS [27/K:320] is assumed to have been in Abingdon around sec. xi\textsuperscript{med.}, when a large number of ink glosses was copied into it verbatim from Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 1650 (cf. Ker 1957: 6). Around that time, the dry-point glossing was added, too. Additions of personal and place names associated with Abingdon may also point to an Abingdon provenance for Cambridge, UL Kk. 3. 21 [11/K:24]. Even if the attribution to Abingdon cannot be secured in connection with the dry-point glossing per se, Abingdon still appears to be a possible centre of dry-point glossing activity around AD 1000.

The “Thorney Gospels” [15/K:131], produced in France, were used in Thorney as a 	extit{liber vitae} around AD 1100.

- London, BL Additional 40 000 [15/K:131]  Gl. sec. x\textsuperscript{1}  in Thorney?

The OE dry-point glossing was added about two generations before that, yet, the MS may possibly have been in Thorney around that time already.

Two OE dry-point gloss MSS can be associated with Glastonbury, one of the centres of the Benedictine Reform:

- Oxford, Bodleian Rawlinson C. 697 [28/K:349]  Gl. sec. x\textsuperscript{med.}  in Glastonbury?
- Oxford, Bodleian Bodley 572 [26/K:313]  Gl. sec. x  in Glastonbury?

In both cases, the link is not very strong, however, and mainly based on circumstantial evidence.

Finally, for a group of seven MSS glossed in the 10\textsuperscript{th} and 11\textsuperscript{th} c., there is no information available as to where they might have been held during that time:
Co-Occurrence with Vernacular Ink Glosses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>MS Details</th>
<th>Gl. Sec.</th>
<th>AS Prov.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London, BL Cotton Vespasian D. xiv</td>
<td>[18/K:210]</td>
<td>x&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, BL Royal 13 A. xv</td>
<td>[21/K:266]</td>
<td>x&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Auctarium D. 5. 3</td>
<td>[25/K:293]</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam 45–1980</td>
<td>[8/K:7*]</td>
<td>x&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, CCC 223</td>
<td>[5/K:52]</td>
<td>x&lt;sup&gt;-xi&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, St John’s College 154</td>
<td>[29/K:362]</td>
<td>xi&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, CCC 285</td>
<td>[6/K:54]</td>
<td>xi</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may well be that even further research into these MSS would not yield results with respect to their provenance. Nonetheless, as far as I could establish no detailed analyses of the dry-point gloss material have been carried out so far, hence further work on these MSS may well yield new insights.

### 6.6 Co-Occurrence with Vernacular Ink Glosses

When we look for patterns in the co-occurrence of vernacular ink and pencil glosses in the MSS of our corpus of OE dry-point gloss MSS, there is a striking geographical correlation. MSS preserved on the Continent clearly more often tend to be glossed vernacularly in dry-point only than MSS preserved in British libraries. Only 10 OE dry-point gloss MSS do not feature vernacular ink glossing:

- Augsburg, UB Cod. I.2.4° 2   | [1/K:287*] | viii<sup>i</sup> | Echternach, Northumbria? |
- Fulda, HLB Bonifatianus 2     | [12/K:A41]  | viii<sup>i</sup> | Luxeuil, Mainz?         |
- Kassel, UB 2° Ms. theol. 65   | [13/K:121*] | vi         | N Italy                 |

---

48 Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 572 [26/K:313] has no OE ink glosses, but Brittonic ink glosses (see below).
These MSS do clearly not form a representative sample of our Catalogue of OE dry-point MSS, as their Continental whereabouts are not their only shared property: Eight of them were produced sec. viii or earlier and the dry-point glosses in them were all identified by Bernhard Bischoff.\textsuperscript{49} The conclusion has to be, then, that our sample is skewed also in this respect.

Only two OE dry-point gloss MSS have been identified in British Libraries that do not feature vernacular ink glosses, too: London, BL Cotton Vespasian D. xiv, ff. 170–224[18/K:210] and London, Lambeth Palace 200 [23/K:–]. The former was identified by its librarians Thomson & Warner, both palaeographers and librarians at the British Museum, who report the dry-point glosses in their (1884) catalogue of the early MSS in the British Museum. London, BL Cotton Vespasian D. xiv is well-known to Anglo-Saxonists for the first part of the codex, which contains a collection of Ælfric’s Homilies (ff. 4–169 [K:209]). Thompson & Warner (1884) do not specify how they discovered the dry-point glosses; their catalogue simply states: “A few English glosses of the 10th c. (see f. 172v) are interlined with a hard point” (Thompson & Warner 1884: 52). There are no OE ink glosses that would have put this part of the MS forward for closer inspection. Perhaps, one of the librarians chanced upon the dry-point material by accident or a previous discovery had been communicated to them in some form, such as a hand-written note, oral communication or an unpublished catalogue.

The Lambeth MS [23/K:–] was identified as an OE dry-point gloss MS by the Anglo-Saxonist gloss scholar Scott Gwara. He had autopsied a number of

\textsuperscript{49} Cf. overview of dry-point glosses identified by Bischoff on p. 233.
Anglo-Saxon MSS that contain Aldhelm, *Prosa de virginitate* in search for L. and OE glosses. The Lambeth MS does not have OE ink glosses, either, but since Gwara was interested in L. glosses as well, he seems to have autopsied the MS repeatedly over several years, until he eventually must have spotted the OE dry-point gloss sometime between 1997 and 1999, after having worked on the MS at least since the late 1980s (cf. above p. 118). The Lambeth MS may serve as an example that the search for dry-point glosses is in most cases a cumulative process that must not be regarded as completed once an edition is published. At the moment and for the foreseeable future, there is no way of establishing conclusively that a MS does not contain further dry-point material.

I suspect that the remaining 24 MSS, which do not only feature vernacular dry-point glosses, but also – and more conspicuously – vernacular ink glosses, were singled out for closer inspection by palaeographers and glossographers due to the presence of the ink glosses. The fact that eight OE dry-point-only gloss MSS have been identified on the Continent, but only two in Great Britain seems suspicious after all. It would be highly interesting to ascertain the precise amount of time that Bischoff spent in British libraries and to trace the itinerary of libraries that he visited in that very productive phase before World War II. As I pointed out above, I suspect that Bischoff’s main focus lay on the Continent and his absence from the main part of the work on CLA, Volume 2 may have seriously and lastingly affected our understanding of OE dry-point glossing up to and including now. I also think that British MSS have probably never been searched for dry-point material systematically. Mainly MSS that were known to feature vernacular ink glosses were autopsied with regard to dry-point glosses. And even among this group of MSS, new dry-point gloss MSS may be identified even now; this is what happened with London, BL Royal 15 B. xix [22 / K:268], whose ink glosses had been edited in Meritt (1945), but whose dry-point glosses went unnoticed for another 50 years.

I cannot offer any generalizations about the functional co-existence of OE dry-point and ink glosses at the moment, as this would require detailed autopsies for each OE dry-point gloss MS in turn. I can merely highlight some extremes here to show the outlines of that co-existence. Only intermittent occurrence of dry-point glosses among large numbers of OE ink glosses can be found in London, BL Royal 6 A. vi [20 / K:254], where one single OE dry-point gloss is edited in a MS that has more than 400 OE ink glosses. In Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibl. mun. 189 [2 / K:7] a single dry-point gloss is surrounded by more than 1,000 OE glosses.

---

50 As far as I can see, there is no technical term for “MS that only contains vernacular dry-point glosses, but no vernacular ink glosses” currently used in the English-speaking literature; German scholarly usage is “reine Griffelglossenhandschriften”, i.e. “pure dry-point gloss MSS”. I shall refer to them as “dry-point-only gloss MSS”. 
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ink glosses; and Oxford, Bodleian Digby 146[27 / K:320] features more than 5,500 OE ink glosses, but only 2 OE dry-point glosses have been edited from it so far. The other extreme is represented by MSS such as Cambridge, CCC 173 [4 / K:40] or Cambridge, CCC 326 [7 / K:61], in which OE ink glosses are outnumbered by OE dry-point glosses by more than 6:1. In some cases, the same L. lemma is glossed both in OE ink and OE dry-point and in some cases there is even a L. lemma that is glossed twice with the same OE interpretamentum, once in OE ink and in OE dry-point each (cf. Meritt 1945: 30 [gloss 74]). In that configuration we may safely assume that the dry-point gloss must pre-date the ink gloss, because it does not seem plausible that a glossator would add a dry-point gloss if the ink gloss was already in the MS. However, it does not necessarily imply that the second (ink) glossator did not see the dry-point gloss, as he may have entered the ink glosses with the aim of confirming the dry-point gloss.

The “Yale Fragment” [24 / K:12] is the only OE dry-point gloss MS for which the dry-point glosses and the ink glosses are dated separately in the literature. Rusche (1994: 197) distinguishes 6 dry-point gloss hands, which he dates sec. xmed – x2. Gwara (2001a: 92) distinguishes two main hands responsible for the ink glosses and dates them sec. xi1. If these datings are correct, the dry-point glosses pre-date the ink gloss in this MS by a margin.51 I do not think that generalizations ought to be derived from this singular observation, however. Quite to the contrary, it is important that each MS witness is analysed independently.

6.7 Co-Occurrence with Other Vernaculars

6.7.1 Co-Occurrence with Old High German Dry-Point Glosses

Out of the 34 MSS of our Catalogue, five MSS (≈15 %) feature both OE and OHG dry-point glosses:

51 It is puzzling that Gwara (2001a) does neither discuss nor acknowledge Rusche’s (1994) datings. Instead, he concludes even more puzzlingly: “HAND 1 [writing glosses in ink] appears throughout the volume, whereas HAND 2 [also writing glosses in ink] is concentrated only on fols. 3–8. Glosses in both hands do not occur above the same lemma, and it is consequently impossible to establish the relative chronology. Whether the scratched glosses preceded the inked glosses in HAND 1 cannot be known, but this is not likely for the same reason.” I cannot make sense of the wording of Gwara’s concluding sentence: “this [i.e. the proposition that dry-point glosses were entered before the ink glosses in HAND 1] is not likely for the same reason [i.e. the observation that glosses in both dry-point and ink do not occur above the same lemma(?)].”
Co-Occurrence with Other Vernaculars

- Augsburg, UB Cod. I.2.4° 2 [1/K:287*] Sec. vii Echternach, Northumbria?
- Fulda, HLB Bonifatianus 2 [12/K:A41] Sec. vii Luxeuil, Mainz?
- Kassel, UB 2° Ms. theol. 65 [13/K:121*] Sec. vi N Italy
- Köln, EDDB 213 [14/K:98*] Sec. viiiin. Lindisfarne, Echternach?
- Würzburg, UB M. p. th. f. 79 [34/K:400] Sec. vii S England

The five MSS are all quite ancient, dating from the first half of the eighth c. or earlier. It is not quite certain to what extent we can group the MSS together, but some noteworthy parallels can be observed. For instance, they were all glossed in OE dry-point during the 8th c. The Kassel MS, the Köln MS and the Würzburg MS are assumed to have been in England around that time, so the OE dry-point glosses may have been entered there. For both the Augsburg and the Fulda MS, there are doubts about their origin and early provenance. The Augsburg MS may have been produced in Lindisfarne, but the literature generally is in favour of an Echternach origin. The Fulda MS was probably produced in Luxeuil or a centre closely associated with it, such as Mainz, and it is possible that the MS never left the Continent and received its OE glossing in a centre of the Anglo-Saxon mission on the Continent.

It is quite certain that all five MSS must have been associated with the Anglo-Saxon missionary activities in Germany – spearheaded by the Northumbrian Wilfrid in the 670s in Frisia and later brought to fruition in the first half of the 8th c. by his pupil Willibrord (later named Clemens), “the Apostle of the Frisians”, and by the West Saxon Wynfrith (later named Boniface), “the Apostle of the Germans”. The Fulda MS [12/K:A41] has even been directly associated with St Boniface, ever since the cuts on the MS’s cover were interpreted as sword cuts connected with his martyrdom. Otloh of St. Emmeram, Vita Bonifatii (written in the 11th c.) relates that St Boniface tried to shield his head from vicious sword blows of a Frisian mob by holding a book of Gospels above his head.52 Quite unproblematically, however, the Frisian swords turned out to be mightier than what the pen had created and St Boniface died, together with a large number of companions on 5 June 754 in Frisia. There is no medieval evidence that Fulda, HLB Bonifatianus 2 [12/K:A41] should be considered to be that impractical shielding device (cf. Jakobi-Mirwald 1993: 18). Moreover, it does not fit Otloh’s descriptions, as it contains a collection of dogmatic writings and creeds, but no Gospels.

52 Otloh calls it “sancti ęuangelii liber” (Levison 1905: 211).
The beginnings of OHG glossing have long been suspected in the context of the Anglo-Saxon mission, which flourished in Anglo-Saxon centres, such as Echternach (monastery established in AD 698), Würzburg, Erfurt (both bishoprics established in AD 742), Fulda (monastery founded by Boniface in AD 744) and Mainz (of which Boniface became bishop around AD 745).\footnote{Cf. Thoma (1958: 583); \textit{BMS} (3: 75, n. 3).}\footnote{I.e. ‘Both with respect to quantity and geographic distribution, the result of the present study demonstrates convincingly that there is a clear connection with the Anglo-Saxon mission, especially when it comes to the most ancient testimonies. The appearance of OHG glosses is a downright and immediate result of the appearance of Anglo-Saxon missionaries and it may be seen as part of their influence on Continental literacy.’} Bergmann (1983), after analysing the OHG gloss MSS of the 8th c., concludes:

Der nach der Quantität und geographischen Verteilung unerwartet aussagekräftige Befund der vorliegenden Untersuchung zeigt vor allem in den ältesten Zeugnissen einen ganz eindeutigen Zusammenhang mit der angelsächsischen Mission. Das Auftreten althochdeutscher Glossen folgt geradezu und unmittelbar dem Auftreten der angelsächsischen Missionare und darf als Teil ihres Einflusses auf die kontinentale Schriftkultur angesehen werden. (Bergmann 1983: 40)\footnote{I.e. ‘Both with respect to quantity and geographic distribution, the result of the present study demonstrates convincingly that there is a clear connection with the Anglo-Saxon mission, especially when it comes to the most ancient testimonies. The appearance of OHG glosses is a downright and immediate result of the appearance of Anglo-Saxon missionaries and it may be seen as part of their influence on Continental literacy.’}

The OHG dry-point glosses in all five OE dry-point MSS are very early, dated from between the mid-8th c. to the turn of the 8th and 9th c. Early OHG literacy predominantly consists of dry-point glossing, with the dry-point glosses in the “Augsburg Gospels” \footnote{I.e. ‘Both with respect to quantity and geographic distribution, the result of the present study demonstrates convincingly that there is a clear connection with the Anglo-Saxon mission, especially when it comes to the most ancient testimonies. The appearance of OHG glosses is a downright and immediate result of the appearance of Anglo-Saxon missionaries and it may be seen as part of their influence on Continental literacy.’} representing some of the oldest documented specimens of OHG writing in the MS context (cf. Schroeder 1979b: 397; Glaser & Nievergelt 2004: 119).

As I pointed out above, it is worth noting that nearly all early OE dry-point gloss MSS have been identified by the German palaeographer Bernhard Bischoff. It remains to be seen whether our knowledge of early OE dry-point glossing is limited to so many MSS connected with the Anglo-Saxon mission on the Continent because the missionary milieu was especially favourably inclined towards dry-point glossing or whether our view of the subject is skewed by the imbalance of research in this field. If glossing really was a cultural importation to early medieval Germany from Anglo-Saxon England, mediated through the Anglo-Saxon mission, and this earliest stratum of glossing is mainly recorded in dry-point, one may wonder why there is not more evidence of early OE glossing recorded from MSS extant in British repositories. After all, in order to make dry-point glossing a cultural export, dry-point glossing must have been practised wherever the Anglo-Saxon missionaries came from.
6.7.2 Co-Occurrence with Celtic Dry-Point Gloses

Following Craster’s (1923) edition of the dry-point glosses in Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 572, ff. 1–50, [26 / K:313] of which he identified two glosses as Brittonic, there seemed to be a link between OE dry-point glossing and Brittonic dry-point glossing in that MS. Falilieyev & Russell (2003: 96–97), however, do not confirm Craster’s interpretation of the presumably Brittonic dry-point material. On the one hand, they interpret Craster’s gloss lo to L. podi ‘monastery, monastery lands[?]’ as a merograph lo- of L. loci (gen. sg. of locus ‘place’). On the other hand, where Craster reads gili glossing L. secalium ‘a kind of grain, rye, black spelt’, they decipher gilb (though they cannot provide a definitive reading for the last letter) and argue in favour of OE background, perhaps gilp ‘powder, dust’ or gilm ‘a yelm, a handful of reaped corn’. In both cases, their argumentation is not particularly convincing, though, and their conclusion that “of the two possible Brittonic dry-point glosses in this MS one is almost certainly Latin, and the Brittonic character of the other is open to serious doubt” cannot be considered a final assessment (Falilieyev & Russell 2003: 97). Then again, the problems may never be resolved, as there are no simple solutions to the conundrum posed by these two dry-point glosses. Perhaps the issue may be re-addressed once our understanding of Celtic dry-point glossing practices is more complete.

Even if there may be no Brittonic dry-point glosses in Bodley 572 [26 / K:313], there is a link between OE and Brittonic glossing in that MS, nonetheless, since the text De rarís fabulis, which is glossed with 7 (perhaps 8 or more) OE dry-point glosses is also glossed with about 140 Brittonic ink glosses. The MS is dated to the second quarter of the 9th c. and Craster (1923) reports that the Brittonic ink glosses are written by the same scribe as the text itself, so they must date from that period, too. Craster (1923: 136) also suggests that the dry-point glosses were added after the ink glosses, but it is not clear to me on what palaeographical grounds this comment is made. Presumably, he concludes this from the above observation, assuming that the ink glosses were incorporated into the MS at the same time or soon after the MS itself was written, hence they would have to pre-date the dry-point additions.

At the moment, it is not possible to construct a link between the very early OIr practice of dry-point glossing, attested from the 7th c., and the OE practice of dry-point glossing, attested from the early 8th c. on the Continent. Glaser & Nievergelt (2004: 131) surmise that dry-point glossing may have been introduced to the Continent as a typically Insular practice:

Die bereits früher geäußerte Vermutung, dass die Gewohnheit der Glossierung mit dem Griffel grundsätzlich von den britischen Inseln mitgebracht worden sein könnte, hat weitere Bestätigung durch die irischen Griffelglossen erfahren, die P. O Néill als
möglicherweise sogar noch aus dem 7. Jh. stammend identifiziert hat. Es bestätigt sich hier im Bereich der Schreibtechnik, was mittlerweile grundsätzlich für die althochdeutsche Glossierung festgehalten werden kann, nämlich dass sie in der Folge der angelsächsisch-irischen Missionstätigkeit eingesetzt und dass damit das althochdeutsche Schrifttum wohl auch hierin seine Wurzeln hat. (Glaser & Nievergelt 2004: 131)

Even if the introduction of dry-point glossing to the Continent really was accomplished by the missionaries from both England and Ireland, it is not clear to what extent the practice of dry-point glossing should be considered to be a typically Insular practice before the 10th c. Our picture of OIr dry-point glossing is very patchy and our picture of early OE dry-point glossing is practically limited to the testimony of the Continental MSS. If dry-point glossing really was practised in England and Ireland from an early date, there would have to be some tangible evidence of it. The three OIr dry-point glosses in the Codex Usserianus Primus, however, are the only early Insular dry-point glosses that are not directly linked with the missionary activities on the Continent.

6.7.3 Co-Occurrence with an Old French Dry-Point Gloss?

Cambridge, Trinity College Library O. 2. 31 [10/K:95] may present a case of OF and OE dry-point glossing united in the same MS, but it would appear that further research is necessary to corroborate this record. The MS definitely unites OE and OF glossing, but it is distributed unevenly across the three different texts in the MS that are glossed in a vernacular:

i. **Prosper**, *Epigrammata* on ff. 1r–33v, is glossed in both OE ink (28 glosses, distributed over more than a dozen pages), OE dry-point (12 or more56 glosses, distributed over half a dozen pages) and OF ink (3? glosses, all on f. 33v, dated sec. xii in Ker 1957: 137).

ii. **Pseudo-Cato**, *Disticha Catonis*, ff. 34r–40v, is glossed in both OE ink (1 gloss, f. 40v) and OE dry-point (1 gloss, f. 34r).

iii. **Prudentius**, *Dittochaeon (Tituli historiarum)*, ff. 44r–49v, is glossed by one single dry-point gloss OF(?) *catel* to L. *gregis* ‘of the flock’, on f. 47r, l. 25.

---

55 I. e. ‘The long-standing assumption that in principle the practice of glossing by means of the stylus may have been introduced from the British Isles has received further corroboration through the Irish dry-point glosses, which P. O Néill identified as possibly going back to the 7th c. In the area of writing technique we thus find confirmation for what can by now be maintained for OHG glossing in general, namely that it [i. e. the technique of writing in dry-point] begins in the wake of the Anglo-Saxon and Irish missionary activities and that writing in OHG arguably has its origin here, too.’

56 Page (1981a: 108) observes that there must have been more dry-point glosses, but an unspecified number of them is now indecipherable.
Whether the single edited dry-point gloss from Prudentius, Dittochaeon can really be said to be an OF dry-point gloss is not certain. On the one hand, the fact that no other OF dry-point glosses are recorded from this MS speaks in favour of OE. On the other hand, OE *catel* is not attested in any other OE source and ME catel meaning ‘live stock’ is only attested much later, namely from sec. xiv (OED s.v. “cattle” II.4.a; MED s.v. “catēl” 2). From the point of view of lexicography OF linguistic background is therefore more likely just now. From the point of view of glossography it can be argued, however, that no stylus activity in French is known from that particular MS, whereas several OE dry-point glosses have been edited. Moreover, the French glossing in ink is restricted to one folio, whereas the OE glossing was demonstrably more extensive. There is no easy way out of this uncertainty, except for a reappraisal of the MS evidence: I am quite confident that further dry-point glosses will eventually be deciphered from this part of the MS. Should they turn out to be exclusively OE, we could confidently reject the notion that *catel* is OF and we must pre-date the first occurrence of *catel* to the late OE period, instead.

### 6.8 Co-Occurrence with Construe Marks

Ten of the 34 OE dry-point gloss MSS that we identified also feature construe marks in ink (cf. Korhammer 1980: 55–58):

- Oxford, Bodleian Rawlinson C. 697 [28/K:349] Sec. ix²/³ NE France
- London, BL Royal 15 B. xix [22/K:268] Sec. x² or xex Canterbury CC
- Oxford, Bodleian Digby 146 [27/K:320] Sec. xex Canterbury StA
- Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibl. mun. 189 [2/K:7] Sec. x/xi Canterbury CC
- Cambridge, CCC 326 [7/K:61] Sec. x/xi Canterbury CC

---

57 The online facsimile of Cambridge, Trinity College Library O. 2. 31 [10/K:95] provided on the website of Trinity College, Cambridge shows further dry-point traces on f. 47v and elsewhere, cf. p. 128.
If we consider the respective base texts, it becomes apparent, though, that they can be related to just three authors – Aldhelm (6 MSS), Prudentius (3 MSS) and Sedulius (2 MSS) – who all enjoyed great attention in the Anglo-Saxon monastic literary canon. It can be argued then that in these cases, the increased interest that these texts generated manifested itself in both dry-point glossing and the addition of construe mark. In Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibliothèque municipale 189 [2/K:7], whose f. 7r shows the notation L. signa hic constructionem 'enter [syntactic] construction [=construe marks] here', we can even get a glimpse of how construe marks were presumably used in teaching:

In response to this request an Anglo-Saxon glossator (possibly the same man who provided the many Old English lexical glosses which appear throughout this manuscript) has used letters of the alphabet along with a system of dots and strokes to show how the words of Prudentius’s involuted sentence should be rearranged so as to bring them into conformity with straightforward Old English word order. (Robinson 1973: 443–444)

It is intriguing to think that we can catch a glimpse of the daily teaching routine in an Anglo-Saxon grammar school. This is the only instance of syntax lettering in this particular MS, however, so one may wonder whether this is evidence of a one-off exercise rather than of a systematic teaching method.

I did not find any reports of dry-point construe marks in the Anglo-Saxonist secondary literature. Although it is conceivable that dry-point writing was not used at all in connection with construe marks, it may just as well be the case that they have simply gone unnoticed so far. Individual letters, strokes and dots entered without ink are even less conspicuous than dry-point glosses, which usually consist of several letters, and hence their chance of being detected by coincidence may be even further reduced. Individual tokens of such dry-point construe marks may even have been noticed by individual scholars, but due to the difficult visibility of dry-point writing their systematic nature will not become apparent as easily as with ink construe marks and hence may have been ignored time and again.