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; 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 Drihtelm (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]).

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. 8*), 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 8th-c. England south of the Humber before we can address this issue again.

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

- Köln, EDBB 213 [14/K:98*] 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 i-mutation OE ð>æ of the OE dry-point gloss brængum ‘boasting, clamorous (dat. pl.)’ in Köln, EDBB 213 [14/K:98*] 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 scel ‘scale’ (of snakes, in the context of VIRGIL, 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 10th 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 9th c. in our Catalogue, namely Cambridge, CCC 173 [4/K:40], dated sec. viii².

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

The glosses, however, are dated to the 10th c. only. The assumption that the MS might have been in Winchester at the time solely depends on the entry Friðestan diaconus prominently placed on the first folio of Part II of the codex (f. 57*).
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. 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; Löffstedt 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). Those in London, BL Cotton Tiberius C. ii [17/K:198] had been known since Plummer’s (1896) edition of Beda, 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 shelf-mark 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:

- Canterbury, Trinity College O. 2. 31 [10/K:95] Gl. sec. xmed. in Canterbury CC?
- Salisbury, Cathedral 38 [31/K:378] Gl. sec. xex. in Canterbury CC or StA
- Canterbury, 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>In Location?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>CCC 57</td>
<td>xi</td>
<td>Abingdon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Digby 146</td>
<td>[27/K:320]</td>
<td>x&lt;sup&gt;sec&lt;/sup&gt;–xi&lt;sup&gt;med&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Abingdon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, UL Kk. 3. 21</td>
<td>[11/K:24]</td>
<td>xi</td>
<td>Abingdon?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Oxford MS [27/K:320] is assumed to have been in Abingdon around sec. xi<sup>med</sup>, 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 liber vitae around AD 1100.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>In Location?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Digby 146</td>
<td>[28/K:349]</td>
<td>xi&lt;sup&gt;med&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Glastonbury?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Bodley 572</td>
<td>[26/K:313]</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Glastonbury?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> c., there is no information available as to where they might have been held during that time: