

Acknowledgements: Barbara Barr[e]tt's name misspelt: Luis Velez's name was accidentally omitted.

p.15: Quire definitions are very slightly wrong.

Printer's Def: 1/20th of a ream, which is, 24 or 25 sheets.

Bookbinder's Def: A gathering made of 4 sheets (8 leaves, 16 pages).

Note: in Medieval times there were terms for various gatherings of 6 to 10 sheets. Only by late medieval times had "quire" become a synonym for "gathering": the discussion should be edited to better reflect this.

p.16: Tironian notae: fewer than a dozen of these survived past the 11thC, and if the abbreviation, suspension, contraction, or tachygraphy in a medieval manuscript is not one of those few signs then it should not be called Tironian.

Additionally, the origin of the ampersand is in contention, therefore one can not say as a fact that it is of Tironian origin.

The 9 figure as a "con" prefix and an "os" suffix is a medieval combination of two different Tironian notae; a reverse C and a superscript comma; so "9" while based on Tironian originals is not Tironian itself

In many places in the book the horizontal bar is called a "macron"; this is incorrect usage. Unless a horizontal bar is being used to alter the spoken quality of a phoneme represented by a grapheme(s) it is not a macron. In all other cases it is called a horizontal bar, or just bar.

The suspensions, contractions, and abbreviations marked by a horizontal bar are not Tironian as the text says either, but rather medieval. Those very few that existed at the same time as Tironian notes were not part of that system.

With the exception of "9" which is part Tironian, the abbreviations, suspensions, contractions, and tachygraphy called "Tironian" here are actually medieval.

p.18: diagram annotations should be in italics

p.19: the table here should be replaced by an annotated scan of Gasparinus' BL MS (if at all possible).

p.31: While parchment may be dyed during production, afterwards it is not porous & so does not absorb pigments and ink: they instead adhere to it. This is what permitted scraping for erasure, both for correction and for re-use: and it was the cracking of unabsorbed ink that led Newbold to see his "micro" letters..

Therefore, what I've (possibly misleadingly) called "bleed through" is in fact the semi-transparency of very fine vellum: a better term should be found.

p.38: the quality of the Galvano Fiamma picture is extremely poor – this should be rescanned & converted.

p.45: add more white space between photograph and following paragraph.

p.53: Parchment could be written upon **both** sides: it was papyrus that was usually written upon one side only (the reverse side did not take ink very well).

Many authorities note that it was this feature of parchment being able to accept ink on both sides that led to the demise of the scroll and the ascent of the codex.

Vellum is just fine parchment, usually made from a soft skin such as calf, lamb etc. It was no advantage over parchment in terms of available writing surface.

p.57: "Gutter" - Incorrect usage.

The "gutter" is a margin: it is the white space between the body text and the spine or binding. The "gutter" here should be instead be called something else: the central fold, quire spine, quire fold, binding fold, binding edge, etc.

p.59: aratru → ásatrú

p.67: "Bleed across" called Contact Transfer.

p.98: "5 / TOA" – this passage should make it clear that other readings are possible, and that the reading I present is only my opinion.

p.109: The "What Fire : Air : Earth : Water..." table should be vertically centred.

p.122: Piero de' Crescen[z]i (mis-spelling)

p.126: O'Neill identified f93r _not_ f33v as "the sunflower": amend text accordingly

p.134: the quotation from Paton's translation of Antipater got slightly mangled:

line 2: "with" --> "at"

line 6: "mill" --> "wheel"

p.165: The photo, third from left, top row, is not aiiV, but the rarer oiiV: totally different ductus, clear even in the B&W photos.

p.166: The passage on the "V" should be rewritten to make it clearer that I was astonished because the variations in shape were methodical, not arbitrary. Also: what is called the "flourish" here should instead be called the "arm".

p.169: A "macron-like loop" is contradictory: need to find a better description.

p.169: Beneventan 't' – discussion needs to better reflect Jacques Guy's idea about how Voynichese "c_c" matches the Beneventan ligature for "ct", not "t" alone.

p.172. Father of modern cryptography (should attribute this properly)

p.174: the term "strokes" is used incorrectly in "*..[the] others [letters] are composed of 1 or 2 flowing strokes.*" Of the 18 letters shown only half (9) use 2 or less strokes, some have as many as 6. The mean is actually 3 strokes which is true of the 4. So it is not unusual in this respect.

Apparently, I am justified in flagging the "4" as being apart from the others, because of a uniqueness to its ductus which Barbara Barrett hasn't yet told me... perhaps she will soon...

p.181. It was Aloys Meister who first observed the missing stroke of Cicco's pen, transforming *vvola* into *mvla*. Opinions differ about this, and this should be reflected in the text.

p.185. When citing the original title in Latin, the date is 1466-67. The page number should be 19.

p.186. *passim*. Small book. Not a book. It is a manuscript treatise.

p.188. We say *san* Simone, *san* Silvestro etc, but *santo* Stefano, *santo* Spirito etc. for euphonic reasons.

p.202. The cells in Steve Ekwall's folding key diagram are left-right reflected (but are otherwise correct, I believe).

p.205. Moreover is on p. 15 of the paper book.

p.206. What I said p. 16

p.207. see above. Page number is 17.

p.210. in the long run p. 15

p.210. absolutely p. 17.

p.225: Piero de' Crescen[z]i (mis-spelling)