Glosses to the Consolation of Philosophy *in Late Anglo-Saxon England: their Origins and their Uses*

Malcolm Godden

Published as: M. Godden, 'Glosses to the Consolation of Philosophy in late Anglo-Saxon England: their origins and their uses', in *Rethinking and Recontextualizing Glosses: New Perspectives in the Study of Late Anglo-Saxon Glossography*, ed. P. Lendinara, L. Lazzari, C. Di Sciacca (Textes et Études du Moyen Âge 54), Brepols: Turnhout, 2011, pp. 67-92.

Glosses to the Consolation of Philosophy in Late Anglo-Saxon England: their Origins and their Uses

Malcolm Godden

Latin glosses in late Anglo-Saxon copies of Latin school-texts such as the works of Boethius, Prudentius, Sedulius and Arator have produced a great deal of debate, both about their origins and their use. Were the glosses new work by Anglo-Saxons and representative of Anglo-Saxon scholarship, or merely copies of older, Carolingian scholarship? Were they for scholarly readers, or for novice readers, or for students, or for teachers[1]?

Back in 1982, Michael Lapidge produced a characteristically provocative paper arguing that such glosses were primarily derived from ninth-century Continental commentaries, reproduced along with the text with little addition, «the repositories of learning which was (in some cases at least) already a century old»[2]. Gernot Wieland published a reply in 1985, arguing that though many glosses were indeed derived from earlier Continental commentaries a significant number were newly added[3]. Neither as it happened mentioned manuscripts of Boethius, but Diane Bolton in 1977 had published a very detailed study of the Anglo-Saxon manuscripts of the *Consolation of Philosophy*, in which she reached conclusions that are hard to disentangle but seemed to hesitate between the two positions: she thought that the glosses in English manuscripts were ultimately based on a commentary of Remigius of Auxerre supposedly written early in the tenth century, but showed evidence of conflation with several other lost early commentaries and possibly the addition of new glosses, and although it was *possible* that the whole process of conflating and supplementing glosses was a Continental phenomenon and merely copied by Anglo-Saxon scribes, the *probability* was that some part at least of this process took place in England[4].

The uncertainty over origins was matched by equal disagreement over the uses of the glosses. Lapidge argued that such glosses had nothing to do with the activities of the Anglo-Saxon classroom, whether as the responses of the students or as aids to the teacher, but if they had any contemporary function at all, which he doubted, were aids for private reading, while Wieland argued that they were records of, and aids for, the activities and concerns of the Anglo-Saxon teacher. Specifically on Boethius, Bolton concluded cautiously that «the glossed texts of

[1] In addition to the studies cited below, see *Early Medieval Glosses on Prudentius' Psychomachia: the Weitz Tradition*, ed. S. O'Sullivan, Brill, Leiden 2004; Mayr-Harting, H., *Church and Cosmos in Early Ottonian Germany: the View from Cologne*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2007.

[2] Lapidge, M., «The Study of Latin Texts in Late Anglo-Saxon England», in *Latin and the Vernacular Languages in Early Medieval Britain*, ed. N. Brooks, Leicester University Press, Leicester 1982, pp. 99-140; repr. in Lapidge, M., *Anglo-Latin Literature, 600-899*, Hambledon Press, London 1996, pp. 455-98, 516.

[3] Wieland, G., «The glossed manuscript: classbook or library book?», *Anglo-Saxon England* 14 (1985), pp. 153-73. For a response see Lapidge, *Anglo-Latin Literature, 600-899*, p. 516.

[4] Bolton, D. K., «The Study of the Consolation of Philosophy in Anglo-Saxon England», *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge* 44 (1977), pp. 33-78.

the Consolation of Philosophy *seem* to have been used in teaching» but R. I. Page in 2001 looked again at the Anglo-Saxon manuscripts of Boethius and concluded on the basis of the vernacular glossing that «it does not look strong evidence of elementary, or indeed advanced, schooling in this major Boethius text in later Anglo-Saxon times»[5].

All four scholars noted that they were drawing their conclusions on a limited number of manuscripts and a limited sample of the text, and that reliable conclusions would require full collations; as Bolton put it with reference to the Boethius text, «Without an exhaustive comparison with the Continental manuscripts it is impossible to say with any certainty whether this process took place on the Continent and was merely copied by Anglo-Saxon scribes or whether some of the resulting commentaries were indigenous»[6]. Bolton, together with Joseph Wittig, embarked on such a process with the manuscripts of the *Consolation*, as preparation for a new edition, in the late 1970s, but apparently abandoned it soon afterwards[7]. In 2002 Dr Jayatilaka and I began anew to collate all the pre-1100 glosses to the *Consolation*, initially as material for use in a new edition of the *Old English Boethius* which I was undertaking with Professor Susan Irvine and which was completed in 2007 and published in 2009[8]. Since 2007 Dr Jayatilaka and I have continued work on the Boethius glosses, together with Dr Rosalind Love and Dr Paolo Vaciago, and we will be publishing the complete corpus when the project ends in 2012[9]. Now that we have full collations of *all* the glosses in nearly *all* the pre-1100 manuscripts of the *Consolation of Philosophy*, it is no longer possible to evade the issue or offer tentative conclusions: we are not going to get much more evidence than we have now, and we should be able to confront these issues with more confidence, at least as they apply to the study of Boethius.

Altogether we are dealing with more than eighty witnesses to Boethian glosses from the period up to 1100. There are about seventy-four manuscripts containing the text with glosses, thirteen of them fragments. Then there are ten copies of what are sometimes called commentaries but are really just collections of lemmata and glosses without the text but almost certainly compiled from glossed copies; sometimes they are bound up with copies of the whole

---

[5] Page, R. I., «Recent Work on Old English Glosses: the Case of Boethius», in R. Bergmann, E. Glaser and C. Moulin-Fankhänel (edd.), *Mittelalterliche volkssprachige Glossen: Internationale Fachkonferenz des Zentrums für Mittelalterstudien der Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg, 2. bis 4. August 1999*, C. Winter, Heidelberg 2001, pp. 217-42.

[6] Bolton, «The Study», p. 39.

[7] Wittig has now published an article based on the analysis of the material that he collected up to 1980 or so; see Joseph Wittig, «The "Remigian" Glosses on Boethius's *Consolatio Philosophiae* in Context», in C. D. Wright, F. M. Biggs and T. N. Hall (edd.), *Source of Wisdom: Old English and Early Medieval Latin Studies in Honour of Thomas D. Hill*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto 2007, pp. 168-200.

[8] *The Old English Boethius: an Edition of the Old English Versions of Boethius's De Consolatione Philosophiae*, ed. M. Godden and S. Irvine, 2 vols., Oxford University Press, Oxford 2009.

[9] The initial project, 2002-7, was funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, and the present one, 2007-12, by the Leverhulme Trust. I would like to express my gratitude to both bodies for their generous support, without which this work could not have been contemplated.

glossed text, sometimes separate. A further eleven manuscripts contain excerpts from the text without glosses, all but one restricted to the metres, and there are also a number of separate commentaries just on 3m9. The manuscripts come from many different places but about a fifth of the surviving glossed copies are from Anglo-Saxon England - thirteen copies of the complete text and three glossed fragments[10]. Several of these are preserved in Continental libraries, which might suggest that there were many more such manuscripts in Anglo-Saxon England and that those that remained in England had a poor survival rate in the sixteenth century. They are generally very heavily glossed, with substantially more glosses than we find in manuscripts from elsewhere in Europe.

The manuscripts produced in England are all from late in the period, from 950 to 1050 or so, many of them from Canterbury, others apparently in use at Abingdon, but there is good evidence that the *Consolation* was being studied and glossed in England earlier in the tenth century as well:

1. Excerpts from four of the metres were copied on to the flyleaves of an Isidore manuscript in England around the year 912, possibly Canterbury[11].
2. V1, an early copy of the *Consolation* produced in France and glossed there and in Cornwall, had reached Glastonbury by the 940s and was further glossed there by Dunstan and others. And they were able to consult at least one other copy and compare readings[12].
3. The author of the *Old English Boethius*, writing at the end of the ninth century or early in the tenth, made extensive use of at least one glossed text of the *Consolation*, as well as showing detailed knowledge of the text and its background generally[13].

It is clear then that glossed copies of the *Consolation* were available and in use in England by at least the first half of the tenth century and that there was intensive study of the text, even though V1 is the only glossed manuscript to survive from that period.

Nature of the glosses

As with most school-texts, the glosses are of many different kinds. There are short glosses, often single words, that seem intended just to explain the meaning of words or perhaps the particular sense of multivalent words, or to show how to construe a sentence. But there are also many longer glosses that take issue with Boethius's argument or extrapolate it or offer analogies or provide the full story behind an allusion; or simply offer an etymology or describe the figure of speech in use. They seem, that is, both to help the understanding of the text and to use it as a basis for accumulating knowledge of all kinds.

---

[10] For a list of the manuscripts cited in this paper, and their sigla, see below.

[11] London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv. For the date and later provenance see Dumville, D., «English Square Minuscule Script: the Background and Early Phases», *Anglo-Saxon England* 16 (1987), pp. 147-79, at 172. The account of the contents there needs some revision.

[12] Godden, M. R., «Alfred, Asser, and Boethius», in K. O'Brien O'Keeffe and A. Orchard (edd.), *Latin Learning and English Lore: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature for Michael Lapidge*, 2 vols., University of Toronto Press, Toronto - London 2005, I, pp. 326-48 (Toronto Old English Series).

[13] *The Old English Boethius*, ed. Godden and Irvine, pp. 55-8.

The origins of the glosses

What then can we say about the origins of the glosses in these English manuscripts? Were they new, old, or a mixture of the two? An analysis of that question is inevitably complicated. Firstly, though there is much agreement among the manuscripts, no two have an identical set of glosses, and in most cases, perhaps all, the glosses in a manuscript were added by several roughly contemporary hands, using several different reference systems, so we are evidently dealing with a complex transmission history and probably multiple origins for the glosses in any particular manuscript. Secondly, the glosses are very numerous, running up to twelve thousand in some manuscripts. In analysing their origins we can distinguish at least four strands.

Glosses in Old English

The vast majority of glosses in these manuscripts are in Latin, but nearly all the Anglo-Saxon manuscripts have a few in Old English, ranging in most cases from just two to sixteen. Similar tendencies are evident in manuscripts from other non-Romance regions: a sprinkling of Old High German glosses is often found in Boethius manuscripts from German-speaking regions, a few in Irish are found in one probably twelfth-century manuscript from Ireland[14], and there is a single Britonnic (Cornish or Welsh) gloss in V1, which was evidently glossed in south-western Britain[15]. Generally in these Anglo-Saxon manuscripts the vernacular glosses are in different hands from the Latin glosses, though not always, and there is no overlap between the manuscripts: each one has a different set of Old English glosses and they gloss different lemmas (with one exception). They seem, then, to be independent of each other, though showing common tendencies. The general paucity of Old English glosses in these manuscripts is a striking feature. It is especially noteworthy in the case of the Antwerp manuscript (A in our list). This has just two Old English glosses and about twelve thousand Latin glosses, whereas the companion manuscript, probably produced in the same scriptorium and perhaps once bound with it (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 1650), has a copy of Aldhelm's *De Virginitate* with more than five thousand Old English glosses[16]. It suggests that those who studied Boethius had less need of an Old English gloss, perhaps because they were more advanced students, or perhaps because the vocabulary of Boethius was less challenging than that of Aldhelm.

One partial exception among Anglo-Saxon manuscripts is our manuscript C. This seems to be from the same stable as the others, produced around 1000, probably at Canterbury. It provides a series of Latin glosses of the usual kind to the first two books of the *Consolation* but then switches to a fairly continuous Old English gloss to the first part of book 3, up to prose 9. After that both Latin and Old English glosses disappear and it just has syntactic glosses. C4 also is something of an exception. There are just two Old English glosses in ink, neither matching

[14] Ó Néill, P. P., «Irish Glosses in a Twelfth-Century Copy of Boethius's *Consolatio Philosophiae*», *Ériu* 55 (2005), pp. 1-17.

[15] Godden, «Alfred, Asser, and Boethius»; Sims-Williams, P., «A New Brittonic Gloss on Boethius: *ud rocashaas*», *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 50 (2005), pp. 77-86.

[16] For a description of the Brussels manuscript see Ker, N. R., *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1957, reissued with supplement, 1990, pp. 6-7. On the relationship to MS A, see further Porter, D., *Excerptiones de Prisciano: the Source for Ælfric's Latin-Old English Grammar*, D.S. Brewer, Cambridge 2002, pp. 7-9 (Anglo-Saxon Texts, 4).

anything in other manuscripts: *steordalce* glossing *clavo* at 3p12.17 and *ing gehid* (for *ingehyd*) glossing *scientiae* at 5p5.12. But it also has about a hundred Old English glosses in drypoint, concentrated on the last three books[17]. These seem to have been added by more than one hand, after the Latin glosses (though the dry-point glosses include a few in Latin themselves). There is no agreement with the other manuscripts that have occasional Old English glosses, and where they overlap with the continuous gloss in C, in the first part of Book 3, there is some agreement in gloss words but probably no more than would be reached by chance. Thus at 3p8.10, in the sentence «nonne introspectis uisceribus illud Alcibiadis *superficie* pulcherrimum corpus turpissimum uideretur?» (Would not the body of Alcibiades, so handsome on the surface, seem most vile if you could see his insides?), both manuscripts gloss *superficie* with *on ansyne* «in appearance»[18]. The lack of agreement generally is all the more surprising because of the close match in the Latin glosses of the two manuscripts; indeed William Hale, who edited the C glosses for a dissertation, thought that C and C4 were the product of the same scriptorium[19].

Although the Old English scratched glosses in C4 seem to belong to a distinct stage from the Latin glosses, they perhaps serve the same function or reflect the same concerns. That is, they provide one-word equivalents or occasionally phrases for words that are generally glossed in other manuscripts (and sometimes in C4 too) with Latin synonyms or near-synonyms as well, perhaps to pin down the meaning of a polyvalent word or to explain a rarer one. So the rather obscure word *porismata* at 3p10.22 is glossed with a whole string of Latin words in the various manuscripts and also, in C4, with *gesweotolung*, «revelation»:

porismata: meatus; similitudines; questus; lucra; illationes; illuminationes; adquisitio; foramina; superadiectum; demonstrationes uel subtiles sententias; *geswe(oto)lung*.

At the other extreme the very simple word *ire* «to go» at 4m6.38 is glossed with Old English *faran* in C4 but it is also glossed with an assortment of Latin words and phrases in other manuscripts, suggesting that readers and commetators found a need for some elucidation and disambiguation here:

ire: pergere; ut eant; ad eundem; cursu suo; ad deum; *faran*.

And sometimes the gloss may really be clarifying the case and syntax rather than the sense of the word, as in this instance at 4p5.3 where the glosses in the different manuscripts are both pointing to the genitive case of the lemma:

sapientiae: cuius rei; *wisdomes*.

The Old English glosses in C4 are more common on prose than on verse, even though the verse is generally more difficult to construe. So there is much Old English glossing in C4 on 3p9 and

---

[17] They were mostly printed by H. D. Merritt in «Old English Glosses, mostly drypoint», *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 60 (1961), pp. 441-50, but a few more were added by R. I. Page in «New Work on Old English Scratched Glosses», in P. M. Tilling (ed.) *Studies in English Language and Early Literature in Honour of Paul Christophersen*, New University of Ulster, Coleraine 1981, pp. 105-14 (Occasional Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching, 8), and in Page, R. I., «Recent Work on Old English Glosses».

[18] Text of the *Consolation* is quoted from *Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii Philosophiae consolatio*, ed. L. Bieler, CCSL 94, Brepols, Turnhout 1957; revised edn 1984; translations are my own.

[19] Hale, W. C., *An Edition and Codicological Study of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 214*, University of Pennsylvania Ph.D thesis, 1978.

3p10 but nothing on the notoriously challenging 3m9 that comes between them. Whether that means that the commentators who used the vernacular did not attempt to read 3m9, or that its problems were of a different kind, is a moot point. But generally these vernacular glosses seem to represent the activities of readers engaging closely with the text and responding to it, rather than the work of scribes copying glosses from one manuscript to another[20]. If the Old English glosses in C4 are indeed in more than one hand, and if the manuscript was indeed in use at Abingdon like A, or indeed at Canterbury like C, it is all the more intriguing that similar scratched glosses do not occur in these other manuscripts[21].

Latin glosses

The story with the Latin glosses is quite different. To make the discussion manageable, I will focus on one manuscript, but it is fairly representative and I will be drawing comparisons and parallels with the others as I go along. The manuscript is one of the best known, C4 in our list. It was produced and glossed around the year 1000 and early additions on the flyleaves suggest a connection with Abingdon[22] but the affiliations with other manuscripts suggest it may have been written and glossed at Canterbury before moving to Abingdon. The text was written with ample space between the lines and in the margins for glosses, and the glosses were added in several hands generally similar to that of the text, with the marginal glosses linked to the text by several different systems. Further glosses were added early in the twelfth century but those are ignored here.

C4 has about ten thousand Latin glosses of the eleventh century, written in a variety of hands from roughly the same date as the text. Very few of these glosses are unique to this manuscript: they mostly appear in other manuscripts, especially English manuscripts. This might suggest that they were all copies rather than original glosses, but we need caution here, since there is a fair amount of evidence, none of it certain, that glosses were sometimes copied from C4 into other contemporary manuscripts, such as A and Ge, and of course possibly vice versa. So, for instance, in the gloss to 3p1.3 reading «ut attentus raperes uerba mea», shared by several English manuscripts, MS Ge has mistakenly *rapes* for *raperes* and *tent* for *attentus,* and in C4 the abbreviation mark for the *-er-* is obscured and that for *-us* is easily overlooked, which suggests it might have been the source for Ge's gloss. Generally there appears to have been much collation and conflation amongst these English manuscripts, and some of the glosses may have been unique when they were entered in C4, though there is no regular pattern that might point to one manuscript being wholly dependent for its glosses on another. Moreover, the variety of hands and the use of different reference systems for linking the marginal glosses to the text in C4 suggest several different sources for those that *were* copied from other manuscripts. So on f. 41v of C4, to take a fairly random example, there are ten substantial glosses to 3p4 entered in the margins. Five of them are marked with the Greek letters α, β, δ, ε and φ to key

[20] It is of course possible that scratched glosses were more difficult to read and so ignored by copyists, but that would not explain the inked glosses in Old English, which seem not to have been copied either.

[21] One scratched gloss has been observed in the closely related Ge but that is in Latin (see Sotheby's catalogue, *Western manuscripts and Miniatures: London, Tuesday 5 July 2005*, Sotheby's, London 2005, Lot 80).

[22] Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 38.

them to the text. The same glosses appear in other English manuscripts, such as Ge, but marked with the Roman letters S, T, U, X, Y. Interspersed with these in C4 are others using different reference symbols. Two of these are found in a more limited group of English manuscripts, just A and P9. Another is found only in C4. Then there are two in the right margin marked with *Aliter*. They also occur in MS A, twice on the same page (45v), once in the left margin marked with φ and χ, and again at the foot in a different hand, marked with *Aliter*, and looking as if they may have been copied from C4 (both manuscripts appear to have been at Abingdon early in the eleventh century).

Trying to capture this bewildering variety of connections in any kind of stemma or summary is difficult enough, but often one finds a quite different picture in the next book or even the next prose or metre. Glossing in Boethius manuscripts was patchy, in terms of the degree of glossing in different sections but also in terms of the work of individual contributors. Dunstan started his glossing at Glastonbury in V1 at or near the beginning, but largely gave up by the end of Book 1 and glossed only sporadically thereafter. The glossators who supplied the Old English glosses in C4 focused on Books 3-5, and particular bits in that, while the Old English glossators in C just did Book 3. That kind of selective focus when copying Latin glosses, especially when the difference of hands is lost in subsequent copies, could produce quite different pictures of transmission histories for different parts of the work. The interconnections of manuscripts, reflected in the use of different sources and systems, are so complicated, and so variable from one section to the next, that any attempt to draw up a precise analysis produces something that is impossibly complex[23].

If we ignore for now these different affiliations among the English manuscripts and focus instead on the larger question of the relations of their glosses to non-English manuscripts, we can distinguish three main strands among the Latin glosses in C4, in addition to the Old English strand:

1. E-type. These are glosses in C4 that also occur widely among English manuscripts but do not occur at all in other manuscripts. They are very variable in number: in some parts of the text, especially from Book 3 onwards, they amount to about 40 per cent of all the Latin glosses in C4 (for instance, in 3p1 some thirty-five glosses are of this type, out of a total of eighty-six in C4), but under 20 per cent in other parts, especially in the early books. A typical example is this (from 3p1.2), occurring in eight of the English manuscripts but none of the fifty or so non-English complete manuscripts:

> Philosophia solamen et iuuamen est lassorum quoniam quibus inseritur non sinit tristari pro temporalibus si uere quilibet sapiens est si caduca amiserit ad caelestia spem erigit ridens iras aeris A C2 C4 Es Ge P P6 P9.

2. V-type. A further small but significant strand are glosses that are found widely in English manuscripts and also in V1 but not elsewhere. These include glosses that were entered in V1 in the second half of the ninth century, before it left France, and glosses that were entered in an

[23] One might cite, for instance, the analyses by Diane Bolton («The Study») and Joseph Wittig («The "Remigian" Glosses»), which are both very complex but even so based on just a few samples of text.

insular hand at the end of the ninth century, in Cornwall or Wales, and glosses that were entered in a hybrid hand at Glastonbury in the 940s. V1 then remained in England until near the end of the Middle Ages. So it seems very probable that the English manuscripts got these glosses directly or indirectly from V1 itself. These amount to about 5 per cent of the glosses in C4 (though it should be noted that much of the glossing in V1 is badly faded or scraped and difficult to read). A representative example is the following:

> imago ista pro falsitate intellegitur quia sicut imaginibus non cernitur plenus homo. sic nec in falsitate ueritas A C4 P9 V1.

3. C-type. The remainder are glosses that are found widely in English manuscripts but also occur in Continental ones. There is no particular pattern or grouping among those Continental manuscripts that share a gloss with English ones; sometimes it is just a single one of them, but generally it involves quite a few manuscripts. These glosses amount to about 60 per cent of the total in C4. One might cite as an example this gloss on 3p2.2, occurring in four English manuscripts but also in ten Continental manuscripts:

> *mortalium cura*: curae mortalium multae sunt. sed unusquisque suum officium ideo exercet. ut per illud quod agit pertingat ad summum bonum. et in hoc omnium intentio consumatur. sed quia inrationabiliter illud querunt. minime comprehendere ualent. quia propter captandam solam beatitudinem omnem agunt homines. licet non semper recte studio A C2 C4 P9; An Lc L4 Ma P5 P7 P8 P16 T V2.

One might imagine that these three strands - glosses with a solely English circulation, glosses derived from V1 and glosses with a Continental presence - reflect three different sources used by the scribes or glossators of C4, but the different strands do not match up with different hands in C4 and the same mix of strands also appears in other English manuscripts, as the examples indicate. It is not, then, a question of the three sources feeding directly into C4 but rather of the English manuscripts generally drawing selectively on a collection or corpus of glosses which already combined these three strands - a corpus which might have come into being in a single manuscript or in two or more available at the same place, and which might have been used by the extant manuscripts directly or at some remove.

Is it possible to locate and date this collection on which the English manuscripts draw? It was evidently in existence by about the 970s, since glosses derived from it already appear in MS O, whose glosses were entered from about the middle of the second half of the tenth century. But the V-type glosses in the collection, derived from V1, cannot have been incorporated into the collection much before that date, since they include glosses entered by Dunstan in V1, apparently in the 940s, and possibly even later glosses in that manuscript. These V-type glosses were added to the main collection roughly around the middle of the tenth century. But the other two strands (E-type and C-type) can be traced further back in England, since both were available, at least in part, to the author of the *Old English Boethius*, who evidently made considerable use of the glosses that he found in his copy (or copies) of the *Consolation*. Nearly all the glosses that he can be shown to have used occur in the later English manuscripts, such as C4, as in this example:

> Gif se anweald þonne of his agenre gecynde and his agenes gewealdes god wære ne underfenge he næfre þa yfelan ac þa godan[24].

[24] *The Old English Boethius*, ed. Godden and Irvine, I, B16.100-102.

This corresponds very closely to a gloss on the relevant sentence in Boethius 2p6.14:

> si per se esset bona saecularis dignitas numquam malos reciperet sed bonos. Ideo recipit malos quia per se non bona est ideo si dignitas natura bona fuisset tunc boni soli habuissent A C4 Ge P9.

Many of the most telling cases of glosses used by the Old English author occur *only* in English manuscripts, as in this example; that is, they are E-type glosses. Some though appear in Continental manuscripts as well (= C-type) and a very few appear *only* in Contintental manuscripts. But although there are a few interesting parallels with glosses found in V1 there are no really telling examples of the translator's use of glosses of the V-type, derived from V1. That of course is what we would expect, given the late date at which V1's glosses would have fed into the mainstream English tradition.

The traditional date for the *Old English Boethius* has been the 890s because of the supposed authorship of King Alfred. His authorship is unlikely, however, and there is no reliable evidence that it was produced in his reign, or indeed in his lifetime or earlier[25]. The latest possible date of composition is that of the earlier manuscript of the *Old English Boethius*, c.950, though the degree of transmission and adaptation by that stage would make it a bit earlier. All we can say at this stage is that at some time before 950 the author of the *Old English Boethius* was using a collection of E-type and C-type glosses, a collection that fed into the main English tradition of glosses recorded in manuscripts of the late tenth century, and that the V1 glosses were added later. A likely scenario, given the early evidence of Canterbury interest in Boethius, is that Dunstan brought V1 or a copy of it from Glastonbury to Canterbury around 950 and found there an already substantial collection of glosses to which those in V1 were added. But there are no doubt other possible explanations.

If this is the story of the earlier history of the Boethius glosses in tenth-century England, can we say more about their ultimate origins - where and when they originated?
This is much more difficult, since it is very rare to be able to catch a commentator in the act of composing an original gloss, with the interesting exception of the drypoint vernacular glosses in C4. All our evidence and analyses so far suggest that the Boethius glosses in early medieval manuscripts originated in many places over the ninth and tenth centuries and were the work of many commentators, accumulating by copying and conflation and new glossing as manuscripts (and perhaps commentators) moved around Europe. But we can make some useful distinctions.

The V-type glosses came into the English tradition from V1 itself, in which they accumulated in the course of a century in France, Cornwall and England. Some of them, of all three types, probably did not originate in V1 but were copied from elsewhere, since they appear in other, Continental manuscripts that are unlikely to have got them from V1. It is clear in any case that the glossators of V1 were consulting other copies of the Latin text, for both the main Cornish commentator, operating probably in the late ninth century, and Dunstan, working in the 930s or 940s, refer to variant readings of Boethius's text which they say occur in other copies, and it seems likely enough that as well as comparing textual readings they compared and borrowed glosses. But much of the glossing in V1 is found only in that manuscript or the English manuscripts derived from it, so it seems likely that the insular glossators of V1, in Cornwall and England, were originating a fair amount of new material, in the late ninth and early tenth centuries respectively.

---

[25] See *The Old English Boethius*, ed. Godden and Irvine, pp. 140-51.

As for the C-type glosses, which are found in Continental manuscripts as well as the English manuscripts of the later tenth century, it would seem natural to suppose that they originated on the Continent and came to England in the late ninth century and the tenth, and thence fed into the English tradition, given all we know, or think we know, about the transmission of scholarship in the period. If that is so, the question naturally arises whether they originated in the much-discussed commentary which was supposedly produced by Remigius of Auxerre in the first decade of the tenth century. Were they indeed conceived and composed by Remigius? That was Diane Bolton's view, reflected in her description of the English manuscripts as representing a «revised Remigius», an expression which has become standard in subsequent references to the Boethian manuscripts in England. We can however dismiss that idea, for various reasons.

In the first place, the commentary by Remigius is entirely hypothetical. It does not survive in any manuscript, and its existence has simply been posited as the ultimate source for some of the glosses found in profusion over a wide range of manuscripts from many regions. The attribution of this presumed commentary to Remigius arose from an ascription to him at the beginning of the *accessus* material in just one manuscript out of the eighty-five or so early manuscripts, and a relatively late one at that, from Trier[26], and the ascription of a further comment in 3p12 in the same manuscript. Joseph Wittig has recently challenged that evidence, concluding that «Trier's attribution is, I think, too oddly placed and too solitary to carry very much weight»[27]. As it turns out, the attribution is not quite as solitary as it had long seemed. In 5m4 the opening reference to the ancient philosophers prompts a very long gloss which includes a reference to the peripatetics and the meaning of their name:

> peripathetici inde uocati sunt .i. deambulantes seu ut Hieronimo placet circumcalcantes. (for that reason they are called Peripatetici, i.e. walking around, or as Jerome prefers, treading around.)

The gloss occurs in at least seventeen early manuscripts, and in just one of them we find *Remigio* instead of *Hieronimo*. The manuscript in question is Rome, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5956, written around 1000, and of unknown provenance; the gloss is in an eleventh-century hand. The gloss *deambulantes* for *peripatetici* is found in Isidore[28], and repeated in the commentary on Martianus attributed to John the Scot[29], but I have not found the gloss *circumcalcantes* in either Jerome or Remigius or anywhere else. The attribution to Remigius here is hard to explain, and is perhaps a casual misreading, but it does suggest that in the eleventh century Remigius was an authority who might be cited in support of an etymology or an occasional comment[30]. But the ascription here is only for a single gloss out of many thousands in the same manuscript, and has no authority in the light of the testimony of the other sixteen manuscripts which attribute the etymology to Jerome. There is no other evidence that

---

[26] Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 1093.

[27] Wittig, «The Remigian Glosses», p. 172.

[28] *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*, ed. W. M. Lindsay, Oxford Classical Texts, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1911, VIII.vi.13.

[29] *Iohannis Scotti Annotationes in Marcianum*, ed. C. E. Lutz, The Mediaeval Academy of America, Cambridge, Mass. 1939, p. 178.

[30] A possible source is a gloss on another text, since Remigius's name also became associated with glosses on Martianus, Persius and Prudentius.

Remigius wrote a commentary on Boethius and nothing in our analysis of the glosses suggests that a full and coherent commentary by any individual played a significant part in the development of the glossing tradition.

Secondly, given Courcelle's late dating of Remigius's commentary, after 900, if it existed it would have had to proliferate very quickly to have influenced the *Old English Boethius* even if the latter is not Alfredian (hence perhaps Bolton's speculation that Remigius was working from the lecture notes of Hericus and that those reached England independently of Remigius).

Thirdly, although the supposed commentary of Remigius does not survive, various manuscripts have over the last century or so been picked on as the major witness to it. Stewart and Silk chose a Berlin manuscript, Courcelle chose a Paris manuscript, our P7, Otten used the Trier manuscript cited above[31]. But none of these actually includes a significant proportion of the C-type glosses found in the English manuscripts. For instance, only a small fraction of the C-type glosses in C4, perhaps 15 per cent, appear in P7, the manuscript which Courcelle identified as the best witness to the commentary of Remigius. In other words, if the commentary of Remigius is represented by the glosses in P7, as Courcelle and Bolton suggested, then the notion that C4 represents a «revised Remigius» is quite incomprehensible: if we consider all the Latin glosses in C4, P7 witnesses barely 10 per cent of the total.

Setting aside Remigius and his commentary, there is evidence even so that *some* of the C-type glosses in the English manuscripts do indeed have Continental origins. Probably our earliest datable glosses to the *Consolation* appear in Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 14, 15, an early ninth-century copy used by Lupus of Ferrieres and quite possibly glossed by him. It has only a few glosses (just twenty-seven in the whole manuscript) but they do appear to be early and some of those do appear in later manuscripts, including the English ones. It is plausible to believe that they originated in France in the middle of the ninth century and found their way to England in the course of the ninth or tenth centuries. Whether the same is true for all these C-type glosses in C4, that is that they all have Continental origins, is unclear: it is a reasonable hypothesis but it is possible that some originated in England and went the other way, given the generally late date of the glosses in Continental manuscripts. That is especially likely for the glosses which occur in a wide range of English manuscripts and only in a single Continental one.

---

[31] Stewart, H. F., «A Commentary by Remigius Autissiodorensis on the *De Consolatione Philosophiae* of Boethius», *Journal of Theological Studies* 17 (1916), pp. 22-42, focusing on what was then Berlin, Staatsbibliothek der Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 4°, 939, and previously Maihingen, Bibliotheca Wallersteiniana, I, 2, lat. 4°, 3, but is now Krakow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Berol lat. 4°, 939, ff. 60-112; *Saeculi Noni Auctoris in Boetii Consolationem Philosophiae Commentarius*, ed. E. T. Silk, American Academy in Rome, Rome 1935, citing the same manuscript; Courcelle, P., *La Consolation de Philosophie dans la tradition littéraire*, Etudes augustiniennes, Paris1967, identifying Remigius especially with the glosses in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 15090 (P7); and Otten, K., *König Alfreds Boethius*, M. Niemeyer, Tübingen 1964 (Studien zur englischen Philologie, neue Folge 3).

The key question is with the E-type glosses, found only in English manuscripts and amounting to perhaps a third of all the Latin glosses in C4, several thousands in total. As we have seen, the evidence of the *Old English Boethius* suggests that a significant proportion of them were in circulation in England by the early decades of the tenth century. Are they then of English origin, and therefore reflective of Anglo-Saxon scholarship, or are they derived from some Continental tradition which just fails to show up in any Continental manuscripts, or perhaps from an insular but non-English source? I have found just a single hint of English origin in one gloss. In 2p7, in the course of her argument that fame is meaningless, Philosophia points out that fame is limited because practices which are thought good and praiseworthy in one country are often thought bad and disreputable in others. The glossators generally give examples of strange cultural practices among the Scythians and the Jews but the English manuscripts also have an example from Britain, glossing 2p7.10:

ut sunt Scotti et habitatores Brittaniae in distantia uestimentorum.

(such as the *Scotti* and the inhabitants of *Brittania* in their difference of clothing)

It is not entirely clear how to translate these geographical and ethnic terms. If *Brittania* means Britain including England then it is perhaps the view of a Continental; but if as I think the gloss means «such as the Irish and the inhabitants of Wales in difference of clothing» then it looks like an English observation, commenting on the very strange clothing worn by Irish and Welsh. But nothing else identifies the source of these glosses as either insular or not.

The case against an English origin for these glosses is the circumstantial argument that scholarship in England was generally at a low ebb from the middle of the ninth century to around the middle of the tenth, which includes the period when their presence can first be identified in England. That argument in turn takes its origin largely from King Alfred's claim, in the 890s, that learning and the knowledge of Latin had largely disappeared by the time of his accession in 871, and that the books had soon afterwards been destroyed in viking raids, followed by Ælfric's very similar claim, around 995, that learning had so declined «a few years ago» that no English cleric could compose or understand a Latin letter until Dunstan and Athelwold restored learning again in the monasteries, meaning presumably around 960[32]. Ælfric was clearly recasting Alfred's preface and just substituting a different set of names and a different time-frame, and both have the appearance of rhetorical tropes. The roll-call of English texts composed in the century in question give the lie to these claims of England as a scholarly wasteland: the *Old English Martyrology* drawing on an enormous range of hagiographical and other books; the Old English prose psalm adaptation, using some rare and distinctly heterodox sources of interpretation; the *Old English Orosius*, using a remarkable range of sources on geography and classical history; the *Old English Soliloquies* translating a text unrecorded in England until much later, and using a range of other sources, some quite rare; and of course the *Old English Boethius* itself, showing a remarkable familiarity with classical legend and history and natural science. To those might be added the *Solomon and Saturn* dialogues which Anlezark has shown to derive from a learned Latinate circle active in the early decades of the tenth century[33]. And Philip

[32] *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, ed. H. Sweet, Early English Text Society os 45, 50, Oxford University Press, London 1871-2, repr. 1988, pp. 3-9; *Aelfrics Grammatik und Glossar*, ed. J. Zupitza, Weidmann, Berlin 1880, p. 3.

[33] *The Old English Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn*, ed. and trans. D. Anlezark, Anglo-Saxon texts, 7, Boydell & Brewer, Woodbridge 2009.

Rusche has demonstrated that the work of Aldhelm was being copied, studied and glossed in the decades before and after 900, and that the glosses in turn were used in the *Old English Martyrology*[34]. The *Old English Boethius* in particular is testimony that the glosses could well have been generated in England by Anglo-Saxon scholars: its author was evidently able to draw on a body of knowledge and range of sources, in science, classical history and legend, very similar to that used for the glosses, in order to supplement what they provided. And the case *for* the English origin of these glosses is their failure to appear in non-English manuscripts, given the sheer number of glossed manuscripts that survive.

But this is not to say that the E-type glosses in C4 and contemporary manuscripts all go back to the Alfredian period or soon after. We should probably think of the body of glosses that was available in the early tenth century as the core of the collection seen in C4 and other English manuscripts, not the whole of it. That is, the C4 glosses are not simply a late copy of what was available to the author of the *Old English Boethius* a century earlier, but that collection had been steadily supplemented by new glosses through the century. It is hard to prove this, but it is suggested by the evidence of Dunstan in the 940s adding glosses that are not recorded elsewhere. One might note too the evidence of C3, the Cambridge Songs manuscript. Most of the English manuscripts cluster around the year 1000 and Canterbury, and seem to have influenced each other a great deal. But C3 was produced and glossed a half-century later and one might expect it to have acquired more glosses in that period if they were still being created in England. Diane Bolton said of this manuscript: «The glosses are too sparse and fragmentary to be identified with one of the main types. There is one recognisable K gloss [meaning a gloss related to those in C4]»[35]. It is not clear what she meant by that, since there are in fact about five thousand glosses in C3. Many of those are found in C4 and related manuscripts and one can see it as a selection from that earlier corpus. But there are also quite a lot of new glosses in C3, unique to that manuscript. New glossing was then continuing through the eleventh century, as it no doubt had through the tenth.

One final point needs to be made on the origins and dissemination of these glosses before we turn to the question of users. Our familiar narratives about late Anglo-Saxon scholarship and education tell us that everything came from France and the Low Countries, in the late ninth century, and in the monastic reform period, and again with Flemish scholars in the eleventh century. The glosses to Boethius have similarly been generally seen as largely derived from France. But if one consults Dumville's article on manuscripts that were stolen from England after 1066 and given to Continental libraries, one thing that stands out among the many bibles and liturgical books is the presence of three copies of the *Consolation* with glosses - P, P6 and P9 in our list, all removed from England to France in or after the eleventh century[36]. Other school-texts scarcely appear in this list: there is one copy of Prudentius, possibly two, but none of Arator or Aldhelm. And Dumville's post-Conquest date may be too late: Gameson has demonstrated that MS P had moved to St-Vaast in Arras before the Norman Conquest because it

[34] Philip G. Rusche, «Isidore's *Etymologiae* and the Canterbury Aldhelm Scholia», *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 104 (2005), pp. 437-455.

[35] Bolton, «The Study», p. 55.

[36] Dumville, D., «Anglo-Saxon Books: Treasure in Norman Hands», *Anglo-Norman Studies* 16 (1993), pp. 83-99.

influenced the initials of the Bible of St-Vaast, produced in 1060[37]. Anglo-Saxon copies of the *Consolation* with glosses were evidently valuable acquisitions on the Continent in the eleventh century, and that may have been true earlier as well. Glosses that appear in both English and Continental manuscripts may themselves have been of English origin.

To sum up on the origins of the glosses, there seems to have been a vigorous tradition of studying and glossing the *Consolation* in Britain from the end of the ninth century and in England itself from at least the early decades of the tenth century, and it continued through the tenth and eleventh centuries. That included a fair amount of collation and conflation, it is true, but very probably a substantial element of new glossing as well. A substantial proportion of the Latin glosses to Boethius found in late Anglo-Saxon manuscripts are witnessed only in insular manuscripts, and are in the main probably of insular origin. There is certainly a significant strand also of glosses that had a Continental circulation, but most of those are not recorded in Continental manuscripts before the tenth century, and even some of those glosses may have originated in England.

A probable example of a Continental Boethius manuscript containing glosses derived from Anglo-Saxon England is MS Valenciennes, BM 298. It was written and glossed in France, s. xi, but many of its glosses are otherwise found only in English manuscripts and V1. The clinching evidence is the mysterious 'fossa dio' glossing 'vallo' (fortifying wall or ditch) at Ip5.5. Given the pair 'fossa: dic' in the Latin-Old English glossary of Ælfric, 'dio' is best explained as a miscopying of OE 'dic' (ditch) by a non-English speaking scribe.[38]

[37] Gameson, R., «La Bible de Saint-Vaast d'Arras et un manuscrit anglo-saxon de Boece», *Scriptorium* 52 (1996), pp. 316-21.

[38] *Aelfrics Grammatik und Glossar*, ed. by Zupitza, p. 318,13.

The users of the glosses

Though much of the evidence for the use of Latin glosses to early medieval school-texts is inevitably circumstantial, in the case of the glosses to Boethius we are in the fortunate position of being able to identify four known tenth-century scholars who used them.

1) *Byrhtferth of Ramsey*

Byrhtferth was an obsessive quoter of the *Consolation* in his own works: Michael Lapidge counted twenty-one examples in his study of 1998[39]. Most of the quotations are from the metres, but a few are from the prose: he twice quotes 1p4.5 on Plato's notion of the desirability of philosopher-kings[40]. The quotations are often connected to his own text in rather inventive ways. So, when reporting in his *Chronicle* the outbreak of peace between the Mercians and Northumbrians he quotes 3m1 lines 7-10 on the departure of night and the arrival of rosy dawn[41]. Again, he claims, rather imaginatively, that whenever King Alfred's subjects and nobles made him depressed and frustrated by their failure to share his enthusiasms, the king would recall the verses on the wise man building a house on a rock, citing the opening and closing lines of 2m4[42]. But Byrhtferth never attributes the quotations to Boethius by name, referring to him if at all as *scholasticus,* a learned man, or just *quidam*, a certain person. He perhaps expected his more learned readers to spot the author. Lapidge pointed out that three of Byrhtferth's citations showed use of the Latin glosses found in contemporary manuscripts of the *Consolation*, and he added at least one more in his recent edition of the *Vita Oswaldi*[43]. There are some more uses of the glosses in the *Vita* that have not so far been noted, and some evidence of their influence on Byrhtferth's vocabulary. So, for example, in book 5 he quotes a line of Greek and gives the Latin translation. The Greek verse is the beginning of 3p6, as Lapidge notes, and the Latin translation agrees verbatim with a common gloss on it:

> o gloria gloria milibus mortalium - nihil aliud facta quam aurium inflatio magna (Byrhtferth, *Vita Oswaldi*, v.15)
>
> O gloria gloria milibus mortalium nihil aliud facta quam aurium inflatio magna (*Gloss to* Boethius 3p6.1)

Again, Lapidge notes that the word *infortunium* is unrecorded before Byrhtferth and questions whether he may have coined it[44]; but it occurs several times in glosses to Boethius, which were probably his source. Byrhtferth clearly knew the text and its glosses very well.

---

[39] Lapidge, L., «Byrhtferth at Work», in P. Baker and N. Howe (edd.), *Words and Works: Studies in Medieval Language and Literature in Honour of Fred C. Robinson*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1998, pp. 25-73.

[40] *Byrhtferth's Northumbrian Chronicle: an Edition and Translation of the Old English and Latin Annals,* trans. and ed. Cyril Hart, Mellen, Lewiston, New York 2006, pp. 166 and 210 (annals 800 and 871).

[41] *Byrhtferth's Northumbrian Chronicle*, ed. Hart, p. 168 (annal 801).

[42] *Ibid.,* p. 230 (annal 887).

[43] *Byrhtferth of Ramsey: The Lives of St Oswald and St Ecgwine*, ed. and trans. M. Lapidge, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2009.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

2) *Ratherius of Verona*

Ratherius of Verona, also known as Rather and Rathier of Liège, is a similar case from somewhat earlier in the tenth century, and on the Continent. He apparently wrote his long, rambling text the *Praeloquia,* on the iniquities of contemporary society, mainly in prison in Pavia in the 930s, but finished it in the 950s, when he was at Cologne and then briefly bishop of Liège. He too was an obsessive quoter of Boethius, and of many other writers from the past. Like Byrhtferth he never identifies Boethius by name. He liked to show off by quoting and naming older authors, but his quotations from them are often lifted from Boethius and other later writers. A nice example is the passage citing the Fables of Avianus:

> Ut enim potens esse possis, non in te sed in seruientium manibus situm ueracissime noueris; unde et quos terres, ipse plus metuis. Metiri autem sese quemque decet, ut Auianus dicit, propriisque iuuari laudibus nec alterius bona ferre, id est computare sibi[45]. (For you know perfectly well that to be able to be powerful rests not in you but in the hands of those who serve you; hence those whom you terrify, terrify you more. But it is proper for everyone to measure himself, as Avianus says, and be pleased with his own praise and not take the goods of another, that is, attribute it to himself.)

The first sentence is taken from the *Consolation* 3p5.8, just slightly rearranged:

> potentem censes qui satellite latus ambit, qui quos terret ipse plus metuit, qui ut potens esse uideatur in seruientium manu situm est?

The next sentence is a quotation from the Fables of Avianus, the opening lines of Fable 5, on the donkey wearing a lion's skin, but it is actually taken from a gloss on Boethius:

> Unde Auianus[46]: metiri se quemque decet propriisque iuuari laudabis, nec alterius bona ferre sibi.

This appears as a marginal gloss to 3p6 in at least ten manuscripts, but it also appears in one as a gloss to 3p5.11, close to the sentence of Boethius used by Ratherius. It is perhaps there by mistake, since it does not relate to the text at that point, on the fall of Seneca, and scribes often put glosses in the wrong place. But it does fit quite well at this point in Ratherius's text, following the barbed point taken from Boethius 3p5.8 about a king's power depending on his supporters: it implies that a king should not measure himself by the size of his entourage. The manuscript in question is significant. It is London, British Library, Harley 3095, suspected to be from Cologne, written and glossed in the first half of the tenth century. Ratherius was there when he was finishing the *Praeloquia*, about the time when Bruno of Cologne was trying to establish him as bishop of Liège. So it seems almost certain that Ratherius got his citation of Avianus from a glossed copy of the *Consolation*, and very probably one related to this manuscript. So in making his point about the vulnerability of power, he steals a neat but unascribed formulation from Boethius but adds the quotation from Avianus, including the ascription, which a glossator has added to his copy of Boethius.

The other two tenth-century scholars who used Boethian glosses are Anglo-Saxons whom we have met already in this paper.

3) *Dunstan*

---

[45] *Ratherii Veronensis Praeloquiorum libri VI*, ed. P. L. D. Reid, Corpus Christianourm, Continuatio Medievalis 46A, Brepols, Turnhout 1984, IV, par. 29, lines 1162-5.

[46] So in two manuscripts; others spell the name Auienus, Auientius, Auigerius.

It is not possible to show that Dunstan used Boethius glosses in his own work, not least because very little of his own work is known, but we can see him in V1 comparing different copies of the *Consolation* and copying glosses from one to the other, and probably adding some of his own.

4) The *Old English Boethius*

Though still nameless, the author of the Old English version of Boethius is more productive for our purposes. He used at least one glossed copy of the *Consolation*, and incorporated a substantial number of the glosses invisibly in his own vernacular version. Often those glosses themselves became triggers for free expansion and development within the Old English text. So, for instance, when Boethius mentions in passing the rebellion of the giants against Jupiter, the glossators cite the parallel story of the Tower of Babel, as a Biblical account of giants rebelling against God. The Old English version does likewise but at much greater length and adds additional material apparently drawn from Biblical commentary[47].

What can we learn from these four brief case-studies? These four were all established scholars when they worked with and used the Boethius glosses, not students struggling to understand the text. Byrhtferth was certainly a teacher, and Ratherius apparently had served as one at some point in his life, but not when he was writing the *Praeloquia*, and Dunstan was perhaps a teacher of sorts when he was abbot of Glastonbury, since St Athelwold is said to have studied under him there. For all we know the author of the *Old English Boethius* may have been a teacher too. So all four may have come to know Boethius and the glosses well through their own studies or through their own teaching activities. But their actual use of Boethius glosses is not as far as we can tell associated with school-teaching activities: only one of Byrhtferth's quotations of a Boethian text or gloss is in his main classroom text, the *Enchiridion*, the others are in his historical and hagiographical writings, and they do not function there as an explanation of Boethius, quite the reverse. Generally, these scholars used Boethius and the glosses in pursuit of their own scholarly interests, in writing or study or adaptation. The glosses were for them an extension of the Boethian argument and stories, a source of additional material not just an explanation of what Boethius meant.

This does not prove that glossed copies of Boethius were not also used in Anglo-Saxon England in the classroom or for beginners' study of the text. A close association with the classroom is perhaps suggested by one of the Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, the one preserved at Antwerp (MS A). This is closely related to, and perhaps once bound with, two other manuscripts with a clear educational function: a copy of Aldhelm's *De Virginitate* heavily glossed in Old English and a copy of a grammatical work, the *Excerptiones de Prisciano*, supplemented with Latin-Old English glossaries and other useful material in the margins, though as noted above, the fact that there are only two Old English glosses in the Boethius text in contrast to the Aldhelm might suggest that it was a more advanced text. However, the general paucity of vernacular glosses in manuscripts of Boethius and the evidence of our four specific readers does suggest a direction in which we should be thinking. The *Consolation* was a difficult text and a dangerous one, as contemporaries acknowledged, not the sort of thing that young students should be exposed to, with all its heterodox ideas and invocation of pagan philosophers. The study of texts continued well into adulthood in this period - Athelwold was after all in his thirties or more

[47] See *The Old English Boethius* ed. Godden and Irvine, I, B 35.126-40, and for commentary II, pp. 407-11.

when he studied under Dunstan at Glastonbury, at the time when Dunstan was glossing Boethius - and we should think of the *Consolation* with its glosses as primarily a text for advanced study by scholars, though parts of it might be studied at earlier stages, especially the metres.

The number of glossed copies of the full text shows that the whole text of the *Consolation* was being intensively studied in tenth-century England, but it was perhaps at a fairly advanced level of scholarship when readers could be expected to cope with the celebration of the wisdom of pagan philosophers and the unguarded repetition of stories from pagan legend. They are then testimony to Anglo-Saxon scholarship in the tenth and eleventh centuries, not just to ninth-century Carolingian scholarship, and not just to the activities of the classroom.

Manuscripts glossed in England before 1100, with sigla:

A Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus, M. 16.8 (*olim* lat. 190)
C Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 214
C2 Cambridge, Trinity College O.3.7
C3 Cambridge, University Library, Gg.5.35
C4 Cambridge, University Library, Kk.3.21
Es El Escorial, Real Biblioteca, E.II.1
Ge *olim* Geneva (Cologny-Genève), Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, Cod. 175 (now in a private collection)
L2 London, British Library, Egerton 267, f. 37 (fragment)
O Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auctarium F.1.15 (2455), ff. 1-77
O2 Oxford, Corpus Christi College 74
O3 Oxford, Merton College E.3.12 (fragment)
O4 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 174 (1775), f. iii (fragment)
P Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 6401A
P6 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 14380
P9 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 17814
V1 Rome, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, lat.3363

Other manuscripts cited above by sigla:

An Alençon, Bibliothèque municipale, 12
Lc London, British Library, Add. 15601, ff. 1r-16v
L4 London, British Library, Harley 3095
Ma Krakow, Biblioteka Jaglellonska, Berol. Lat. 4º, 939 , ff. 60r-112v [previously: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek der Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 4º, 939 (*olim* Maihingen, Bibliotheca Wallersteiniana, I, 2, lat. 4º, 3)]
P5 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 12961
P7 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 15090
P8 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 16093
P16 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 6402
T Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 1093
V2 Rome, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, lat. 3865

V4 Rome, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, lat. 5956