

Boethius Glosses in Early Glossaries

Malcolm Godden and Rohini Jayatilaka

Published as:

M. Godden and R. Jayatilaka, 'Boethius glosses in early glossaries', in *Studies on Late Antique and Medieval Germanic Glossography and Lexicography in Honour of Patrizia Lendinara*, ed. Claudia Di Sciacca, Concetta Giliberto, Carmela Rizzo, Loredana Teresi, 2 vols, Edizioni ETS: Pisa, 2018, vol. 1, pp. 377-400.

Boethius glosses in early glossaries

Malcolm Godden and Rohini Jayatilaka

Early medieval glosses to the *Consolation of Philosophy* of Boethius survive in enormous numbers. More than seventy manuscripts of the work survive from the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries, produced in numerous places in France, Switzerland, Germany and the British Isles, and nearly all have glosses from the period. These range from a mere handful in some manuscripts to many thousands in others, and include glosses in Greek, Old High German, Old English, Old Cornish and Old Irish as well as the ubiquitous examples in Latin¹. Although many of them appear in multiple manuscripts there is also a great deal of variation, with glosses being frequently copied and miscopied, conflated, altered and supplemented by readers and commentators over much of Europe. These glosses have been known and discussed, though not yet printed except for a few selections, for more than a century now, and there has also been some discussion of the use of these glosses by other medieval authors². Less well known, indeed so far unmentioned in print we believe, are the

¹ An edition of the complete corpus is in preparation by ourselves and Dr R.C. Love with the assistance of Dr Paolo Vaciago for publication by Brepols. For a recent list of the manuscripts see R.C. Love, *The Latin Commentaries on Boethius's De consolatione philosophiae from the 9th to the 10th Centuries*, in N.H. Kaylor, Jr. and P.E. Phillips (eds.), *A Companion to Boethius in the Middle Ages* (Brill Companions to the Christian Tradition 30), Brill, Leiden 2012, pp. 75-133.

² See for example, P. Courcelle, *La "Consolation de Philosophie" dans la tradition littéraire. Antécédents et postérité de Boèce*, Études augustiniennes, Paris 1967; D.K. Bolton, *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; J. Wittig, *The "Remigian" Glosses on Boethius's "Consolatio Philosophiae" in Context*, in C.D. Wright, F.M. Biggs and T.N. Hall (eds.), *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; M. Godden and R. Jayatilaka, *Counting the Heads of the Hydra: the Development of the Early Medieval Commentary on Boethius's 'Consolation of Philosophy'*, in M. Teeuwen and S. O'Sullivan (eds.), *Carolingian Scholarship and Martianus Capella. Ninth-Century Commentary Traditions on 'De nuptiis' in Context* (Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages 12), Brepols, Turnhout 2011, pp. 363-376. For the use of Boethian glosses by Ratherius of Verona and Byrhtferth of Ramsey, see M. Lapidge, *Byrhtferth at Work*, in P. Baker and N. Howe (eds.), *Words and Works. Studies in Medieval Language and Literature in Honour of Fred C. Robinson*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1998, pp. 25-73; M. Godden, *Glosses to the 'Consolation of Philosophy' in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Their Origins and their Uses*, in P. Lendinara, L. Lazzari and C. Di Sciacca (eds.), *Rethinking and Recontextualizing Glosses. New Perspectives in the Study of Late Anglo-Saxon Glossography* (Fédération internationale des Instituts d'études médiévales. Textes et Études du Moyen Âge 54), FIDEM, Porto 2011, pp. 67-92. Another heavy user of the glosses for his own work was the First Vatican Mythographer; see N. Zorzetti (ed.) and J. Berlioz (tr.), *Premier mythographe du Vatican* (Collection des Universités de France), Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1995.

instances of glosses to the *Consolation* being incorporated in glossaries. They have much to tell us about the compilation of glossaries and about the early development and circulation of Boethius glosses. They are not easy to identify and there are probably many more to be found, but we would like to discuss here the three examples of such glossaries that we have found so far, in recognition of Patrizia Lendinara's immense scholarly contributions to the world of Anglo-Saxon glosses and glossaries. The first is from a manuscript produced in France, but perhaps the work of an Irish scholar and showing connections with an insular set of glosses; the second from an Anglo-Saxon manuscript; and the third from an Italian manuscript with Anglo-Saxon connections.

The Laon Glossary

The earliest and in some respects most interesting case is from the famous Laon Glossary, Laon, Bibliothèque Municipale 444 (s. ix^{3/4}, Laon), which has been much cited as evidence for the knowledge of Greek in early medieval western Europe and for the role of Irish scholars³. Current scholarship suggests that it is in fact an amalgamation of two independent manuscripts: the first, covering ff. 1-4 and 276-319, is a lexicographical compilation assembled by the Irish scholar Martin of Laon between 869 and 875; the second, covering ff. 5-276, is a version of the glossary of Ps-Cyril, copied at Laon by several scribes between 858 and 871⁴. The entries drawn from Boethius glosses are in the Martin of Laon booklet and the relevant part is in a short collection of Greek words and names with Latin glosses on ff. 290-293. The first part of this section, ff. 290v-291r, contains Greek terms taken from the *Categoriae decem* of Pseudo-Augustine. The last part, f. 293r-v, contains interpretations of the names of the Muses and other Greek figures, in part drawn from Fulgentius. In between, on ff. 291r-293r, is a series of Greek words and their glosses whose origin has not hitherto been identified, and which is just called «Item greca utilia» in the manuscript.

The Boethian part of this series begins at the top of f. 292r. What perhaps immediately gives away its origin is the sequence «ΛΥΡΑC: ludis, ONOC asinus»⁵ forming the sixth and seventh items. The

³ See, for example, J.J. Contreni, *The Cathedral School of Laon from 850 to 930. Its Manuscripts and Masters* (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung 29), Arbo-Gesellschaft, Munich 1978; A.C. Dionisotti, *Greek Grammars and Dictionaries in Carolingian Europe*, in S.A. Brown and M.W. Herren (eds.), *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks. The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages* (King's College London Medieval Studies 2), King's College, London 1988, pp. 1-56; D. Muzerelle, *Martin d'Irlande et ses acolytes: genèse codicologique du "Pseudo-Cyrille" de Laon (ms 444)*, in H. Spilling (ed.), *La collaboration dans la production de l'écrit médiéval. Actes du XIII^e Colloque international de paléographie latine (Weingarten, 22-25 septembre 2000)*, École nationale des Chartes, Paris 2003, pp. 325-346; G. Bonnet, *Survivance du grec au IX^e siècle: une consultation à Laon*, in H. Duchêne (ed.), *Survivances et métamorphoses*, Université de Bourgogne, Dijon 2005, pp. 263-278.

⁴ D. Muzerelle, *Manuscrits datés des bibliothèques de France, II. Laon, Saint-Quentin, Soissons*, CNRS, Paris 2013, and the online description of the manuscript on the Bibliothèque Nationale de France website at <http://archivesetmanuscripts.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc947012>.

⁵ Greek words in the early medieval manuscripts of the *Consolation*, in both the text and the glosses, are generally written in majuscules, using the letter C for sigma, though modern editions

two Greek words occur together, with the same interpretations, in the opening sentence of Book 1 prose 4 of the *Consolation*: «Sentisne, inquit, haec atque animo illabuntur tuo an ὄνος λρας? quid fles, quid lacrimis manas?» (“Do you get the message?” she asked. “Has it penetrated your mind, or is it a case of the donkey listening to the lyre? Why are you weeping, with the tears running down your cheeks?”)⁶. But it is perhaps clearest to take the list in the order in which it appears in the manuscript.

1. «BIBΛOC: *id est liber inde BIBΛHOΘEKA .i. librorum custodia. sed melius librorum mandatum quia ΘEKH mandatum dicitur*»

(*biblos* that is book, hence *bibliotheca* that is custody of books, but better interpreted as commission of books, since *theca* means committed)

«Bibliotheca», in Greek or Latin form, is a common enough *lemma* in glossaries and glossarial texts but does occur twice in the *DCP* (1p4.3, 1p5.6) where it is frequently glossed, and there is an almost identical gloss in several manuscripts at both places: «librorum custodia sed melius librorum mandatum. Nam thece Grece, Latine mandatum dicitur» *Ec Gc Lh Ka*⁷.

2. «CINTAΓMA: *mysticum. secretum. arcanum*»

3. «ΥΠΕΡΦΡΑΚΤΕC: *falsus expositor. uel <e>xpers*»

These two entries are not from Boethius or as far as we can tell from glosses to Boethius⁸.

4. «ΠOΠICMA: *meatus*»

5. «KOPOΛΛAΠIA: *id est furta uel predae*»

The two *lemmata* occur together, in Latin form, in the *DCP* at 3p10.22: «super haec, inquit, igitur ueluti geometrae solent demonstratis propositis aliquid inferre, quae *porismata* ipsi uocant, ita ego quoque tibi ueluti *corollarium* dabo» (“Then too”, she said, “I shall follow the example of the

all substitute standard classical Greek forms and spellings in lower-case in the text. We have retained the manuscript format for the glosses but followed the modern editions when citing the text.

⁶ Quotations from the *Consolation* are from L. Bieler, *Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii Philosophiae consolatio* (CCSL 94), Brepols, Turnhout 1957, rev. ed. 1984, and are abbreviated as *DCP* henceforth. Translations are from P.G. Walsh, *Boethius: The Consolation of Philosophy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1999.

⁷ For the sigla used for Boethius manuscripts see the appendix below. The same *lemma*, with much the same gloss, is cited from another glossary by P. Lendinara, *The Scholica Graecarum Glossarum and Martianus Capella*, in M. Teeuwen and S. O’Sullivan (eds.), *Carolingian Scholarship and Martianus Capella*, pp. 301-362, at 339.

⁸ Dr Vaciano suggests to us that they derive from glosses to Jerome’s Preface to Genesis.

geometricians who often add riders (they call them *porismata*) to theorems which they have proved. Like them I shall present you with this corollary”), and again at 26: «et pulchrum, inquam, hoc atque pretiosum siue *porisma* siue *corollarium* uocari maui» (“What a beautiful and valuable observation that is”, I said, “Whether you prefer to call it a *porisma* or a corollary!”). Both words are heavily glossed in the Boethius manuscripts, in both places. The gloss *meatus* (movements) appears in just two manuscripts however: the ninth-century manuscript *Vb* has it twice against *porismata* and once again against *porisma* in 26; and the very lightly glossed copy of *DCP* in another Laon manuscript, our *La*, has it against *porismata* in 22. For the curious interpretation of *corollarium* as «furta uel praedae» ‘stolen goods or booty’, *Vb* is again a close match, having in 22: «corollaria dicuntur preda furta; tamen pro secretu posuit hic» (*corollaria* are booty or stolen articles, but here he put it for secret). No other manuscript has the gloss *praeda*, but the gloss *furtum* also occurs against *corollarium* in *La*, in 22, though it has been altered to *furtuum*.

6. «ΛΥΡΑC: *ludis*»

7. «ONOC: *asinus*»

As noted above, these two words occur together in Greek form in *DCP* at 1p4.1: «an ὄνος λυραC» (or are you a donkey to a lyre). This standard reading is however a modern emendation: most, if not all, early manuscripts read something like «ANONOC» rather than «an ONOC», taking the «AN» as part of the Greek word⁹. In many manuscripts the resulting word is glossed «sine merito» ‘without merit’, perhaps through identification with Greek ἀνόνητος ‘useless’ or something similar. Another common gloss in the Boethius manuscripts is «expers [...]» ‘free from, without’, presumably by association with Greek ἀνευ ‘without’; commonly, indeed, we find the phrase «expers lyrae» ‘without a lyre?’ as an interpretation of the two Greek words. But despite the form that the text generally takes in the manuscripts, a good many glossators evidently did recognise the text in the same way as modern editors, since glosses often include the Latin word *an* when paraphrasing the Greek, and *asinus* ‘donkey’ for ONOC. Whoever was originally responsible for the gloss copied in Laon 444 did correctly recognise that the *lemma* was «ONOC» not «ANONOC» and that its sense was ‘*asinus*’. More problematic, though, is the Laon glossary entry «ludis» as an interpretation of ΛΥΡΑC. Most Boethius manuscripts gloss this word correctly with a form of *lyra* ‘lyre’, though a few have also or instead words that catch the more general sense, such as «iocunditatis» ‘pleasure’. Just one manuscript has «ludis». This is *Vb*, where the Greek phrase is rewritten in the margin and glossed with «an asinus ludis», presumably to be understood as ‘or do you play like a donkey’ or perhaps ‘or are you a donkey in games’. The form *ludis* perhaps originated as a scribe’s misreading of *lyrae* when copying the gloss from one Boethius manuscript to another, but its repetition in the Laon list suggests that the compiler did not have enough Greek to recognise the word ΛΥΡΑC.

8. «ΚΥΚΛΙΟΝ: *mobil<is>*»

The Greek word means round, circular, but the interpretation as ‘*mobilis*’ is probably derived from the quotation attributed to Parmenides at *DCP* 3p12.37: «sicut de ea Parmenides ait, πντοθεν εὔκ

⁹ See the discussion by J.C. Frakes, *The Knowledge of Greek in the Early Middle Ages: The Commentaries on Boethius Consolatio*, «Studi Medievali» 27 (1986), pp. 23-43, esp. pp. 31-2, though this is based on only a small selection of manuscripts.

κλον σφαιρης ἐναλ γκιον ὄγκω rerum orbem mobilem rotat dum se immobilem ipsa conseruat» (as Parmenides describes it, “’Tis like the substance of a perfect rounded sphere”, rotating the mobile sphere of the universe, while maintaining its own immobility). Again the text has benefited from modern editorial improvement and the Greek in particular is badly corrupted in the manuscripts. Not surprisingly this created much confusion for the glossators, many of whom noted that the Greek was corrupt but asserted (mistakenly) that the Latin which followed the Greek in the Boethius text was a paraphrase of it, and so attempted to gloss the Greek accordingly, while others attempted to gloss the Greek independently of the Latin, or to conflate the two. The significant parallel to the glossary entry in Laon 444 is once again to be found in *Vb*, where the glossator wrote glosses above the Greek, word by word, and offered «mobilis» over «ΚΥΚΛΟΥ» ‘circle’. The Laon glossary has a different form of the Greek word but probably drew the pair from a manuscript of Boethius with a similar gloss to *Vb*.

9. «ΔΑΙΜΑC: corpus»

The Greek word looks like a form of δαίμων ‘god’ but the source here is probably *DCP* 4p6.38 «nam ut quidam me quoque excellentior: ἀνδρς δὴ ἱερο δμας αἰθρες οἰκοδμησαν.» (in the words of one more outstanding than myself, “The body of the holy man was formed in heaven”). The quotation is otherwise unknown. Again the Greek appears in very corrupt form in the manuscripts and «δέμας» ‘bodily frame’ is an editorial emendation, the manuscripts often having what appears to be «ΑΙΜΑC» (so *La*, *Vb* for instance), which is frequently glossed with *corpus*. The compiler of the glossary presumably interpreted the Greek form as ΔΑΙΜΑC.

10. «ΤΟΡΕΥΟC: orator»

The source for this strange form is probably the next Greek quotation in *DCP*, at 4p6.54: «ργαλ ον δ με τα τα θεδν ὡς π ντ' ἀγορε ειν» (“how hard it is to say all this as though I were a god!”). As some of the glossators pointed out, the Greek is corrupt in many manuscripts, but a few glossed the final word reasonably as *convocare*, *invocare*. However, the glossator in *Vb* wrote the (unconstruable) gloss «perfecta oportet timere uel supere haec deum sicut omnia ornatores» above the Greek, with «ornatores» over the final word, written as «ΑΓΟΡΕΙΕΙΝ». The first I in the latter word has been altered to Y and it would be easy to read the first letter as belonging to the preceding word (as it is written in many manuscripts) and the second as a T rather than Γ (indeed it may have been altered in one direction or the other in *Vb*), giving something like «ΤΟΡΕΥΕΙΝ». (The final word is written as «ΤΟΡΕΥ ΕΙΝ» in *Gc* according to Frakes.) The reader who produced the «ornatores» gloss that is found in *Vb* was perhaps thinking of Greek τορευτς ‘one who carves in relief’.

This is the end of the sequence of entries taken from Boethius on f. 292r, and what follows in the Laon manuscript is a series of words for animals. There is however one more entry that might be from the *Consolation*, on f. 293r amongst some entries drawn from John the Scot:

11. «ΠΑΚΤΙΚΑ: id est actiua. ΘΕΟΡΙΚΑ: id est contemplatiua siue diuina»

In *DCP* 1p1 the narrator sees the Greek letters Π and Θ inscribed on Philosophia’s robe, and these were universally interpreted by the glossators as standing for ΠΑΚΤΙΚΗ and ΘΗΟΡΙΚΗ or ΘΕΩΡΗΤΙΚΗ. The two Greek words are glossed as «actiua» and «contemplatiua» in a great many

manuscripts of the *Consolation*, and «diuina» is also found in a few glosses on the second word. See for example «¶ id est practicum id est actiuam uitam significat [...] Θ theoretica, hoc est diuina contemplatio. Theorica Grece, contemplatiuum est Latine» *Ec Gc*. (*Vb* is not a witness at this point, since the opening leaves of the manuscript, including all of 1m1 and 1p1, have been lost). But the preceding and following items in Laon 444 are not from Boethius and it may be that this one came from another source as well.

One further Boethian gloss occurs in another manuscript linked to Martin of Laon, Laon, BM 468 (s. ix^{3/4}, Laon ?). This is a ninth-century collection of material relating to Vergil and Sedulius, annotated and corrected by Martin. On ff. 6-7 are some notes on figures from classical mythology, including the following on Titius: «Tityus filius terrae adamauit matrem Apollinis. In hoc +fectus est sagitta Apollinis et missus uultur qui semper cor ei exederet» (Titius the son of the Earth loved the mother of Apollo. He was killed by an arrow of Apollo and a vulture was sent to continually eat his heart). A contemporary note in the margin, partially preserved, adds «<...>oetio est», which Michael Clarke ingeniously reconstructed as «e Boetio est»¹⁰. The note is indeed from Boethius, though from a gloss not the text itself; *Vb* has an identical gloss on the reference to Titius in *DCP* 3m12: «Ticius filius terrae adamauit matrem Apollinis. interfectus est sagitta Apollinis et m<is>sus uultur qui semper cor ei exederet». The two agree in the probable error «cor» (heart) for «iecur» (liver), which is what other glosses specify at this point. The Laon scribe's «in hoc» followed by a plus sign instead of *inter-* perhaps stems from difficulty in reading his source, though *Vb* itself is clear enough at this point. The preceding notes deal with several figures who also figure in the *DCP* (Ixion, Ulysses, Orpheus) but the Boethian glosses seem not to have been used for any of these. Clearly whoever wrote the note, presumably Martin himself, was well aware of where this entry at least came from.

Returning to the list of glossarial entries drawn from the *Consolation* in Laon 444, two general questions arise from it: firstly, what can they tell us about the compilation of glossaries; secondly, what can they tell us about the transmission of glosses on the *Consolation*. On the first point, the compiler of the list (whether Martin of Laon himself or some predecessor who collected the list from Boethius) was of course interested solely in Greek words. That he should have picked out items 6-10 is not then very surprising since the *lemmata* in question are generally written in Greek majuscules in the Boethius manuscripts and are fairly easy to spot, for one who might be searching for Greek items. It is more surprising that he picked out items 1, 4 and 5, since these are never written in Greek letters in the Boethius manuscripts of our period. The first two, *bibliotheca* and *porisma*, are certainly identified as Greek in origin in the glosses generally, but *corollarium* is not Greek and is never said to be Greek in the Boethius glosses. Quite why the compiler picked on these items, ignoring many others that are written in Greek letters in the text or said to be of Greek origin in the glosses, remains a mystery. An easy answer would be that these, and only these, were the words that he found glossed in his copy of the *Consolation*. But that takes us to our second general question, the transmission of Boethian glosses.

The compiler of the list was evidently using a glossed copy of the *Consolation* at some date before 875. This is relatively early evidence for the glossing of this text. Some light glossing of the *Consolation* survives from the first quarter of the ninth century, in manuscripts such as *Fa*, but the

¹⁰ M. Clarke, *Demonology, Allegory and Translation: the Furies and the Morrigan*, in R. O'Connor (ed.), *Classical Literature and Learning in Medieval Irish Narrative*, Brewer, Cambridge 2014, pp. 101-122, at 111, note 67.

really heavy glossing first appears, in various parts of Europe, towards the end of the century, in manuscripts such as *Af* (northern France?), *Na* (St Gall?) and *Vb* (Cornwall or Wales). Glossing of quotations or phrases that were written in Greek letters is amongst the earliest kind of annotation, so again it is not wholly surprising to find items 6-10 at such an early date, and if this was the only kind of material used for the glossary it would be possible to imagine that the compiler was taking whatever he could find that was useful in a very lightly glossed manuscript. But items 1, 4 and 5 derive from glosses to words that are written in Roman letters normally; the glosses occur only late in the century in Boethius manuscripts, in the context of much heavier glossing, and are of a type that one does not find in early glossing. The evidence of the Laon 444 glossary is that this more extensive glossing was in circulation somewhat earlier than the evidence of surviving Boethius manuscripts would suggest, emerging therefore by the third quarter of the ninth century rather than the fourth. The most striking point is the close correlation with *Vb*, which provides virtually the only match for items 4-8 and 10, and for the item in Laon 468, as well as a more common match for 9 (and is missing for 11).

Vb is a very important and complex witness to the glossing of the *Consolation*¹¹. The manuscript itself is one of the four very early copies of the *Consolation* that survive, and is thought to have been produced in the first half of the ninth century in the Loire valley. It received some light glossing in France in the second half of the century and then was heavily glossed in south-west Britain (that is, Cornish or Welsh territory) at the end of the ninth or beginning of the tenth, and then further glossed in England, partly by St Dunstan and probably at Glastonbury, some time around 940. The glosses that match items 4, 5, 8 and 10 and the item in Laon 468 are in the insular script of the south-western glossators, but those which match 6-7 and 9 are in a Caroline script – in both cases the Greek quotation has been rewritten for the purpose in the margin, presumably because the body of the text was already too crowded with glosses. All these are entered too late for *Vb* to have been the actual source for the Laon glossary, so presumably are drawn from an earlier glossed copy of the *Consolation* closely related in its glosses to the one used for the Laon glossary earlier. For the first item, *bibliotheca*, *Vb* does not have a gloss at all, at either point where the word is used, but it is of course possible that it came to the glossary from the same source as the others and was omitted by *Vb* itself. The fact, though, that the closest examples of such a gloss to «*bibliotheca*» are found only in manuscripts from the south-eastern region of the Frankish world, what is now Switzerland and contiguous parts of Germany, while the main body of entries relates to a manuscript that originated in the Loire valley but was glossed in south-west Britain, and the whole list ended up in a manuscript produced in north-eastern France, suggests that the early circulation of Boethius glosses was even more varied and complicated than we have so far envisaged.

In summary, the short sequence of entries on f. 292r of the Laon Glossary was drawn from a

¹¹ For more detailed discussion of this manuscript see M.B. Parkes, *A Note on MS Vatican, Bibl. Apost., Lat. 3363*, in M.T. Gibson (ed.), *Boethius. His Life, Thought and Influence*, Blackwell, Oxford 1981, pp. 425-427; repr. in his *Scribes, Scripts and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts*, Hambleton, London 1991, pp. 259-262; F. Troncarelli, *Tradizioni perdute. La "Consolatio Philosophiae" nell'alto medioevo*, Antenore, Padova 1981, pp. 135-196; and M.R. Godden, *Alfred, Asser, and Boethius*, in K. O'Brien O'Keefe and A. Orchard (eds.), *Latin Learning and English Lore: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature for Michael Lapidge*, 2 vols. (Toronto Old English series), University of Toronto Press, Toronto and London 2005, I, pp. 326-348.

glossed copy of the *Consolation* closely related to the one which was used as a source for the glosses in *Vb* at the end of the ninth century in Britain, some time before 875, by a compiler who was interested in Greek or Greek-derived words and combed through a heavily glossed copy in search of such words in the text and glosses, ignoring or overlooking many examples but picking up items from various parts – 1p4, 1p5, 3p10, 3p12, 4p6, with perhaps a further item from 1p1. It was perhaps the same compiler who spotted the gloss on Titius in 3m12 and added it to the list of notes on mythology in Laon 468.

The Harley Glossary

The well-known Harley Glossary, London, British Library, Harley 3376 (s. x/xi, west of England), is a much later example, produced in Anglo-Saxon England, probably at Worcester, some time around the year 1000¹². It is a fragment of what was once a massive glossary in rough alphabetical order, now covering only the letters A to F but even so containing more than 5500 entries. The *lemmata* are primarily Latin, the glosses either Latin or Old English (or both). The compiler, who may well have been the scribe of the Harley copy itself, drew heavily on earlier glossaries but also on glosses to a variety of Latin authors such as Isidore, Vergil (and his commentator Servius), Persius, Bede and others. It has not we think been previously noticed that one of his sources was a glossed copy of the *Consolation of Philosophy*. The most obviously revealing item is the entry: «conigastum: *nomen barbari*». Conigastus is the name of a leading Gothic nobleman under Theodoric the Ostrogoth, mentioned disparagingly in *DCP* 1p4 and nowhere else in early medieval Latin texts apart from a letter to him written on behalf of Theodoric by Cassiodorus. The name is glossed «nomen barbari» in numerous manuscripts of the *DCP*. But there are many other probable examples of items drawn from a glossed *Consolation*, scattered throughout the glossary. Several have alternative possible sources, but cumulatively they are telling. In some cases the *lemma* in the glossary matches the particular form that the word takes in the *DCP*. We will take them in order of occurrence in the Harley manuscript using the reference system employed by Oliphant.

1. A 28 «Abditis: *id est absconditis*»

Compare *DCP* 3m8.5 «abditis», glossed «absconditis» in many manuscripts.

2. B 170 «Bibliotheca: *id est librorum repositio*»

As we have noted in the discussion of the Laon glossary, «bibliotheca» occurs at 1p4.3 and 1p5.6. The gloss «librorum repositio» occurs in very many manuscripts in 1p4, though other sources are possible.

3. B 316 «Boetos: *graece adiutor*»

¹² The most recent analysis of the Glossary is by J. Cooke, *Worcester Books and Scholars, and the Making of the Harley Glossary (British Library MS. Harley 3376)*, «Anglia» 115 (1997), pp. 441-468. The glossary was edited by R.T. Oliphant, *The Harley Latin-Old English Glossary, Edited from British Museum MS Harley 3376* (Janua linguarum. Series practica 20), Mouton, The Hague and Paris 1966.

B 323 «Boites: *graece boetius adiutor*»

The name Boethius (Latin Boetius) appears in the title of the *Consolation* in most manuscripts and is regularly glossed in similar fashion, e.g. «Boetius dicitur a Graeco Boetes .i. adiutor».

4. B 495 «Brachylogia: *breuis locutio*»

The Greek word does not occur in the *DCP* itself but occurs several times as a marginal comment or annotation, with the same Latin gloss, pointing out the use of this rhetorical figure: cf. 2p4.23 «BPAXYΛΟΓΙΑ Breuis locutio» *Lh Ka*. The same word and gloss does however appear also in Cassiodorus and Sedulius Scottus.

5. B 541 «Brutus: *stultus insipiens l primus consul fuit romanorum*»

The name Brutus is given at *DCP* 2m7.16 and usually identified as «primus consul Romanorum» in the glosses.

6. C 10 «Cachinnus: *graece risus ceahhetung*»

At *DCP* 2p6.4 occurs the phrase «quanto moueris cachinno!» (with what laughter you would be moved), and «cachinno» is similarly identified in the glosses as Greek (wrongly in fact) and glossed with «risus»: «cachin: *Graece, Latine risus*» *Fb*; «cachinum: *Graece, risus Latine*» *Ld*; «cachinnus: *Grecus dicitur risus*» *Ap Ck Er Ge Pb Pn Ps*. One might note too that *The Old English Boethius* renders the word *cehhetunge*, though that seems a standard rendering for *cachinnus* in Old English texts and glossaries.

7. C 165 «Camena: *a cantu dicta quasi canendi musa*»

(camena is so named from singing, as if it means the muse of singing)

The word *camenae* occurs at *DCP* 1m1.3 in the sense ‘Muses’. There is no very exact match in the glosses, but one might compare such comments as «musae a canendo dictae».

8. C 551 «Catullus: *nomen poete*»

Catullus is mentioned at *DCP* 3p4.2 and generally identified as a ‘*poeta*’ in the glosses.

9. C 768 «Celibes: *id est casti, steriles, caelestem uitam ducentes, clængeorne*»

The form *caelibem* occurs at *DCP* 2p4.14, and is glossed «castam», «sterilem» and «caelestem uitam ducens» in a variety of manuscripts.

10. C 1175 «Conigastum: *nomen barbari*»

As noted above, the name *Conigastum*, in the accusative as here, occurs uniquely at *DCP* 1p4.10 and is similarly glossed «nomen barbari» in many manuscripts.

11. C 1525 «*Consularem: dignum consulatu l electum*»

(*consularem*: worthy of the consulate or elected)

Consularem occurs twice in *DCP* 1p4.14, just a few lines after *Conigastum*. Many manuscripts offer the gloss «*dignum consulatu*» and one (*Er*) has «*dignum consulatu uel eiectum (sic)*» against the second instance of the word in 1p4.14. «*Eiectum*» is probably not just a scribal error for *electum* here, since several manuscripts add after «*dignum consulatu*» the further gloss «*uel de consulato eiectum iniusta accusatione*» (or one ejected from the consulship by an unjust accusation). There is perhaps influence here from the sense ‘*exconsul*’ that *consularis* can have. There may be influence too from the title to the *Consolation*, where the abbreviation *ex. cons.* in the list of Boethius’s titles and honours is glossed «*ex consulatu eiectus*». It is likely then that Harley’s «*electum*» is a miscopying of *eiectum*, even though ‘elected’ makes reasonable sense.

12. C 1708 «*Contra hisceres: aperires*»

The phrase *contra hisceres* occurs, uniquely in the corpus of Latin texts it seems, at *DCP* 2p3.1, and is glossed «*aperires*» in many manuscripts.

13. C 1868 «*Corollarium: id est munusculum premium corone l brauium*»

As we have already noted in the discussion of Laon 444, the word *corollarium* occurs at *DCP* 3p10.22 and 26 and again at 4p3.8. One manuscript (*Ct*) glosses it at 3p10.22 with «*praemium corone uel brauium*», another (*Ta*) with «*munusculi*» at 4p3.8, while «*munusculum*» occurs in the text at 3p12.32 and is glossed «*corollarium*» in a great many manuscripts (including *Ct*).

14. C 2194 «*Curia: id est domus consilii*»

Curia occurs at *DCP* 2p3.8 and is glossed «*domus concilii*» and «*domus consilii*» in many manuscripts.

15. C 2203 «*Currules: .i. sellas praetores consules*»

Curules occurs immediately after *curia* at *DCP* 2p3.8 (and again at 3m4.6), and is glossed «*sellas consulares*» and also (in one manuscript) «*consules*».

16. F 527 «*Fluituras: id est perituras*»

The accusative plural form points to *fluituras* at *DCP* 2p6.20, glossed «*perituras*» in many manuscripts.

17. F 561 «*Forenses: id est ubi exercentur iudicia saeculares*»

(*forenses* that is where secular cases are tried)

Probably taken from *forenses* at *DCP* 3p3.13, glossed «*ubi exercentur iudicia*».

Fomenta ‘poultices’ occurs at *DCP* 2p3.3 and 2p5.1 and is glossed «nutrimenta» and «medicamenta» in a range of English manuscripts. What particularly suggests the link with the *DCP* is the more unexpected Harley gloss «sententia», since the full phrase in 2p5.1 is «rationum iam in te mearum fomenta» (the poultices of my arguments already in you) and many manuscripts gloss *rationum* as «sententiarum», which would allow a reader to interpret «fomenta» as meaning ‘*sententia*’.

These entries are scattered through the glossary for A to F at the appropriate points, and well integrated into the alphabetic organisation of the glossary, though the compiler has mostly not bothered to remove the inflexions that derive from their source-texts. They come from various points in the text of the *Consolation*, up to almost the end of Book 3 but not beyond. Presumably a compiler worked through a glossed copy of the *Consolation* picking out words of interest with their accompanying glosses and he or another incorporated them into a much larger project. The glosses in question occur only in very heavily glossed copies of the *Consolation*, containing many thousands of glosses, and it is hard to guess why the compiler chose these particular ones, though one might speculate that he was looking for words or interpretations that were not adequately covered by the material that he had already collected. There is no particular interest evident in Greek-derived words or especially esoteric terms. Perhaps they were selected by someone reading the *Consolation* for its own sake, rather than specifically hunting for useful words, who noted words that interested him or which he found unfamiliar as he went along. Two at least of the examples are found only in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts of the *DCP*: item 11 is matched specifically by *Er*, owned by the nunnery at Horton and glossed in England in the eleventh century; and item 13 links specifically with *Ct*, a Canterbury manuscript whose glosses are closely related to those of *Er*. Most of the others are to be found in Anglo-Saxon copies of the *Consolation* as well as Continental ones: the one significant exception is item 4, which is a type of gloss that does not generally appear in Anglo-Saxon copies of the *Consolation*, though it could, as noted above, have come from another text. It seems likely that the work of selecting them from a glossed Boethius and then incorporating them into the precursor of the Harley Glossary was done in England, though probably not using any of the extant copies of the *DCP*.

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, M 79 sup.

This is again a very famous glossary collection, well-known to Anglo-Saxon scholars. It was produced in northern Italy (possibly in Piacenza) in the second half of the eleventh century, but includes amongst its various glossary-type texts material thought to be derived from the Biblical commentaries produced or taught by Theodore and Hadrian at Canterbury in the seventh century¹³. However, it also includes some glossaries or word-lists that are less well-known, and mostly unprinted and unidentified. Two of these word-lists, preserved on ff. 159r to 166r and 167v to 171v¹⁴, comprise some 2000 or more entries drawn from glosses to the *Consolation*. The source was

¹³ See B. Bischoff and M. Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian* (CSASE 10), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1994; for a detailed discussion of this manuscript, see pp. 275-287.

¹⁴ There are two sets of foliation used in the Milan manuscript; the references here are made to the new foliation, which is recorded at the foot of each folio.

identified in 2009 by Dr Hannah Matis, then a doctoral student at Notre Dame University, now Assistant Professor at Virginia Theological Seminary, and we are extremely grateful to Dr Matis for telling us about her discovery at the time and agreeing to our discussing the glosses in this article.

The manuscript, which consists of 254 folios, was evidently written by two principal scribes, the second of whom wrote all but one of the glosses drawn from Boethius's *DCP*. The Boethius glosses are not written in list form but in a continuous format, in keeping with the vast collection of other *glossae collectae* in whose midst they are recorded. The first main sequence of Boethius glosses begins with a slightly enlarged initial at the top of the second column on f. 159r, which is part way through quire 20 of the manuscript, but there is no heading and no indication of the source of the glosses. This sequence ends half way down the first column on 166r. It is immediately followed by a series of glosses, on folios 166r and 167v, drawn mainly from a glossed copy of Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae*, but the sources of these entries are also not identified in the manuscript. A second sequence of Boethius glosses begins about a third of the way down column 2 of f. 167v, ending half way down f. 171v. The glosses on folios 159r to the bottom of f. 171r are written in double columns in a dark brown ink. The final gloss from 3m9 on f. 171v, which is the last folio of quire 21, surrounds a circular diagram of the 4 elements and the ages of man. The second sequence of Boethius glosses which begins at 167v is divided into sections by a series of rubrics, beginning with «Vbi sit sedes ignis» (167v), and following on with the rubrics «Quia deus inuisibilis est omnibus rebus» (168r), «De fato» (168v), «De natura humana quomodo fuit munda et perfecta» (168v), «De bonitate dei qualiter bonos facit» (168v), etc. This second set of Boethius glosses is immediately followed by the «Breuiarium apostolorum», beginning immediately under the diagram and gloss to 3m9.

Sequence 1 (ff. 159r-166r)

On the whole the glosses in the first set consist of a *lemma*, as it appears in the text of the *DCP* rather than in headword form, followed by the gloss, but sometimes there is no *lemma* at all and we have had to assume one, and occasionally the gloss and *lemma* are written in reverse order. These entries are mainly made up of one- or two-word glosses, short phrases, or glosses that are a couple of sentences long. It looks as if this set was compiled primarily from glosses that were recorded in between the lines of a copy of the *DCP*, rather than the longer glosses which are typically written in the margins. The first entry does not include a *lemma* and begins with a simple enlarged initial C at the top of the second column of f. 159r thus: «Carmen dicitur eo quod car<p>tim pronuntietur, unde hodie lanam quam discerpunt purgantes carminare dicimus» (a poem is so called because it is proclaimed intermittently, and so nowadays we say that the cleaners card the wool which they separate). This gloss is recorded in several manuscripts of the *DCP*, and refers to the opening word of Book 1, metre 1, «carmina». In the Milan glossary it is immediately followed by the entry «differt inter carmina et modos. carmina in laetitia modos in mesticia accipimus eo quod affectum doloris rependant prosperis» (he distinguishes between poems and measures: we take poems to be in time of joy, and measures in time of misery, because they measure out the sense of grief to those who prosper). A version of this appears in a continental manuscript (*Ga*): «distat inter carmina et modos. carmina in laetitia in mestitia modos accipimus», but the only exact parallel is in *Fb*, where it immediately follows the previous gloss in Milan: «Carmen dicitur eo quod carptim pronuntietur. unde hodie lanam quam discerpunt purgantes carminare dicimus. differt inter carmina et modos. carmina in laetitia modos in mestitia accipimus eo quod affectum doloris rependant prosperis». Further glosses to 1m1 follow in Milan, citing as *lemmata* «modos» (line 2 of the metre), «camenae»

(line 3), «florete» and «peregi» (both line 1 again) and so on.

This first set of glosses is not in strict order of the text of the *DCP*, nor are they alphabetically arranged. The glosses begin with some from 1m1 and these are followed by several hundred glosses primarily from Book 1, with a handful of glosses from Books 3 and 4. The next hundred and fifty or so are mostly from Book 2, with a few from Book 1. These are followed by nearly a hundred glosses from Books 2, 4 and 5. About 200 further glosses follow from Book 2, along with a handful from Book 3. Then there are about fifty glosses from Book 3. The next eighty glosses are primarily from Books 4 and 5. These are followed by roughly 300 glosses from Book 3, about fifteen from the beginning of Book 4, and then another 130 or so from Book 3. The last fifty or so glosses recorded at the end of this first set of Boethius glosses are taken from the first four books of the *DCP*, and are in no particular order.

Sequence 2 (ff. 167v-171v)

The second set of glosses is almost entirely made up of longer glosses, ranging from a sentence or two to a paragraph long, providing discursive explanations or comments on a word or phrase. These glosses were probably compiled from the margins of a text of the *DCP*, where glosses are sometimes linked to the text by a *lemma* or a reference mark, or simply written in the margins in close proximity to the word or phrase being glossed. This second set of glosses only rarely records a *lemma*, and is further distinguished from the first in that its glosses are organised under a series of rubrics, which might be described loosely as subject headings or thematic topics, and the entries consist of a random selection of glosses from the first four books of the *DCP*. For example, the first heading «Vbi sit sedes ignis» (where the seat of fire is) is followed by four glosses from 3m9 and 3p11 on the four elements, primarily about fire. The second rubric, «Quia deus inuisibilis est omnibus rebus» (because God is invisible to all things), which is in fact part of a gloss from 3p12, is followed by a series of glosses about the nature of God taken from Books 2, 3 and 4. A couple of glosses concerning fate from 4p6 come under the heading «De fato» (concerning fate), and so on. The last two headings «Distat inter animam et animum» (he distinguishes between soul and mind) and «De qualitate .i. temperie morum quae alio nomine conspersio dicitur» (on quality, that is the complex of manners which is also called a scattering) are each followed by glosses that are less cohesive in content, and derive from various sections of the first four books of the *DCP*. There are no glosses drawn from book 5 of the *DCP* in this second set of glosses.

Immediately preceding the first set of Boethius glosses is a collection of *glossae collectae* from a variety of sources that begins on f. 156r with the incipit «Tres sunt principales lingue, scilicet Hebraea et Grega et Latina». The sources for these entries are not identified, but they include glosses to the psalms and to Donatus's *Ars Maior*. Embedded amongst them, however, in column one of 159r, are three glosses from *DCP* 4p4:

1. «Quedam enim sunt animalia lucifuga quae infirmo intuitu claritate diei sustinere non possunt. Noctu ergo apparent. die abscondunt. Vt sunt bubones noctue. uespertiliones. et nicticoraces. Interpretatur autem nicticorax noctis pupilla. quidam uero dicunt noctis coruus sed male»

(For there are certain light-avoiding creatures which cannot cope with the brightness of daylight because of their weak gaze. They therefore come out at night and hide in daytime. Such are horned owls, little owls, bats and night-ravens. But 'night-raven' is interpreted as the eye of the night; some say that it means raven of the night, but they are wrong.)

The same wording occurs in several manuscripts of the *DCP*, glossing 4p4.27 «similesque auibus sunt quarum intuitum nox inluminat, dies caecat» (they are like those birds whose vision is enhanced at night and blinded by daylight). There is no *lemma* preceding this entry in the Milan manuscript, but it continues on from an entry that begins at the end of the preceding folio, which is glossing a verse from psalm 101 («Similis factus sum pellicano solitudinis; factus sum sicut nycticorax in domicilio»).

2. «Cognitor: *censor .i. iudex*»

(an attorney is a censor, that is, a judge)

3. «Cognitores: *dicuntur dicuntur (sic) iudices. eo quod forenses causae et publicae ab illis cognitae examinentur. Ipsi censores dicuntur*»

(attorneys is a name for judges, because public law-cases and things openly known by them are examined. The same are called censors)

Cognitor occurs at *DCP* 4p4.35. Numerous manuscripts gloss it «*iudex*» above the line, and many have a version of the longer gloss. The closest parallel is in *Fb*, which records the following in the margin: «Cognitor .i. iudex. cognitores dicuntur iudices. eo quod forenses causae et publicae ab illis cognitae examinentur. ipsi censores dicuntur.» The interpretation «*censores*» could have been taken from the end of the *Fb* gloss or from another source, but *censor* does occur as a gloss to *cognitor* in three Anglo-Saxon manuscripts (*Cg Ge Ps*). These three glosses taken from Boethius's *DCP* are followed immediately by a series of glosses on Greek and Latin words that relate to physical spaces, and which are neither in alphabetical order nor necessarily in headword format. This set of glosses, whose source is not identified in the manuscript, neatly ends at the bottom of the first column of f. 159r, and the first main sequence of glosses to Boethius begins at the top of the second column.

Like the Boethius glosses, the glosses to Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae*, which are recorded on ff. 166r to 167v, are not written alphabetically, nor in a list form. They begin about two-thirds of the way down the first column of f. 166r with no more than an enlarged initial, and are arranged in much the same way as the first set of Boethius glosses: a *lemma* is followed by a gloss. The *lemmata* are not in headword form, but retain the form of the words in the Priscian text. After a few *lemmata* taken from Priscian's first book, the remaining *lemmata* do not follow the order of the text.

An analysis of the roughly 2000 glosses in both sets of Boethius glosses in the Milan manuscript reveals the following observations (for the sigla of manuscripts see appendix below; Milan readings are referred to by the siglum *Mo*):

1. Virtually all the Milan glosses appear in early medieval glossed copies of the *DCP*, in a range of English and continental manuscripts. The first sequence of Boethius glosses shows a striking parallel with the glosses in *Fb* (Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, San Marco 170; s. x). Nearly all the *Mo* entries are to be found in *Fb*. Several glosses appear only in *Fb* and *Mo*, and where they appear in other manuscripts as well, there are often variants shared only by *Fb* and *Mo*. In addition to the entries drawing on glosses from 1m1 referred to above and recorded at the opening of the first sequence of glosses on 159r, the following are some examples of glosses from the first set of glosses that appear only in *Mo* and *Fb*:

1m1.12: «*effeto (effecta Mo): mulieres enim crebro fetu efficiuntur debiles et ideo effetae (foete Mo)*»

dicuntur»

(for women are often made weak by a foetus and so are said to be exhausted)

This gloss occurs in several manuscripts, but only *Fb* has this particular wording.

1m3.9: «Phoebus: *orientalis uentus*»

This odd gloss for Phoebus the sun seems to have strayed from 1m3.7 where Boreas, the northern wind, is glossed «uentus orientalis» ‘eastern wind’ in *Pc* and *Pk*. In *Fb* Boreas is not glossed at all, and «orientalis uentus» is clearly written directly above Phoebus.

1p5.9: «increpuisti: *redarguisti. duo praeterita habet increpauit et increpuit*»

(you have accused; *increpare* has two preterites, *increpauit* and *increpuit*)

Although «redarguisti» glosses *increpuisti* in several English and continental manuscripts, only *Fb* and *Mo* record the rest of this gloss.

2m6.3: «ferus: *horridus, crudelis, truculentus, sanguinolentus*»

Of these one-word glosses «crudelis» is recorded in several other manuscripts; «sanguinolentus» is recorded in one other (*Va*); and «truculentus» and a corrupted form of «horridus» appears in one English manuscript (*Er*). However the full combination of glosses is only recorded in *Fb*.

2m7.1: «praecipiti: *in praecipitium ruenti et festinanti ueloci*»

(rushing to ruin, hastening, speeding)

No other early manuscript records this gloss apart from *Fb* and *Mo*.

4p3.1: «in caeno: *cenum est fetens lutum. ponitur pro immunditia*»

(*cenum* is stinking mud; it is put for uncleanness)

Although a similar gloss is recorded in some East Frankish manuscripts, only *Fb* and *Mo* record the version above.

The following example shows an interesting link between a *lemma* and its gloss in *Mo* and *Fb*. At 3p9.27 the standard text of the *Consolation*, followed by most of our glossed manuscripts, reads *plenam beatitudinem*, and *plenam* is glossed «perfectam» in a range of mostly English manuscripts. The text of *Fb* however reads «ueram beatitudinem», with *ueram* glossed «perfectam». *Mo* has «ueram id est perfectam» at this point, evidently drawing on a manuscript with the same unique variant reading as *Fb* as well as the same gloss.

Where the two manuscripts are not identical, they are often fairly similar. The following are a few examples from the first set of Boethius glosses in the Milan manuscript taken from Book 3:

3p1: «efflagito»: «*exoro*» *Mo*; «*exoro sc. ut tu*» *Fb*

- 3p2: «metiuntur»: «*compessant*» *Mo*; «*esse compensant*» *Fb*
 3m2: «laxant»: «*absoluant*» *Mo*; «*tunc absoluant*» *Fb*
 3p4: «inlustrare»: «*manifestare*» *Mo*; «*aliis manifestare*» *Fb*
 3p6: «plures»: «*multi*» *Mo*; «*multi mortalium*» *Fb*
 3p11: «intemperiem»: «*pluuiam*» *Mo*; «*pluuias*» *Fb*
 «generatim»: «*sed generaliter*» *Mo*; «*sed generaliter simul omnia*» *Fb*
 «patuit tibi»: «*manifestum tibi*» *Mo*; «*manifestum est tibi*» *Fb*
 3m11: «nubes»: «*caligo*» *Mo*; «*ignorantiae caligo*» *Fb*
 3p12: «diuelleret (*diuellere Mo*)»: «*diuidere*» *Mo*; «*diuideret*» *Fb*
 «sentias»: «*intellegas*» *Mo*; «*intellegas de deo*» *Fb*
 «quo»: «*si aliquo*» *Mo*; «*aliquo*» *Fb*

In some cases it is easy to see that the two manuscripts draw on the same gloss but that the glossator of *Fb* has miscopied it. So *Mo* appropriately glosses *acriora* with «*fortiora*», matching a gloss that appears in a number of manuscripts at 3p1.2 (*Ap Ck Fd Ge Ld Vb*). *Fb* has «*fortuna*» which must be a miscopying of *fortiora*. This suggests that the Milan compiler was drawing on a copy of the *Consolation* containing glosses closely related to those in *Fb* but not on *Fb* itself. The small proportion of glosses in the Milan manuscript that clearly derive from the *DCP* but are not in *Fb* in any form are probably then to be explained by selectivity on the part of the *Fb* glossator.

2. As for the longer glosses in the second sequence, most of these do not appear in *Fb*. They do appear in a range of other manuscripts, though there is no one manuscript that shows consistent links to the glosses in Milan. However, those that do appear in *Fb* sometimes show distinctive agreement with that manuscript. Thus at f. 170v Milan has a long gloss from 3m9 beginning: «*Vis animae omnem molem corporis regit. Philosophi animam mundi solem esse dixerunt. quia sicut calificat et uiuificat corpus humanum anima [...]*» (The power of the soul rules the whole mass of the body. Philosophers say that the soul of the world is the sun, because as it warms and gives life, so does the soul to the human body). It is in *Fb* and some fifteen other manuscripts, but only *Fb* has «*humanum*» at this point.

One striking example of the connection between the Florence and Milan manuscripts is evident at the end of the second sequence of Boethius glosses in Milan. The diagram of the four elements and the ages of man and the gloss surrounding it on f. 171v are nearly identical to those in the Florence manuscript. The diagram and gloss in the Milan manuscript is recorded on the verso of the final folio of a quire and was written by a scribe other than the one who had written the preceding Boethius glosses, which ended neatly at the foot of the second column of f. 171r. The gloss in *Fb*, written by the scribe of the text, begins immediately under the last line of 3m9 on f. 29r and partly surrounds the diagram beneath. In Milan (f. 171v) the gloss is written on both sides of the circular diagram, whose design is very similar to that in the Florence manuscript, except that the Milan diagram is filled with colour and that in the Florence manuscript is not. Though shorter and longer versions of this gloss appear in several glossed Boethius manuscripts, only *Fb* and *Mo* have this particular rendering. What this suggests is that the second sequence of glosses in *Mo*, like the first sequence, draws on a glossed copy of the *Consolation* closely related to that used by *Fb* but that the glossator of *Fb* has been much more selective in his choice of longer glosses present in the common

source. As noted below, longer marginal glosses appear only in a few parts of *Fb*, although most similar manuscripts have long marginal glosses throughout.

The links between *Fb* and *Mo* are somewhat intriguing in their implications for the origin and provenance of the material that they share. They are both presently housed in Italian libraries but whereas the Italian origin of *Mo* is fairly well documented, little is known of the early history of *Fb* except that it was bequeathed to the convent of San Marco of Florence by the Renaissance humanist Niccolò de Niccoli (d. 1437), who collected books from many countries¹⁵. The Florence manuscript contains the text of the *DCP* written in the tenth century by a single scribe of unknown location, except for folio 7 and Book 5, which were supplied by a late-eleventh century scribe. It is a rather scruffy manuscript, not ruled to take glosses. It is heavily glossed between the lines, but the longer marginal glosses are sporadic, occurring against the beginning of Book 1, then against 3m9, and again from 4m2 to the end of Book 4. The majority of the glosses to the *DCP* are contemporary and were added by several glossators, including some by the main scribe of the manuscript; further glosses were added in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The few glosses on the supply leaves were mostly added in the twelfth century or later. The glossing in *Fb* seems to conflate two distinct traditions. On the one hand there are many glosses in Books 1 to 3 which are otherwise found only in Anglo-Saxon copies of the *DCP*, and show an especially close link to *Er*. On the other, there are many glosses throughout which do not occur in most of the Anglo-Saxon manuscripts but occur instead in a range of Continental copies of the *DCP*, with possible affiliations to *Fd* (St Florian), *Pt* (Cluny) and *Vf* (Germany). The glosses in *Mo* reflect both these traditions, indicating that they were already combined in the manuscript used by the compiler of the glossary entries.

The glosses to *Mo* were evidently drawn from a glossed copy of the *DCP* closely related to *Fb*, though not from *Fb* itself. Given that the Milan manuscript was produced in Italy and the Florence manuscript at least ended up there, it might follow that the common source was also available in Italy and that the glosses shared by the two manuscripts represent unique evidence of the early medieval circulation of the *DCP* commentary tradition in Italy, since none of the other nearly eighty manuscripts testifying to that tradition before the year 1100 are known to have been produced or glossed in Italy. But it remains possible, of course, that the Milan Boethius glosses are merely an Italian copy of a collection made elsewhere in Europe and that *Fb* was itself produced and glossed elsewhere. As for date, the Milan material is evidently a copy, not by the original compiler, of an existing compilation, and the kind of heavy glossing on which that earlier compilation drew was probably current from at least the late ninth century. The compilation could thus have been put together at any time between then and the date of the Milan manuscript in the eleventh century.

In format the first sequence of Boethius glosses in the Milan manuscript somewhat resembles the continuous commentaries on the *Consolation* found in manuscripts such as *Ec*, *Kc*, etc., which give the *lemmata* and glosses taken from a glossed copy but not the full text. Those manuscripts, however, were evidently intended for use alongside a full copy of the *Consolation* as an aid to understanding it – they often abbreviate the longer *lemmata*, for instance, giving only the initial letters. This manuscript cannot have been intended as an aid for following the *Consolation* since it does not identify the source-text or the starting-points of proses and metres, and does not follow the order of the text at all consistently. Equally, it cannot have been much use in its present form as an independent glossary, since no effort has been made to put the *lemmata* into an order, whether

¹⁵ B.L. Ullman and P.A. Stadter, *The Public Library of Renaissance Florence: Niccolò Niccoli, Cosimo de' Medici and the Library of San Marco*, Antenore, Padova 1972.

alphabetical or by subject. But the format, with a brief *lemma* followed by a short, generally single-word gloss, which is in keeping with the entries preceding this sequence and the Priscian glosses following it, suggests the work of a compiler intent upon assembling a glossary to expand a reader's Latin vocabulary. It is possible that it represents an intermediate stage between collecting the glosses and organising them in an alphabetical glossary format such as those found in the Laon and Harley glossaries discussed above.

The second set of glosses on ff. 167v to 171v, however, point to a different design and possibly a different function. Since these glosses take the form of long expositions and are organised more or less topically, they are more encyclopaedic in nature. Their relative length and the fact that the glosses mostly do not include the *lemmata*, points to a compiler who probably assembled this collection of glosses mainly from those written in the margins of a glossed copy of the *DCP*, where the *lemma* to the gloss is often not repeated. They presumably represent a different kind of attempt to collect the information provided by a glossed copy of the *Consolation* and make it available independently of the Boethius text. Despite the haphazard order and the different design and functions of the two sequences, it seems distinctly possible that the whole work of extraction and compilation in the two sequences of Boethius glosses was the work of a single compiler. There is very little repetition of glosses in either set, such as one would expect if different compilers were working on the same material, and where the *lemma* and one-word gloss have been repeated in the first set, this can be explained by the *lemma* being repeated at different points in the Boethius text. Only one long gloss appears in both sets, first towards the end of the first sequence at 166ra and then again at 168vb. The glosses are identical, barring two orthographical variants: «anchora: *autem est dens ferreus dicta a greca ethimologia (aethimologia) quod quasi manus hominis comprehendat scopulos. uel arenas nauemque. detineat nam cyra (chyra) grece manus dicitur*» (an anchor is an iron tooth, so named because of the Greek etymology, because like the hand of a man it grasps rocks or sand and holds a ship, for in Greek a *cyra* [χείρ] is a hand). Versions of this gloss appear in several Boethius manuscripts against *ancorae* in 2p4.9, but it is not in *Fb*. The slight variation in these two glosses that are repeated does not preclude them both deriving from the same manuscript source. The variation may have been introduced by the Milan scribe or his predecessors, or the gloss may have occurred twice in a glossed Boethius manuscript. There are numerous examples in many early glossed manuscripts of the *DCP* that contain more than one copy of the same gloss. Often one is written between the lines of the text and the same one is repeated in the margin of the same page; sometimes one or more copy of an identical gloss may be written in the margins of the same page or different pages; sometimes these multiple entries are even copied by the same scribe.

As for the haphazard way in which the first set of glosses from the *DCP* was recorded in the Milan manuscript, not following closely the order of the text but including glosses to the same book or section at several different points, several explanations are possible. A natural one is that they were assembled from the work of several different compilers going over the whole text independently, or of the same compiler going through the text on several different occasions and selecting different glosses each time. But if that were true we would expect there to be a fair amount of replication of *lemmata* and glosses, whereas in fact there is virtually none, as we have seen. One possibility is that they were compiled from an early glossed manuscript that was written in double columns, where often several metres or proses with their glosses appear alongside one another. Copying glosses from a manuscript laid out in such a way could result in a less than orderly sequence of glosses since often the glosses from one section run alongside or even overlap with others on the same page. A more plausible explanation for the disorder evident in the first set of glosses is that

they were collected from a Boethius text in essence as a single exercise by a compiler working steadily through a glossed copy of Boethius from beginning to end, making lists on scraps of parchment or in the margins of another manuscript, which then got disordered when copied on to manuscript folios. This method of compilation was probably also used for the Priscian glosses that come between the two sets of Boethius glosses. The lack of order makes it unlikely that the compiler was working from a continuous commentary such as that found in *Ec* or *Kc*, since it would be much more difficult to create disorder from such a manuscript.

Conclusions

To conclude, these three glossaries differ considerably in their organisation and history, but together they show the ways in which glossed copies of the *Consolation of Philosophy* were being used in early medieval Europe to assemble compilations of lexicographical and encyclopaedic material and preserve the body of knowledge that was being steadily accumulated by readers and commentators on the *Consolation*. The fact that the use of Boethius in these three glossary manuscripts has only recently been noticed, despite the fact that they are among the best-known of such manuscripts, suggests that there are more examples to be found.

Addendum

Since completing this article we have found one more important example of glossary material taken from a glossed copy of the *Consolation*. This is Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, St. Peter perg. 87, which has often been cited for the numerous glossaries it contains. The material on folios 94v to 100v, written in the eleventh century, which is described in many modern catalogues and descriptions as «glossarium de diversis auctoribus», is indeed headed by the rubric «Incipiunt glosae de diversis auctoribus», but on examination it is evident that the glosses are drawn primarily from a glossed copy (or copies) of Boethius's *DCP*, supplemented by some that are probably from Eutyches's *Ars de uerbo* and other sources. A connection with Boethius was noted in passing by Steinmeyer and Sievers in the 19th century and the presence of Boethian *Vitae* material in the margin has been recorded more recently by BStK Online (<https://glossen.germ-ling.uni-bamberg.de/bstk/324>) [accessed 20 December 2017] but the extensive use of Boethius glosses has not previously been noted. The Boethius material, amounting to several hundred entries, generally corresponds with glosses found in other manuscripts of the *DCP* but is not an exact match with any particular extant copy. Space and time do not allow for an analysis here but we will be including the material in our forthcoming edition of early medieval glosses to the *DCP*.

Appendix

Sigla for Boethius manuscripts cited in the article

- Af*, Alençon, Bibliothèque Municipale 12; s. ix², northern France
Ap, Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus, M. 16.8 (*olim* lat. 190); s. x/xi, England (Abingdon)
Cg, Cambridge, University Library, Gg.5.35; s. xi med., England (Canterbury)
Ck, Cambridge, University Library, Kk.3.21; s. xi¹ or xi med., England (Canterbury)
Ct, Cambridge, Trinity College, O.3.7; s. x² or x ex., England (Canterbury)
Ec, Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek 179; s. x, St Gall

Er, El Escorial, Real Biblioteca, E.II.1; s. x/xi or xi in., England (Horton)
Fa, Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 14, 15; s. ix in., Fulda
Fb, Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, San Marco 170; s. x
Fd, Sankt Florian, Stiftsbibliothek, XI.75; s. xi, St Florian
Ga, Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 844; text s. ix; glosses s. x, St Gall
Gc, Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 845; s. x, St Gall
Ge, Private collection (*olim* Geneva (Cologne-Genève), Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, Cod. 175); s. x² or xi in., England (Canterbury ?)
Ka, Krakow, Biblioteka Jagiellonska, Berol. Lat. 4°, 939 (*olim* Berlin, Staatsbibliothek der Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 4°, 939, and Maihingen, Bibliotheca Wallersteiniana, I, 2, lat. 4°, 3), ff. 4r-57v; s. x ex., Tegernsee
Kc, Krakow, Biblioteka Jagiellonska, Berol. Lat. 4°, 939 (*olim* Berlin, Staatsbibliothek der Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 4°, 939, and Maihingen, Bibliotheca Wallersteiniana, I, 2, lat. 4°, 3), ff. 60r-112v; s. x ex., Tegernsee
La, Laon, Bibliothèque Municipale 439; s. ix^{3/4}, Laon
Ld, London, British Library, Add. 19726; s. x/xi, Germany
Lh, London, British Library, Harley 3095; s. x, Germany (Cologne?)
Mo, Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, M 79 sup.; s. xi, Italy (Piacenza?)
Na, Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale, IV G. 68; s. ix, St Gall
Pb, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 6401A; s. x ex. or x/xi, England (Canterbury)
Pc, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 6402; s. xi, France ?
Pk, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 12961; s. xi, France
Pn, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 14380; s. x ex., England (Canterbury)
Ps, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 17814; s. x ex., England (Canterbury ?)
Pt, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, nouv. acq. lat. 1478; s. xi¹, France (Cluny)
Ta, Trier, Stadtbibliothek 1093; s. x, Echternach
Va, Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipale 298; s. xi, France (Saint-Amand)
Vb, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, lat. 3363; s. ix, France; SW Britain (Cornwall ?); Glastonbury
Vf, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 1581; s. x, Germany