



**QUEEN'S  
UNIVERSITY  
BELFAST**

## **Text, Gloss, and Tradition in the Early Medieval West: Expanding into a World of Learning**

O'Sullivan, S. (2017). Text, Gloss, and Tradition in the Early Medieval West: Expanding into a World of Learning. *Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin*, 11, 3-24. <https://doi.org/10.1484/M.PJML-EB.5.113251>

### **Published in:**

Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin

### **Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

### **Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:**

[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

### **Publisher rights**

Copyright 2017 Brepols.

This work is made available online in accordance with the publisher's policies. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

### **General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### **Take down policy**

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact [openaccess@qub.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@qub.ac.uk).

# Text, Gloss and Tradition in the Early Medieval West:

## Expanding into a World of Learning

Sinéad O’Sullivan

Queen’s University, Belfast

Marginal and interlinear glosses in early medieval manuscripts were not just ubiquitous but generated widely circulating gloss traditions that afford insight into the reception of key texts and transmission of learning.<sup>1</sup> Vital to our understanding of glosses is the question of function, foregrounded by Gernot Wieland. His essential typology outlining different categories of annotations demonstrates how glosses clarify a text on both the literal and allegorical levels.<sup>2</sup> Elucidation of the text is certainly a prime purpose of glosses and dovetails with codicological and palaeographical evidence. This strongly suggests that in many instances the transmission of text and glosses was intertwined.<sup>3</sup> Another equally important function has been observed by Wieland. Commenting on glosses on Prudentius’s *Psychomachia*, he detects a tendency to introduce matters “which, strictly speaking, are irrelevant to the poem.”<sup>4</sup> Others have since paid

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Henry Mayr-Harting, *Church and Cosmos in Early Ottonian Germany: The View from Cologne* (Oxford, 2007), on the “thought world” at Cologne as evidenced by glosses on key authors such as Boethius, Gregory, Martianus, and Prudentius.

<sup>2</sup> Gernot Rudolf Wieland, *The Latin Glosses on Arator and Prudentius in Cambridge University Library, MS Gg. 5.35*, Studies and Texts 61 (Toronto, 1983), outlined five key categories of glosses: prosodic, lexical, grammatical, syntactical, and commentary.

<sup>3</sup> For overlap between the stemma of a text and its glosses, as well as other factors indicating that the copying of a text and glosses was part and parcel of the same scholarly enterprise, see *Glossae aevi Carolini in libros I–II Martiani Capellae De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, ed. Sinéad O’Sullivan, CCCM 237 (Turnhout, 2010), pp. xxv–xxvii. In the same vein, we find that the basic classification of Prudentius manuscripts remains valid for the glosses on the *Psychomachia*. For which, see Sinéad O’Sullivan, *Early Medieval Glosses on Prudentius’ “Psychomachia”*: *The Weitz Tradition*, *Mittellateinische Studien und Texte* 31 (Leiden, 2004), p. 23. Layout and ruling often point in the same direction. See Mariken Teeuwen, *Harmony and the Music of the Spheres: The “Ars musica” in Ninth-Century Commentaries on Martianus Capella*, *Mittellateinische Studien und Texte* 30 (Leiden, Boston, Cologne, 2002), p. 343 and eadem, “Glossing in Close Co-Operation: Examples from Ninth-Century Martianus Capella Manuscripts,” in *Practice in Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Rolf H. Bremmer Jr and Kees Dekker, *Mediaevalia Groningana New Series* 16 (Leuven, 2010), pp. 85–100.

<sup>4</sup> Wieland, *Latin Glosses*, p. 183.

attention to this practice, noting that glosses often point outwards to knowledge of all kinds.<sup>5</sup> Glosses have, as Mariken Teeuwen argues, a collecting purpose.<sup>6</sup> In the case of glosses on Martianus Capella, the goal, she observes, was to gather authorities and to create works of reference which enabled scholarly debate.<sup>7</sup> Glossators, moreover, not only assembled information, but also collated, paraphrased, condensed, and cross-referenced sources. At times, glosses exhibit the vitality of the encyclopaedic tradition, with its age-old antiquarian priorities of excerpting, summarising, synthesising and citing authorities.

Building on current scholarship, this paper examines how glosses expand outwards beyond the text into a world of learning. The starting point is Wieland's study of the function of annotations. Wieland provides a useful corrective to traditional research on glosses which formerly centred on the exposition of words in the vernacular and gave the impression that the function of glosses was "exhausted with the monolingual or bilingual explanation of a word."<sup>8</sup> Drawing primarily on early medieval glosses on three heavily glossed authors (Martianus Capella, Prudentius, and Virgil), this paper elucidates the practice of gathering in glosses and its wider implications. Early medieval glosses often transmit information from ancient sources, together with medieval accretions, frequently accumulated in stages by many scribes and

---

<sup>5</sup> Paulina Taraskin identifies important practices in glosses in a Bavarian Horace manuscript. She notes the presence of extensive verbatim extracts from a wide range of sources, as well as an interest in collecting sources, and in cross-referencing material. See the unpublished doctoral thesis of Paulina Taraskin, "Reading Horace's Lyric: A Tenth-Century Annotated Manuscript in the British Library (Harley 2724)," (Ph.D. diss., London, 2013), p. 261. See also Malcolm 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. Patrizia Lendinara, Loredana Lazzari, and Claudia di Sciacca, *Textes et Études du Moyen Âge* 54 (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 67–92, at 70, for the nature of glosses on Boethius. With regard to pointing outwards, see O'Sullivan, *Early Medieval Glosses on Prudentius' "Psychomachia,"* p. xx.

<sup>6</sup> Teeuwen, "Glossing in Close Co-Operation," pp. 92–94; Mariken Teeuwen, "Marginal Scholarship: Rethinking the Function of Latin Glosses in Early Medieval Manuscripts," in *Rethinking and Recontextualizing Glosses*, ed. Lendinara, Lazzari, and di Sciacca, pp. 19–37; Mariken Teeuwen, "The Impossible Task of Editing a Ninth-Century Commentary: The Case of Martianus Capella," *Variants: The Journal of the European Society for Textual Scholarship* 6 (2007), 191–208, at p. 201.

<sup>7</sup> Mariken Teeuwen and Sinéad O'Sullivan, "The Harvest of Ancient Learning: Healthy Fruits or Rotten Apples?," in *Fruits of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Rolf H. Bremmer Jr. and Kees Dekker, *Mediaevalia Groningana, New Series* 21 (Leuven, 2016), pp. 303–320.

<sup>8</sup> Wieland, *Latin Glosses*, p. 2.

sometimes from multiple exemplars.<sup>9</sup> From short to longer glosses, explanations ranging from the grammatical and linguistic to the encyclopaedic and allegorical were assembled. The aim is to demonstrate that *collectio*, an essential constituent of early medieval scholarly practice and of medieval *memoria*, was frequently at the heart of glossing. A gloss was keyed to its lemma or tag word, which often served as a cue or reference point for collecting.

An important function of glosses was to use the text as a bridge to a wider world of learning. I use the word “learning” to underscore an open-ended process, rather than solely a skills-based, goal-orientated pedagogy. The practice of expanding is mirrored in other scholarly methods, for instance, in exegesis (from the verb ἐξηγεῖσθαι, “to lead out”).<sup>10</sup> Crucially, the practice was not a free association but operated within a well-articulated tradition of canonical works and authors, a tradition that was being systematically defined through library catalogues, booklists, and inventories in the early Middle Ages, in which, as Rosamond McKitterick has shown, a high degree of conformity and standardisation is discernible.<sup>11</sup> Glosses reinforced the status of a text by drawing it into a world of learning. They shaped tradition as well as were circumscribed by it. We see this in early medieval glosses on Virgil, where the prodigious efforts expended by annotators to incorporate the ancient Virgilian commentaries into the reception of the poet frequently resulted in new entities in which late antique sources were collated and supplemented with medieval accretions.<sup>12</sup> Above all, the scholarly endeavours of many a glossator were defined by an intellectual endowment. Hence the importance of *collectio*.

---

<sup>9</sup> For accumulation and layering in glosses, see O’Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, pp. xxv–xxxiv. For the same processes in Boethius glosses, see Malcolm Godden and Rohini Jayatilaka, “Counting the Heads of the Hydra: The Development of the Early Medieval Commentary on Boethius’s *Consolation of Philosophy*,” in *Carolingian Scholarship and Martianus Capella: Ninth-Century Commentary Traditions on Martianus’ “De Nuptiis” in Context*, ed. Mariken Teeuwen and Sinéad O’Sullivan, Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages 12 (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 363–76, at 365, who observe that the glosses were “added in successive stages by different hands, in ways which would suggest a variety of sources and commentators.”

<sup>10</sup> For an example of how exegesis leads outwards in many directions, see Jennifer O’Reilly, “Exegesis and the Book of Kells: The Lucan Genealogy,” in *The Book of Kells: Proceedings of a Conference at Trinity College Dublin, 6-9 September 1992*, ed. Felicity O’ Mahony (Aldershot, 1994), pp. 344–97.

<sup>11</sup> Rosamond McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 165–210.

<sup>12</sup> Sinéad O’Sullivan, “Glossing Vergil and Pagan Learning in the Carolingian Age,” *Speculum* (forthcoming, 2018).

## *Wider Context of Gathering*

It is essential to recall that *collectio* was not only at the heart of glossing. It underpinned all kinds of compendia and florilegia in the early Middle Ages, ranging from bilingual manuals to vademecums. As a scholarly endeavour, the practice is foregrounded at places like St. Gall, where what McKitterick has termed “glossary chrestomathies” were actively gathered.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, *collectio* was often accompanied by other techniques, for example, by those of synthesising, supplementing, and cross-referencing sources, as is evidenced by all sorts of early medieval compendia. Such techniques demonstrate that *collectio* was far from simply a derivative activity. In the case of early medieval miscellanies, as Anna Dorofeeva observes, they were storehouses “but not passive receptacles.” She notes that miscellanies were often “purposefully compiled.”<sup>14</sup> As for the significance of gathering we have only to turn to the work of Frances Yates and Mary Carruthers, who have demonstrated that *collectio* was *de facto* part of ancient and medieval invention, which was integral to the art of memory, that depended on the construction of inventories of inherited materials.<sup>15</sup>

## *Glosses and Gathering*

In general, many factors suggest that glosses were part and parcel of a wider collecting enterprise. Often the product of accretion, glosses were regularly copied alongside an array of paratextual materials, signs and symbols in early medieval manuscripts such as *argumenta*, illustrations, diagrams, neumes, tironian notes, captions, subtitles, headings, syntactical markers,

---

<sup>13</sup> Rosamond McKitterick, “Glossaries and Other Innovations in Carolingian Book Production,” in *Turning Over a New Leaf: Change and Development in the Medieval Manuscript*, ed. Erik Kwakkel et al., Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Book Culture (Leiden, 2012), pp. 21–76, at 69.

<sup>14</sup> See the unpublished doctoral thesis of Anna Dorofeeva, “The Reception and Manuscript Context of the Early Medieval Latin Pre-Bestiary *Physiologus*” (Ph.D. diss., Cambridge, 2015), pp. 192 and 226.

<sup>15</sup> Frances A. Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London, 1966); Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 10 (Cambridge, 1990).

and *signes de renvoi*.<sup>16</sup> Such vast assemblages of materials exhibit a desire to surround authoritative texts with all kinds of matter.<sup>17</sup>

Another factor indicating that glosses were part of a collecting enterprise is evidenced by the fact that identical juxtapositions and information are sometimes found in glosses, glossaries, and compendia. This suggests that glosses were part of a comparable collecting endeavour.<sup>18</sup> The endeavour to gather is further attested by the incorporation of annotations into glossaries, as is evidenced by the efforts of Heiric of Auxerre, who, in the third quarter of the ninth century, made use of the oldest gloss tradition on Martianus Capella in his copy of *Liber glossarum* now in London, British Library, MS Harley 2735.<sup>19</sup> In a similar vein, as Patrizia Lendinara has discovered, the original *Scholica graecarum glossarum*, a glossary of Greek loanwords and transcriptions from Greek that circulated widely, were in the course of their transmission “supplemented with further batches of entries, which included material from Martianus Capella’s *De nuptiis* and commentaries on this late antique work.”<sup>20</sup>

Additional testimony that glosses cohered with a wider collecting enterprise is exhibited by the gathering of marginal and interlinear notes into independent commentaries. For example,

---

<sup>16</sup> For glosses as the product of accretion, see above, n. 9. For marginal scholarship and textual criticism, see Mariken Teeuwen, “Carolingian Scholarship on Classical Authors: Practices of Reading and Writing,” in *Manuscripts of the Latin Classics 800–1200*, ed. Erik Kwakkel (Leiden, 2015), pp. 23–52.

<sup>17</sup> Noteworthy is the fact that these extraneous materials were often repeated. See discussion of the astronomical diagrams in glossed manuscripts of Martianus Capella in Bruce S. Eastwood, “Astronomical Images and Planetary Theory in Carolingian Studies of Martianus Capella,” *Journal for the History of Astronomy* 31.1 (2000), 1–28, and also in glossed Virgil manuscripts in Silvia Ottaviano’s unpublished doctoral thesis, “La tradizione delle opere di Virgilio tra IX e XI sec.” (Ph.D. diss., Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, 2014), pp. 305–6 and eadem, “Reading Between the Lines of Virgil’s Early Medieval Manuscripts,” in *The Annotated Book: Early Medieval Practices of Reading and Writing*, ed. Mariken Teeuwen and Irene van Renswoude, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy (Turnhout, 2018, forthcoming).

<sup>18</sup> For overlap between glosses and compendia, see Ottaviano’s discussion, “La tradizione delle opere di Virgilio,” pp. 303–4, of the *Origo Troianorum* found in Carolingian glossed manuscripts of Virgil, in a ninth-century compendium for the study of Virgil (Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 468) and in the so-called First Vatican Mythographer, an early medieval mythographic compilation. See also Sinéad O’Sullivan, “Glossing Vergil in the Early Medieval West: A Case Study of Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Guelf. Gud. lat. 70,” in *Studies on Late Antique and Medieval Germanic Glossography and Lexicography in honour of Patrizia Lendinara*, ed. Elena Alcamesi, Claudia Di Sciacca, Concetta Giliberto, Carmela Rizzo, and Loredana Teresi (Pisa, 2018, forthcoming). For a similar juxtaposition of materials in a gloss and glossary, see analysis of the same patchwork of sources found in a ninth-century annotation on Atlas and in the *Liber glossarum* in Silvia Ottaviano, “II Reg. lat. 1669: un’edizione di Virgilio d’età carolingia,” *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae* 16 (2009), 259–324, at pp. 294–95.

<sup>19</sup> O’Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, p. xiv.

<sup>20</sup> Patrizia Lendinara, “The *Scholica Graecarum Glossarum* and Martianus Capella,” in *Carolingian Scholarship and Martianus Capella*, ed. Teeuwen and O’Sullivan, pp. 301–62, at 301–2.

glosses were copied as a running commentary in Orléans, Médiathèque municipale, MS 191 (saec. IX<sup>2</sup>, Fleury), where annotations from the oldest gloss tradition on Martianus Capella were transmitted as an independent text.<sup>21</sup> Glosses also became part of eclectic commentaries, as in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 153, Part II (saec. X<sup>med.</sup> or <sup>3/4</sup>, England) and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 330, Part II (saec. IX<sup>2</sup>, France or Northern France[?]), where glosses from different gloss traditions on Martianus Capella were blended.<sup>22</sup> Even specific kinds of glosses were collected into running commentaries, for instance notes on the gemstones at the end of Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, which surface both as annotations and as an independent text.<sup>23</sup> Not only, however, were glosses amassed into running commentaries, but the variety of sources and formats found in early medieval glossed manuscripts indicates that glossed manuscripts became nodal points for collection. This is demonstrated by the early medieval glossed Virgil manuscripts: Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 167 (saec. IX<sup>2</sup>, Brittany, Auxerre, Fleury, Northern France[?]) and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 10307 (saec. IX<sup>2</sup>, Eastern France, Laon). In these two manuscripts, we find comments excerpted from a wide variety of different sources copied both as marginal and interlinear glosses and also as fully-fledged marginal commentary accompanying the text.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> O'Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, pp. lxxi–lxxvi.

<sup>22</sup> Sinéad O'Sullivan, "The Corpus Martianus Capella: Continental Gloss Traditions on *De Nuptiis* in Wales and Anglo-Saxon England," *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 62 (2011), 33–56, at pp. 48–49.

<sup>23</sup> See, for example, the comment on the sapphire copied as a gloss and as part of an independent text in O'Sullivan, *Early Medieval Glosses on Prudentius' "Psychomachia,"* pp. 332 and 341–42. See also the commentary on the twelve gemstones written as an independent text in London, British Library, MS. Add. 34248 (saec. XI, Southern Germany), fol. 203r.

<sup>24</sup> For descriptions of Bern, MS 167 and Paris, MS lat. 10307, see Bernhard Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*, part 1: *Aachen-Lambach*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für die Herausgabe der mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz (Wiesbaden, 1998), p. 114, no. 542; idem, *Katalog*, part 3: *Padua-Zwickau (aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Birgit Ebersperger)* (Wiesbaden, 2014), pp. 160–61, no. 4627. For an overview of the possible origins of Bern, MS 167, see Ottaviano, "La tradizione delle opere di Virgilio," pp. 184–85. In some instances, the well-ordered marginal commentaries were considerably denser than the text itself. See, for example, the ninth-century Virgil manuscript produced in the Paris region, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 7929, fol. 50v. The manuscript transmits a marginal commentary copied on either side of the text (*Aeneid* 6–12). For a description of the manuscript, and its other half, Bern, Burgerbibliothek MS 172, see Bischoff, *Katalog*, 1:115, no. 545. See also Louis Holtz's elucidation of the development of the "édition commentée," where text was surrounded by well-ordered commentary in Louis Holtz, "Les manuscrits latins à gloses et à commentaires de l'antiquité à

## *Glosses and Expansion*

But where did all this gathering of materials, so amply illustrated by early medieval glosses, lead? Expansion into a world of learning was certainly an important consequence. In what follows, I shall single out specific ways, by no means exhaustive, which show that glossators reached outwards into a wider intellectual arena, establishing connections of all sorts. For example, (a) annotators displayed a keen interest in interconnected learning; (b) they highlighted authorities and excerpted from authoritative works; and (c) they created repositories of learning.<sup>25</sup>

### *a) Interconnected Learning*

Even a cursory look at early medieval glosses indicates that a high premium was placed on interconnected learning, that is, learning that forges connections of all kinds. We see this in various ways, for instance, through repetition, word pairing, code switching and cross-referencing. Repetition, relatively commonplace in glossed manuscripts, underscores the interconnected nature of learning. It does so by demonstrating a clear link between a particular word and its accompanying comment. Very often, the tag word in glosses acted as a trigger, sparking a specific explanation, frequently drawn from an authority. In such instances, lemma and gloss were mutually joined and subject to iteration. The result was that commentators, once faced with a particular lemma, often drew upon a specific elucidation. This suggests an emergent pattern of interconnected learning; it also implies that learning was grounded in a scholarly world of correspondence. We see this in the repetition of identical or near-identical information within the same manuscript, same gloss tradition, same family of glosses, and across different gloss

---

l'époque carolingienne," in *Atti del convegno internazionale 'Il libro e il testo'*, ed. Cesare Questa and Renato Raffaelli (Urbino, 1984), pp. 139–67.

<sup>25</sup> For the idea that glosses are “repositories of learning,” see Michael Lapidge, “The Study of Latin Texts in Late Anglo-Saxon England,” in *Anglo-Latin Literature, 600–899* (London, 1996), pp. 455–98, at 495.

traditions, as well as different sorts of compendia.<sup>26</sup> For example, a similar interpretation of *coturnus*, a kind of high boot, appears in glossed manuscripts of Arator, Martianus Capella, and Virgil, as well as in the *Liber Glossarum* and *Scholica graecarum glossarum*:<sup>27</sup>

COTHVRNO coturnum genus est calciamenti, quod solebant portare uenatores et poetae, aptum utrique pedi (Arator, *Historia Apostolica* 2.756)<sup>28</sup>

COTHVRNATOS Coturnus calciamentum poeticum utroque (*intellege* utrique) habile pedi (*De nuptiis* 2.121; Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossianus Latinus Fol. 48, fol. 13ra14; Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 594, fol. 10va11) | <sup>2</sup> Coturnus calciamentum poeticum utrique pedi aptum uel est ocrea poetria (*intellege* poetica) (*De nuptiis* 2.121; Trier, Bibliothek des Bischöflichen Priesterseminars, MS 100, fol. 78v30; O’Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, p. 307.14–16)

COTVRNO Coturnum calciamentum est poetarum uel uenatorum utrique pedi aptum (*Eclogue* 8.10; Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 165, fol. 12r16) | <sup>2</sup> uestimento habile utroque pedi (*Eclogue* 8.10; Montpellier, Bibliothèque interuniversitaire, Section Médecine, H 253, fol. 13r14) | <sup>3</sup> coturnum est poeticum calciamentum utroque pede aptum (*Eclogue* 7.32; Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS lat. 407, fol. 12r20) | <sup>4</sup> genus calciamenti utrique pedi aptum (*Eclogue* 7.32; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 7925, fol. 8r36) | <sup>5</sup> calciamentum uenatorum aptum utrique pedi (*Aeneid* 1.337; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 7926, fol. 61ra26)

The ultimate source of the glosses is Servius’s late-antique commentary on Virgil, which was an important work for early medieval glossators.<sup>29</sup> What is striking about these glosses, however, is

---

<sup>26</sup> For duplication within the same manuscript, see O’Sullivan, “Glossing Vergil and Pagan Learning,” where in a ninth-century glossed Virgil manuscript we find the same Servian comment on *Aeneid* 8.597 entered first by a Carolingian glossator and later by an eleventh-century hand. Moreover, in another Carolingian glossed Virgil manuscript, Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS lat. 407 (saec. IX<sup>2</sup>, Northeast France), fol. 10v, the same Servian comment on *Eclogue* 6.31, written by two different glossators, occurs. For the comment, see *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, ed. Georg Thilo and Hermann Hagen, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1881–1902), 3.1:69.14–30. For a description of the Valenciennes manuscript, see Robert A. Kaster, *The Tradition of the Text of the Aeneid in the Ninth Century* (New York, 1990), p. 27. Bischoff, *Katalog*, 3:400, no. 6394, locates the Valenciennes manuscript in Northeast France. For repetition of material across manuscripts transmitting the same gloss tradition, we have the example of the oldest gloss tradition on Martianus Capella which can be sorted into specific families that frequently share similar glosses with identical wording, spelling, word order, omissions, additions, errors, and corrections. See O’Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, p. cx. Similarly, for early medieval glosses on Virgil, we find considerable overlap in the extant manuscripts. See Silvia Ottaviano, “Scholia non serviana nei manoscritti carolingi di Virgilio: prime notizie degli scavi,” *Exemplaria Classica: Journal of Classical Philology* 17 (2013), 221–44, for a study of the close relationship between two such manuscripts, Montpellier, Bibliothèque interuniversitaire, Section Médecine, MS H 253 (saec. IX<sup>2/3</sup>, Northeast France[?]) and a fragmentary manuscript from St. Emmeram. For the Montpellier manuscript, see also Bischoff, *Katalog*, part 2: *Laon-Paderborn* (Wiesbaden, 2004), p. 205, no. 2852.

<sup>27</sup> *Liber glossarum* CO2408 in *Glossaria Latina iussu Academiae Britannicae edita*, ed. Wallace M. Lindsay et al., vol. 1 (Paris, 1926), p. 151. For comments on *coturnus* in the *Scholica Graecarum Glossarum*, see Lendinara, “The *Scholica Graecarum Glossarum* and Martianus Capella,” p. 343.

<sup>28</sup> *Aratoris subdiaconi Historia Apostolica*, 2 vols., ed. Arpad P. Orbán, CCSL 130–130A (Turnhout, 2006), p. 580, 39–41.

<sup>29</sup> *Servii grammatici*, ed. Thilo and Hagen, 1:119.20–21; 3.1:87.18. For Servius’s influence in the ninth and tenth centuries, see Sinéad O’Sullivan, “Servius in the Carolingian Age: A Case Study of London, British Library, Harley 2782,” *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 26 (2016), 77–123.

the degree of repetition across annotations on different works of Virgil, as well as across glosses on different authors.<sup>30</sup> Also noteworthy is the fact that similar information on *coturnus* is present in a number of major glossaries. The same is true of annotations on the Greek loanword *palaestra* (παλαίστρα “a wrestling school”), which appear in early medieval glossed manuscripts of Martianus Capella and Virgil, as well as in glossaries. The loanword was annotated with its Latin counterpart *luctatio* (wrestling) and with an etymology based on the Greek word πάλη (wrestling),<sup>31</sup> information that could have been gleaned from Servius, Isidore, and reference works such as the *Liber glossarum*:<sup>32</sup>

PALAESTRÆ Palestra dicta *apo tu palin*, hoc est rustica luctatione (*De nuptiis* 1.5; Leiden Voss. lat. 48, fol. 2v17; Besançon 594, fol. 1v6; Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 36, fol. 1v26) | <sup>2</sup> Palo Grece, luctor Latine. Palestra dicta *apo tu palin*, i. rustica luctatione (*De nuptiis* 1.5; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud. lat. 118, fol. 1v) | <sup>3</sup> Dicta palestra *apo tu palin*, i. luctatione (*De nuptiis* 1.5; Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 88, fol. 4r12; Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. lat. 1987, fol. 2v19; Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 87, fol. 3v5; O’Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, p. 30.31–35)

PALESTRIS Luctationibus uel luctis palestra uocatur lucta *apo tu palym*, id est a luctatione (*Aeneid* 6.642, Montpellier H 253, fol. 131v4)

In similar fashion, the same elucidation of the name Abraham derived from Jerome appears in annotations on Prudentius’s *Psychomachia* and in glossaries:<sup>33</sup>

ADIECTA Aiunt hebrei quod *h* litteram nomini suo quod apud eos tetragrammatum est Abrahae deus addiderit. <ut prius> pater excelsus appellabatur, postea pater sed multorum <populorum> uel gentium uocaretur (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek,

<sup>30</sup> See here James Zetzel’s discussion of repetition in James E. G. Zetzel, *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance: The “Commentum Cornuti” and the Early Scholia on Persius*, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement* 84 (London, 2005), pp. 71–73.

<sup>31</sup> For *palaestra*, a loanword from Greek, see Oscar Weise, *Die griechischen Wörter im Latein* (Leipzig, 1882), p. 48.

<sup>32</sup> *Servii grammatici*, ed. Thilo and Hagen, 2:89.18; 3.1:269.20–22; *Etymologiae* 18.24.1; and *Liber glossarum* PA162–163 in *Glossaria Latina*, ed. Lindsay et al., 1:420. Some of the information is also to be found in *Glossaria Latina*, 2:94; 3:63; 5:67; and *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, ed. Georg Goetz, 7 vols. (Leipzig, 1888–1923), 2:392.47; 3:409.42.

<sup>33</sup> See also Eucherius, *Instructiones ad Salonium*, ed. Carmela Mandolfo, CCSL 66 (Turnhout, 2004), p. 186.22–24. *Etymologiae* 7.7.2; *Liber glossarum* AB296–297 in *Glossaria Latina*, ed. Lindsay et al., 1:18. Anna Dorofeeva discovered similar information on Abraham in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 14388, a mid ninth-century composite manuscript, transmitting a number of glossaries (my thanks to Anna Dorofeeva for sending me her unpublished paper in which she discusses this manuscript; the paper, entitled “Strategies for Knowledge Organisation in Early Medieval Latin Glossary Miscellanies: The Example of Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS clm 14388,” was delivered at a workshop in Cambridge in 2016).

MS Clm. 14395, fol. 141r3; O’Sullivan, *Early medieval glosses on Prudentius’ “Psychomachia”*, p. 141)

Dicunt autem Hebraei quod ex nomine suo deus, quod apud illos tetragrammum est, he literam Abrahae et Sarae addiderit: dicebatur enim primum Abram, quod interpretatur pater excelsus, et postea uocatus est Abraham, quod transfertur pater multarum: nam quod sequitur, gentium, non habetur in nomine, sed subauditur (Jerome, *Hebraicae quaestiones in libro geneseos*, CCSL 72 [Turnhout, 1959], p. 21).

Moreover, identical material not drawn from commonplace sources occurs in glosses on different authors, as in the etymology of the name Minerva in annotations on Martianus Capella and Virgil.<sup>34</sup> In all of the examples above, the tag words evince specific explanations, suggesting, in many instances, that the lemma acted as a trigger and that glossators drew on well-established interpretations.

Casting our net a little wider, it is hardly a surprise that we should find identical or near identical information in glosses on a wide range of different authors. See, for example, the annotations below elucidating the title of Virgil’s *Georgics* and the fountain of the Gorgonian horse in Martianus Capella’s *De nuptiis*. The Virgil gloss, heavily influenced by Servius, has analogues, as Silvia Ottaviano observes, in the Remigian commentary on Martianus Capella and in scholia on Persius.<sup>35</sup> The same information is further exhibited by eight manuscripts transmitting the oldest gloss tradition on Martianus Capella:

Titulus huius libri est georgica; grece enim *ge* terra; *orgia* cultura. Hinc gorgonas dici uolunt quasi georges, id est terrae cultrices (*Georgics*; Valenciennes, MS 407, fol. 17v20)

FONS GORGONEI...CABALLI Locupletes nimis, unde Gorgones dicuntur quasi george uel georgi, id est cultrices terrae (*De nuptiis* 2.119; O’Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, p. 300.27–29)

---

<sup>34</sup> MINERVA Nam Min non, erua mortalis dicitur (*Georgics* 1.18; Valenciennes, MS 407, fol. 18r13); MINERVA Min non, erua mors (*De nuptiis* I, 42; O’Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, p. 168.22). See *Le commentaire érigénien sur Martianus Capella (De nuptiis, lib.I) d’après le manuscrit d’Oxford (Bodl. Libr. Auct.T.2.19, fol. 1-31)*, in *Quatre thèmes érigéniens*, ed. Édouard Jeuneau (Montréal, 1978), p. 110, 1; *Remigii Autissiodorensis Commentum in Martianum Capellam*, ed. Cora E. Lutz, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1962–1965), 1:75.28; 2:118.23. This gloss appears original to the Carolingians. For ancient Latin etymologies of Minerva, see Robert Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds, 1991), p. 385. I am grateful to an anonymous reader for pointing this out.

<sup>35</sup> Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1:129.3 (*Georgics* 1, praef.). Ottaviano, “La tradizione delle opere di Virgilio,” p. 313. See also Mariken Teeuwen’s observation in “The Impossible Task,” pp. 200–1, that many glosses on *De Nuptiis* are found in other commentaries, including Persius’s *Satires*. She notes that we find analogous comments on the fountain of the Gorgonian horse in Martianus and the horse’s well in Persius.

Similarly, the following comments on *exul* and *chalybes* transmit comparable information. Indebted to Servius, the notes appear in glossed manuscripts of Arator, Prudentius and Virgil, and in glossaries:<sup>36</sup>

EXVL Exul dicitur quislibet extra solum eiectus; Exul dicitur quasi extra solum est (Arator, *Historia Apostolica* 2.225; 2.681)<sup>37</sup>

EXVL Exul dicitur qui extra suum solum est (London, British Library, MS Add. 34248, fol. 140r18; O'Sullivan, *Early medieval glosses on Prudentius' "Psychomachia,"* p. 219)

EXSVLAT Nam exulare dicuntur qui extra solum sunt (*Aeneid* 11.263; Montpellier, MS H 253, fol. 193v23)

EXVL Peregrinus extra solum (*Eclogue* 1.61; Paris, MS lat. 7926, fol. 3ra5)

Identical material, however, is not just found in glosses and glossaries. Similar elucidations were repeated time and again in all kinds of works, as is illustrated by the explanation of *chalybes*, drawn from Servius, found in glossed manuscripts of Prudentius and Virgil, and in Sedulius Scottus's ninth-century commentary on Donatus's *Ars maior*:<sup>38</sup>

CALIBEM Calibes sunt populi apud quos nascitur ferrum (Cologne, Dombibliothek MS 81, fol. 73r7; O'Sullivan, *Early medieval glosses on Prudentius' "Psychomachia,"* p. 201)

CHALIBVM Chalibes autem proprie populi sunt apud quos nascitur ferrum (*Aeneid* 8, 421; Paris MS, lat. 7925, fol. 113r29)

Chalybes enim sunt populi, apud quos abundat optimum ferrum (Sedulius Scottus, *In Donati artem maiorem*, ed. Bengt Löfstedt, CCCM 40B [Turnhout, 1977], p. 81.71).

Establishing a correspondence was even evident at the level of the lexical gloss where we regularly find repetition of synonyms and word pairs. The same lexical equivalents, as well as identical Latin-Latin and Greek-Latin word pairs sometimes appear in early medieval glosses and glossaries.<sup>39</sup> For instance, in glosses on Martianus Capella and Virgil and also in the *Liber*

---

<sup>36</sup> Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 2:263.4–5; 2:510.3–4; 3.1:147.20. See also *Etymologiae* 5.27.28; *Liber glossarum* EX1148 in *Glossaria Latina*, ed. Lindsay et al., 1:226; and O'Sullivan, *Early Medieval Glosses on Prudentius' "Psychomachia,"* p. 110, n. 24 and 25.

<sup>37</sup> Orbán, *Aratoris subdiaconi Historia Apostolica*, pp. 457 and 564.

<sup>38</sup> Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1:147.20 (*Georgics* 1.58).

<sup>39</sup> For the appearance of the same lexical equivalents in glossed manuscripts and glossaries, see O'Sullivan, *Early Medieval Glosses on Prudentius' "Psychomachia,"* pp. 109–10. See also Wieland, *Latin Glosses*, p. 45, for discussion of the purpose of the lexical gloss, which often served to expand vocabulary.

*glossarum*, the word *olympus* was linked to the Greek word *ololampus* (όλολαμπής “shining all over”), the likely source of which was Servius or Isidore.<sup>40</sup> And in glosses on a number of early medieval glossed Martianus manuscripts, annotators commenting on the Greek word *hydraula* (ὑδραθλις or ὑδραθλος “a water organ”) offered the pairing *Hydraula – organum*, a pairing present in the Cyrillus glossary.<sup>41</sup> Even at the level of the individual word, then, a pattern emerges: a binary relationship is established and word pairs repeated, which strongly suggests a scholarly environment that valued interconnected learning.

Cross-linguistic switching, that is, switching between one language and another, also underscores an interest in forging connections. Early medieval glossators deployed both classical and vernacular languages to annotate texts, sometimes switching between languages within the same gloss and even, as Pádraic Moran has discovered, attempting in a small number of Old Irish glosses that translate Greek words in Priscian to provide a morpheme-by-morpheme analysis, substituting Irish for Greek.<sup>42</sup> Additionally, the same vernacular glosses were sometimes found in more than one manuscript, as is evidenced by the Old High German glosses on Prudentius’s *Psychomachia* in the so-called Weitz tradition, a tradition of Latin and German glosses in numerous manuscripts scattered throughout Alemannia, Bavaria and the Rhineland, dating primarily to the tenth and eleventh centuries.<sup>43</sup> Frequently, however, the precise function of the vernacular and of code-switching in glosses remains unclear, as Moran has demonstrated for the Old Irish glosses in the St. Gall Priscian (St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 904, saec. IX<sup>med</sup>,

---

<sup>40</sup> OLYMPI Olympus dicitur quasi ololampus, id est totus ardens (*De nuptiis* 2.185; O’Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, p. 407.31); OLYMPVM Olympus dicitur quasi ololampus, id est totus ardens (*Georgics* 1.282; Valenciennes, MS 407, fol. 22v18). See Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1:514.19; *Etymologiae* 14.8.9; Hrabanus Maurus, *De uniuerso* 13.1, in PL 111:363B. See also *Liber glossarum* OL57 in *Glossaria Latina*, ed. Lindsay et al., 1:410.

<sup>41</sup> For the word pairing *Hydraula* and *organum*, and similar word pairs, see Sinéad O’Sullivan, “The Sacred and the Obscure: Greek and the Carolingian Reception of Martianus Capella,” *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 22 (2011), 67–94, at pp. 77–78. For the pairing *Hydraula* and *organum*, see also the Cyrillus glossary in *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, ed. Goetz, 2:462, 10.

<sup>42</sup> Pádraic Moran, “Language Interaction in the St Gall Priscian Glosses,” *Peritia* 26 (2015), 113–42. I am grateful to Pádraic for sending me a copy of his paper in advance of publication.

<sup>43</sup> See, for example, the Old High German glosses on the lemma *BACIS* in O’Sullivan, *Early Medieval Glosses on Prudentius’ ‘Psychomachia,’* p. 151, where we find the same vernacular annotations in different manuscripts.

probably Ireland), where language instruction does not seem to fit the bill.<sup>44</sup> Indeed, Moran notes that elementary Latin words such as *pater* and *mater* would hardly have necessitated translation into the vernacular and that Priscian's sixth-century text, in any case, was aimed at advanced Latin readers.<sup>45</sup> In some instances, the vernacular appears to have been incorporated into an existing Latin gloss tradition, as with the Old Welsh glosses in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 153, Part I (saec. IX<sup>2</sup> or *Xin*, Wales). The original portion of CCCC 153 transmits Latin marginal and interlinear glosses from the oldest gloss tradition on Martianus Capella together with vernacular annotations, attesting to the expansion of a continental gloss tradition into the Brittonic-speaking world. The vernacular annotations were copied at the same time as the Latin glosses, sometimes by the same scribe or scribes. It is clear that the annotators in CCCC 153 glossed in the vernacular words that are generally found annotated in Latin in manuscripts transmitting the oldest gloss tradition.<sup>46</sup> In like manner, Moran discovered that the occurrence of Irish in the St Gall Priscian glosses "corresponds to Latin in equivalent glosses in other manuscripts."<sup>47</sup> For the purposes of this paper, however, what is important to note is that language-switching, commonplace in early medieval glossed manuscripts, provides another illustration of the scholarly practice of interlinking knowledge, this time across linguistic borders.

A further indication of the scholarly predilection for interconnected learning is cross-referencing. Teeuwen discusses the importance of this practice in her research on early medieval glosses on Martianus Capella. She notes that annotators connected "thematically related texts,

---

<sup>44</sup> For an interest in Greek in the Priscian manuscript, see Anders Ahlqvist, "Notes on the Greek Materials in the St Gall Priscian (Codex 904)," in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Michael W. Herren in collaboration with Shirley Ann Brown, King's College London Medieval Studies 2 (London, 1988), pp. 195–214.

<sup>45</sup> Moran, "Language Interaction," p. 129. On code switching and inter- as well as intra-sentential switching, see Jacopo Bisagni and Immo Warntjes, "Latin and Old Irish in the Munich Computus: A Reassessment and Further Evidence," *Ériu* 57 (2007), 1–33. Note also Bisagni's important article, "Prolegomena to the study of code-switching in the Old Irish Glosses," *Peritia* 24-25 (2014), 1–58.

<sup>46</sup> O'Sullivan, "Corpus Martianus," pp. 41–42.

<sup>47</sup> Moran, "Language Interaction," p. 138.

and marked their differences and contradictions.”<sup>48</sup> In particular, she foregrounds how glossators when reading Martianus’s books on the quadrivial arts “weaved strands from Boethius’s treatises, Augustine’s *De civitate dei* or his *De musica*, Macrobius and Calcidius into their fabric.”<sup>49</sup> She observes that glossators on Martianus Capella established links with texts such as Boethius’s *De institutione arithmetica* and that the traffic was both ways: namely that in annotations on Boethius, Persius and Arator we find references to *De nuptiis*.<sup>50</sup> Another very interesting example of cross-referencing is provided by Giorgia Vocino in her study of the miscellany, Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 363 (saec. IX<sup>3/4</sup>, St. Gall[?]).<sup>51</sup> Vocino identified a reference to Porphyrius Pomponius’s commentary on Horace added to Servius’s commentary on *Eclogue* 9.35.<sup>52</sup> The Bern master, then, provides a link to an additional late antique commentary. This fits the tenor of the Bern manuscript, where cross-references of all kinds appear in the margins, including references to contemporary Irish masters (e.g. John Scottus Eriugena and Sedulius Scottus) and continental writers (e.g. Godescalc and Ratramnus).

Early medieval glosses, moreover, regularly linked texts, as in the following annotation that cites Isidore in a gloss on Virgil. Though it is no surprise that Isidore is deployed, the use of the Isidorian reference in this specific instance is noteworthy. By means of an intertextual reference, the reader is lead back to the original Virgilian passage that is being annotated:

CLASSICA IAMQVE SONANT Esidorus classica sunt cornua quae uocandi causa erant facta et a calando classica dicebantur. De quibus Virgilius “classica iamque sonant” (*Aeneid* 7.637; Valenciennes 407, fol. 150v3; see *Etymologiae* 18.4.4)

---

<sup>48</sup> Teeuwen, “Marginal Scholarship,” pp. 23–24; Mariken Teeuwen, “Writing Between the Lines: Reflections of Scholarly Debate in a Carolingian Commentary Tradition,” in *Carolingian Scholarship and Martianus Capella*, ed. Teeuwen and O’Sullivan, pp. 11–34, at 28–31.

<sup>49</sup> Teeuwen and O’Sullivan, “Harvest of Ancient Learning,” p. 301.

<sup>50</sup> Teeuwen, “Marginal Scholarship,” pp. 27–29.

<sup>51</sup> Bischoff, *Katalog* 1:125, no. 585, ascribes the manuscript to the circle of Sedulius Scottus. For discussion of the Bern manuscript, see John J. Contreni, “The Irish in the Western Carolingian Empire,” in *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. Heinrich Löwe, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1982), 2:766–98. For a facsimile, see *Codex Bernensis 363 phototypice editus: Augustinus, Beda, Horatius, Ovidius, Servius, alii*, ed. Hermann Hagen, *Codices Graeci et Latini photographice depicti* 2 (Leiden, 1897). See also Simona Gavinelli, “Per un’enciclopedia carolingia (codice bernese 363),” *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 26 (1983), 1–25.

<sup>52</sup> Giorgia Vocino, “A *Peregrinus*’s Vademecum: Once More on Bern 363 and the Circle of Sedulius Scottus,” in *The Annotated Book* (Turnhout, 2018, forthcoming)

The same is true of the gloss below resolving a difference with regard to the location of the river Arar mentioned in the first book of Virgil's *Eclogues*. We know that glossators, as Teeuwen detects, highlighted contradictions and differences amongst authorities.<sup>53</sup> In the following gloss, two explanations are provided and the interpretation of Lucan rather than that of Isidore is used:

AVT ARARIM PARTHVS BIBET AVT GERMANIA TIGRIM: ... Isidoro dicente: Ararim fluius Orientis, de quo Virgilius ait "aut Ararim Parthus bibet." Tamen Lucanus dicit "Rodanum morantem praecipitavit Arar." Sed sic soluitur, quod Arar fluius Galliae est, de quo hic Virgilius dicit, Araris autem est in Oriente, de quo non dixit (*Eclogue* 1.62; Bern MS 167, fol. 7r22)<sup>54</sup>

In general, cross-referencing has wider significance. Together with repetition, word pairing and code switching, it furnishes evidence for a scholarly interest in establishing correspondences. In addition, it bears witness to the practice of *collectio* and to the desire to expand outwards beyond the glossed text into a world of learning. In what follows, we shall see these interests reflected once again in the avid attention paid by early medieval glossators to authorities.

### *b) The Importance of Authorities*

Glossators cited, highlighted and excerpted from authorities. Accordingly, they built interconnected trackways between their intellectual inheritance and glossed texts. When excerpting from an authority, annotators sometimes named their sources, as in the examples below:

TVENTIBVS HIRCIS **Isidorus**: hircus lasciuum est animal et petulcum feruens semper ad coiticum (*lege coitum*), cuius oculi ob libidinem in transuersum aspiciunt, unde et nomen traxit. Nam hirci sunt oculorum anguli secundum Suetonium, cuius natura adeo calidissima, ut adamantem lapidem, quem neque ignis, nec ferrum domari ualet, solus cruor desoluat (*Eclogue* 3.8; Bern MS 167, fol. 9r2; *Etymologiae* 12.1.14)<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Mariken Teeuwen, "The Master Has It Wrong: Dissenting Voices in Commentary Texts," in *Auctor et Auctoritas in Latinis Medii Aevi Litteris/Author and Authorship in Medieval Latin Literature*, ed. Edoardo D'Angelo and Jan Ziolkowski (Florence, 2014), pp. 1097–1108.

<sup>54</sup> Lucan, *De Bello Civili* 6.475–76 in *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili libri X*, ed. David Roy Shackleton Bailey, Bibliotheca Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Stuttgart, 1988), p. 150; *Etymologiae* 13.21.13. See also *Scholia Bernensia ad Vergili Bucolica atque Georgica*, ed. Hermann Hagen, *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Supplementband 4 (Leipzig, 1867; rpt. Hildesheim, 1967), p. 754; Gino Funaioli, *Esegesi Virgiliana Antica: Prolegomeni alla edizione del commento di Giunio Filargirio e di Tito Gallo* (Milan, 1930), p. 151.

<sup>55</sup> For this annotation, I have made one alteration to Funaioli's transcription in *Esegesi Virgiliana Antica*, pp. 152–53. See also Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2:50.18–51.3.

PROFANIS GENTIBVS Profanae gentes sunt portenta cordis animae passione, quae Grece philargiria appellatur, id est, cupiditas et laetitia et egritudo. Vnde et **Virgilius** hinc canebat, cupiunt, dolent, gaudentque (London, British Library, MS Add. 34248, fol. 133v9; O’Sullivan, *Early Medieval Glosses on Prudentius’ “Psychomachia”*, p. 143; *Aeneid* 6.733)

Highlighting authorities took place through a variety of means. For instance, in the glossed Virgil manuscript, Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 172 (saec. IX<sup>2/3</sup>, Paris region or Fleury), authorities cited in the marginal commentary are often underlined.<sup>56</sup> A parallel is to be noted in manuscripts transmitting Servius’s commentary on Virgil, where we sometimes find the names of the authorities cited by Servius picked out and written in the margins.<sup>57</sup>

Above all, early medieval glossators excerpted from authorities. However, identifying the source of a particular gloss, that is, the actual authority consulted, is at times far from straightforward. Even a cursory examination of the sources of any given annotation frequently unearths a chain of authorities transmitting similar material rather than an individual *Quelle*. By way of example we have Isidore, whose *Etymologiae* was heavily consulted by annotators in the early Middle Ages. When compilers excerpted from Isidore, the material was frequently not unique to Isidore but had become part of a broad tradition which included his sources and their sources, as well as his excerpters.<sup>58</sup> Hence, glosses, more often than not, reflect a tradition rather than a specific source or an individual reader’s private musings. Indeed, the problems of identifying the author of a particular gloss are manifold, as is illustrated by the fact that even when an individual can or has been attributed to a particular set of glosses, we sometimes find cross-fertilisation with earlier annotations.<sup>59</sup> What is noteworthy is that by excerpting from

---

<sup>56</sup> For the Bern manuscript, see Bischoff, *Katalog*, 1:115, no. 545. For an overview of the possible origins of Bern, MS 172, see Ottaviano, “La tradizione delle opere di Virgilio,” pp. 141–43. The names of Varro (fol. 104v), Cato and Pliny (fol. 106v), Terence (fol. 113r), Lucan and Sallust (fol. 115r) are underlined in the marginal commentary. In addition, the names of commentators such as Gaudentius and Iunilius (fol. 6r) are underscored.

<sup>57</sup> O’Sullivan, “Servius in the Carolingian Age.”

<sup>58</sup> Sinéad O’Sullivan, “Isidore in the Carolingian and Ottonian Worlds: Encyclopaedism and Etymology, c. 800–1050,” *Brill’s Companion to Isidore*, ed. Jamie Wood et al. (Leiden, 2018, forthcoming).

<sup>59</sup> See, for instance, discussion of the glosses on Martianus attributed to Eriugena in O’Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, pp. xxxi–xxxii, where we find considerable cross-fertilisation. For debate as to the specific context in which glosses were used, see Teeuwen, “Glossing in Close Co-Operation,” p. 89, who argues that the glosses from

authorities, glossators reached outwards into a well-defined tradition of learning, which they, in turn, appropriated and reshaped. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the encyclopaedic practices deployed by early medieval Virgil glossators who not only gathered, but also collated and synthesised sources, as well as added new materials, creating repositories of learning. Significantly, such repositories were not static storehouses but were continually subject, as Claudia di Sciacca observes in the case of glossing in late Anglo-Saxon England, to a process of “accumulation and blending of both past and present scholarship.”<sup>60</sup>

### *c) Repositories of Learning*

The efforts of glossators both to gather and synthesize demonstrate that *collectio* was no simple matter. This is evidenced by the heavy collection of materials in early medieval glossed Virgil manuscripts. Ninth- and tenth-century glossators on Virgil drew upon the major available ancient commentaries on the poet, as well as supplied new information. The late antique Virgilian commentaries, however, were not fixed entities. To begin with, they were transmitted in many forms, as is illustrated by Servius’s commentary, which circulated in a vulgate and expanded version.<sup>61</sup> Additionally, the commentaries were, on occasion, supplemented, as in the case of

---

the oldest gloss tradition on Martianus are the “record of a textual tradition rather than traces of a pedagogical practice.” For an example of glosses circulating as a gloss tradition in clearly identifiable groups, see O’Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, pp. cx–cxxx.

<sup>60</sup> Claudia di Sciacca, “Glossing in Late Anglo-Saxon England: A Sample Study of the Glosses in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 448 and London, British Library, Harley 110,” in *Rethinking and Recontextualizing Glosses*, ed. Lendinara, Lazzari, and di Sciacca, pp. 299–336, at 334.

<sup>61</sup> Servius exists in two forms: the original or vulgate Servius probably written in the early fifth century by the grammarian Servius and the expanded version known as Servius Danielinus (DS) after its first editor Pierre Daniel who published in 1600. Initially believed to represent a more comprehensive version of Servius, the additional material, generally labelled as “D,” came to be regarded as coming from a different source. The attribution of the “D” material to the late antique grammarian Aelius Donatus by E. K. Rand found widespread support until the theory was dismantled by figures such as David Daintree and others. See Edward K. Rand, “Is Donatus’s commentary on Virgil lost?,” *The Classical Quarterly* 10, No. 3 (1916), 158–64. Following Rand’s lead, scholars such as John J. Savage, “Was the commentary on Virgil by Aelius Donatus extant in the ninth century?,” *Classical Philology* 26, No. 4 (1931), 405–11, argued for the existence of Donatus’s commentary in the Carolingian period. For a revision of the Rand theory, see Giorgio Brugnoli, “Servio,” *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 4, (Rome, 1988), pp. 805–13, at 809–10 and especially David Daintree, “The Virgil commentary of Aelius Donatus – black hole or *éminence grise*?,” *Greece & Rome, Second Series* 37, No. 1 (1990), 65–79. The commentary known as Servius Danielinus contains additional material as well as alterations and deletions. See George P. Goold, “Servius and the Helen Episode,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 74 (1970), 105–17.

London, British Library, MS Harley 2782 (saec. IX<sup>3/4</sup>, Northeast France), where in the second codicology unit large portions of Servius's work were copied as an independent text and expanded with the so-called Bern scholia, a collection of glosses on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* which derives its name from two manuscripts housed in Bern.<sup>62</sup> In similar fashion, an expanded version of the commentary of Servius is preserved in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. lat. 1495 (saec. X/XI, prov. Rheims).<sup>63</sup> Not only, however, were the extant Virgilian commentaries subject to change, but early medieval glossators often synthesised information from these commentaries. This is illustrated by the gloss below on Daphnis where an annotator merges material from Servius and the Bern scholia. The reference to Julius Caesar being killed by the Romans in the gloss shows greater affinity with Servius than the Bern scholia, which only mentions the emperor but not his fate:

DAPNIM Daphim alii dicunt filium Mercurii, qui dilectus fuit a Nimpha, qui fidem dedit ut se nullius alterius mulieris concubitu usurum. Alii dicunt Flaccum, fratrem Virgilio, qui iuuenis mortuus est (**Bern scholia**). Alii Iulium Cesarem, quem Romani interfecerunt (**Servius and Bern scholia**). Sed istorialiter Mercurius intellegitur, quem fleuit Nimpha postquam mortuus est (*Eclogue* 5.20; Montpellier, MS H 253, fol. 9r24).<sup>64</sup>

Additionally, glossators blended information from the Virgilian commentaries with other authorities, as in the annotation below from a ninth-century Tours manuscript where Servius is conflated with Isidore:

RASTRIS rastroi eo quod radunt terram [**Servius**] siue a raritate dentium dicuntur [**Isidore**] (*Georgics* 1.94; Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 165, fol. 17v30)<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Bern 167 and 172. The so-called 'Bern scholia' constitute an important late antique commentary tradition on Virgil surviving in many formats and contributing to the sizeable body of non-Servian materials on the poet which surface in Carolingian manuscripts. See Sinéad O'Sullivan, "The *Scholia Bernensia*," in *The Oxford Guide to the Transmission of the Latin Classics*, ed. Justin Stover (Oxford, 2018, forthcoming). Debate surrounds the origin of the Bern scholia. For discussion of connections with Ireland, see Brent Miles, *Heroic Saga and Classical Epic in Medieval Ireland*, Studies in Celtic History 30 (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 31–32; Michael W. Herren, "Literary and Glossarial Evidence for the Study of Classical Mythology in Ireland A.D. 600–800," in *Text and Gloss: Studies in Insular Learning and Literature Presented to Joseph Donovan Pheifer*, ed. Helen Conrad-O'Briain, Anne Marie D'Arcy, and John Scattergood (Dublin, 1999), pp. 55–61 and 67. See also Jan M. Ziolkowski and Michael C. J. Putnam, eds., *The Virgilian Tradition: The First Fifteen Hundred Years* (New Haven, 2008), pp. 674–98.

<sup>63</sup> The Vatican manuscript contains an expanded version of Servius's commentary copied in the tenth/eleventh century, the origin of which is unclear. Ottaviano, "II Reg. lat. 1669," p. 288, gives Rheims as its provenance. Some of the additional material is found elsewhere in early medieval Virgil manuscripts.

<sup>64</sup> See Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1:56.26–28; 3.2:94.4–10; Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 786.

<sup>65</sup> Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1:154.12–13; *Etymologiae* 20.14.6; Funaioli, *Esegesi Virgiliana Antica*, p. 171.

It should be noted that excerpts from the *Etymologiae* were incorporated into all kinds of comments on Virgil. For example, a passage from Isidore is integrated into the prologue of the *Explanationes in Bucolica Vergilii* of the late antique Iunius Philargyrius.<sup>66</sup> Moreover, the *Etymologiae*, as Ottaviano shows, enriches a non-Servian gloss on the mythological *Chimera* preserved in a number of ninth-century Virgil manuscripts.<sup>67</sup>

In addition to the practices of synthesising the ancient Virgilian commentaries and supplementing them with sources such as Isidore, early medieval glossators also added information not drawn from the extant commentaries. This information is often present in early medieval glossed Virgil manuscripts and appears largely, though not exclusively, to represent a medieval accretion. So it is that unknown glosses are repeated across a wide variety of Virgil manuscripts. For example, in the gloss below not only do we find analogues in Servius and in the Bern scholia, but also with unknown glosses attested in Carolingian glossed Virgil manuscripts:

GALATEA subaudis postquam Mantua (= **Servius**) uel concubina (**unknown**) uel Gallia (= **Bern scholia**) (*Eclogue* 1.30; Paris, MS lat. 7926, fol. 2va2)<sup>68</sup>

This gloss is written by two scribes, the second half of which (*uel concubina ... Gallia*), copied by a second scribe, transmits the non-Servian element. The explanation *Gallia* occurs in the Bern scholia. The elucidation *concubina*, however, does not appear in the extant Virgilian commentaries, but is found in other Carolingian manuscripts and is also repeated in the Paris manuscript:

GALATHEA concubina uel Gallia uel potestas Cesaris (*Eclogue* 3.72; Paris, MS lat. 7926, fol. 5vb19)<sup>69</sup>

Similarly, the following gloss comprises information drawn from the Bern scholia mixed in with unknown material that occurs elsewhere in early medieval glossed Virgil manuscripts:

---

<sup>66</sup> Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2:10.14–26; Funaioli, *Esegesi Virgiliana*, pp. 23 and 119; *Etymologiae* 1.39.16.

<sup>67</sup> For the comment on the *Chimera*, see Ottaviano, “Scholia non serviana,” pp. 231–37.

<sup>68</sup> Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1:9.14–15; 3.2:20.20–21; 3.2:60.20; Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 751.

<sup>69</sup> The same annotation is in Montpellier, MS H 253, fol. 7r31. The elucidation *concubina vel Gallia* appears as part of a longer gloss in Valenciennes, MS 407, fol. 6r23 and Paris, MS lat. 10307, fol. 54r7. For the reference to Caesar, see Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 771.

TESTYLIS rustica mulier (= **Bern scholia**) uel mea concubina (**unknown**) (*Eclogue* 2.43, Montpellier, MS H 253, fol. 5v28)<sup>70</sup>

Early medieval glosses on Virgil, then, bear witness not only to the appropriation of late antique commentaries on the poet, but also to the complex interplay between ancient and medieval scholarship. Through a process of *collectio*, materials old and new were constantly being assembled and synthesised. Above all, early medieval glossing of Virgil demonstrates the creation of dynamic storehouses of learning, under continual construction.

### *Conclusion*

Early medieval glosses constitute vital evidence for the practice of gathering, as affirmed by the efforts of glossators to establish connections, excerpt from authorities and create repositories of learning. Indeed, such was the importance of collecting that corruptions in texts, even when they made little sense, provided a focus for collecting knowledge and were elucidated by early medieval annotators.<sup>71</sup> The practice of *collectio*, an open-ended process, furnishes insight into a key function of glosses, namely to expand outwards into a world of learning. This practice, in turn, begs the question what did glossators hope to achieve? It would seem that an essential aim was to furnish a link between a given text and a wider intellectual tradition. Examination of the practice of *collectio* demonstrates that early medieval glossators interlinked works, drew upon a well-defined tradition of authorities and authoritative works, as well as operated in a scholarly world of correspondence. Text, gloss and tradition were thus interconnected. Hence, with regards

---

<sup>70</sup> Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2:40.15. See also similar information (*rusticana mulier*) in Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 761. The unknown information (*concubina* or *mea concubina*) is attested in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Auct. F. 2. 8 (saec. IX<sup>2/4</sup>, Paris region), fol. 2r14; Paris, MS lat. 7925, fol. 3v1; Valenciennes, MS 407, fol. 4r26.

<sup>71</sup> See early medieval glosses elucidating the text word *ambrosium* (divine/befitting to the gods) in *De nuptiis* II.108, which was corrupted to *ambronum* (glutton) and provided with commentary relating to the practice of cannibalism; O'Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, p. 291.9–22. Likewise, Rohini Jayatilaka, “*Descriptio Terrae*: Geographical Glosses on Boethius’s *Consolation of Philosophy*,” in *Rethinking and Recontextualizing*, ed. Lendinara, Lazzari, and di Sciacca, pp. 93–117, at 98, observes that early medieval glossators commented on corruptions in Boethius.

to the function of glosses, it is necessary to consider both the text that is being elucidated, as well as the scholarly tradition within which glossators were working.

Crucially, the widely-attested practice of *collectio*, at the heart of glossing, had significant value. Gathering was a key constituent of ancient and medieval *memoria*, being integral to the creative techniques of invention. And glosses distinctly demonstrate many of the core aspects of *memoria*. To begin with, the navigation tool or anchor, fundamental for *memoria*, is to be found in glosses in the form of the lemma, which sometimes served as a cue for collecting knowledge and as a hook for retrieving material. Here, it is useful to recall Quintilian, who, as Mary Carruthers observes, spoke of the importance of *notae* or marks placed beside passages one wishes to remember.<sup>72</sup> For Quintilian, *notae* had a mnemonic function. The lemma could also serve such a purpose. Though speaking about the glossed book from the twelfth century onwards, Carruthers's comments resonate with the earlier period. She highlights how the glossed format, with notes chained to a text “*catena* fashion,” seemed designed to stimulate memory. She suggests that the placement of the source-text in the centre of the page served as the “ordered set of backgrounds into which material” was keyed.<sup>73</sup>

Additionally, central practices associated with *memoria* such as those of dividing, storing, building and grafting were also part and parcel of glossing.<sup>74</sup> *Divisio*, essential for *memoria*, was at the heart of early medieval glossing, where we find the age-old practice of “atomisation,” that

---

<sup>72</sup> Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, p. 107, n. 100: “It is useful to place marks (*notae*) against those passages that prove especially difficult, the remembrance of which will refresh and excite the memory; for almost no-one could be so dull as to be unable to recollect a mark (*signum*) which he had chosen for a particular passage” (“non est inutile his, quae difficiliter haereant, aliquas adponere notas, quarum recordatio commoneat et quasi excitet memoriam: nemo enim fere tam infelix, ut, quod cuique loco signum destinaverit, nesciat”; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 11.2.28–29); *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis oratoriae libri xii*, ed. Ludwig Radermacher, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1965), 2:320. Translation from Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, pp. 315–36.

<sup>73</sup> Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, p. 215. See also Teeuwen, “Glossing in Close Co-Operation,” p. 88, who rightly speculated that early medieval glosses on Martianus may function as mnemonic triggers.

<sup>74</sup> See, for example, discussion of *divisio*, the storehouse model of memory, building and digestion in Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, pp. 33–45, 76, 86, 122, 145–47, 172, 174, 189, 191–92, and 246–47.

is, of segmenting the text into bite-sized morsels and commenting on these chunks.<sup>75</sup> Storing, underpinning scholarly efforts to imprint knowledge onto a mnemonic place system, finds a reflex in early medieval glosses, where knowledge was accumulated around an authoritative text and repositories of learning were constructed. Building, reflected in the architectural models of *memoria* and interpretation, was a fundamental feature of glossing as is evidenced by the layering of comments over time and the provision of different levels of interpretation.<sup>76</sup> Finally, the laborious task of grafting or embedding knowledge onto the memory as illustrated by the technique of *ruminatio* coheres with the slow mode of reading that one can often infer from early medieval glossed manuscripts, where crowding, layering, non-linear placement of information sometimes forced the reader to prise apart, even to assemble information. In such a context, reading was slowed down, far from straightforward and required an engaged level of concentration.<sup>77</sup>

However, even more than simply manifesting the same features and practices associated with the art of memory, glosses were ideal mnemonic devices. Here it is useful to consider both the format of glosses and a highly-valued feature of *memoria*, namely the ability to manipulate material. According to Carruthers, the proof of a good memory lies “not in the simple retention even of large amounts of material; rather, it is the ability to move it about instantly, directly and securely.” Annotations, non-linear and fragmentary by arrangement, were thus not merely containers of knowledge, but containers perfect for recollection. Bite-sized chunks of information in marginal and interlinear glosses, readily retrieved via the lemma, could easily be moved around and adapted to all kinds of situations as required. We see this in the appearance of

---

<sup>75</sup> See Simon Goldhill on the practice of “morselization,” that is, “the practice by which a commentary divides up a text into units for commentary.” Simon Goldhill, “Wipe Your Glosses,” in *Commentaries – Kommentare*, ed. Glenn W. Most, *Aporemata: Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte* 4 (Göttingen, 1999), pp. 380–425, at 411.

<sup>76</sup> For an example of the architectural metaphor underpinning interpretation, see elucidation of the levels of interpretation in Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob, Epist. ad Leandrum*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 143 (Turnhout, 1979–1985), p. 4. For layering and accretion, see O’Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, pp. xxix–xxxiv.

<sup>77</sup> For reading practice in early medieval glossed manuscripts, see Sinéad O’Sullivan, “Reading and the Lemma in Early Medieval Textual Culture,” in *The Annotated Book* (Turnhout, 2018, forthcoming).

identical material in glosses on a wide variety of different authors, both pagan and Christian. In short, the fluid format of glosses provides a vivid illustration of the “art of memory” in action. Thus it is that in the case of early medieval glosses, the collecting purpose, confirmed by practices such as those of word pairing, code switching, excerpting, synthesising and cross-referencing, not only resulted in expansion into an interconnected world of learning, but also, it would seem, had memorial utility.