

Discovering a text

The *Glosulae* were opened in the 1940s by the pioneering work of R.W. Hunt (1941-1943), who had located in the Durham, Dean and Chapter Library, C.IV.29, a series of commentaries on Priscian that are absolutely exceptional in their size and richness, called the *Notae Dunelmenses*¹ (henceforth *ND*). These *Notae* are particularly interesting for their numerous mentions of masters. These masters, who are often identified by their initials, include Guillaume (de Champeaux, Abelard's master), Anselme (of Laon), Manegold, Étienne (Étienne de Vitry, mentioned in the life of Bernard of Clairvaux by Guillaume de Saint-Thierry). Richard Hunt had also noted in the *NDs* numerous mentions (47 in all) of another anonymous text called '*Glosulae*', and he had managed to identify part of these *Glosulae* with a commentary on Priscian that he had been able to examine in two manuscripts that were accessible to him at the time, one in Paris and the other in Chartres (the Cologne manuscript was known to him at the time, but was inaccessible).

The name "*Glosulae*", which in recent historiography has become *Glosulae in Priscianum maiorem / minorem*, and which is now the established name for this anonymous commentary on Priscian, exists practically only in the *Notae Dunelmenses*. It is consistent with the explicit of the ms *F*: *Expliciunt glosule Prisciani feliciter*. The name *Glosulae* is therefore in reality confined to a very narrow circle, which can be compared to the school of Laon: see thus the *Glosulae super Cantica Canticorum* of Anselm of Laon (title indicated in the manuscript Paris, BnF lat. 568) or the *Glosulae de glosis in Epistolas Pauli et Euangelium Iohannis* by Gilbert de la Porrée (Omont 1903: 191), or the *Glosulae glosularum*, an anonymous commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians (see Ingegno 2014). It may be added, however, that William of Conches will cite his own commentary on Priscian as the *glosulae nostrae*², thus seeming to contrast his own *glosulae* with other glosses on Priscian of the same name, "nos" *Glosulae*, which he uses elsewhere.

Fluid text in a network

The dossier of the *Glosulae* was taken up again in the 1970s, for the Priscian major, by M. Gibson (1977, 1979) and K.M. Fredborg (1977), and, for the Priscian minor, by O. Kneepkens (1978). Following several studies devoted to the grammatical sources of Abelard's thought (Rosier-Catach 1993, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c), Irène Rosier reopened the file in the 2000s. This has made it possible to propose new dates for the manuscripts of the *Glosulae*, and thus for the text itself (Grondeux-Rosier-Catach 2011), as well as to begin to resituate the grammatical commentaries in a much broader perspective, extended in particular to logic, rhetoric and school teaching.

In connection with these studies, a publishing programme started in 2011 with the publication of the *Glosa Victorina*, a commentary on Priscian Minor, by K.M. Fredborg, then the *Notae Dunelmenses* (Grondeux-Rosier-Catach 2017), and now the *Glosulae on Priscian Major*.

¹ Grondeux-Rosier-Catach, 2017.

² . *Commentaire sur le Priscien mineur*, Paris, BnF lat. 15130 (f. 85ra-137vb), f. 88va: 'Si quis quaerat quid a gramaticis tempus vocatur syllabae et quid sit haberi duo tempora, quid haberi unum, qui scire desiderat nostras *Glosulas* super *Orthographiam* legat'; f. 88va-vb : " Quid autem sit metrum iambicum, quid diambicum dimetrum, quid pentimimeris et quae sit heroica et spondaica totiusque huius uersus expositionem in nostris *Glosulis* de *Orthographia* quaere "; f. 101ra : "Haec est secunda similitudo quae est in accentu, modo quemadmodum dimittamus et ibi incipiamus *nomina* quando sunt *interrogatiua* *seruant* *generalem* id est communem regulam *accentuum*, quam qui scire desiderat nostras *Glosulas* de *Orthographia* legat"; f. 113ra: "Sed quare uerba dicuntur infinita et an sint omnia nullius personae, ut dicunt quidam, uel omnis, ut dicunt alii, uel tertiae ut asserunt alii, et an sint uerba per se uel pars uerbi, et si sunt uerba, cuius generis sint in nostris *Glosulis* de *Magno Prisciano* quaere"; and *passim*.

The *Glosulae* are a lemmatic commentary, in which Priscian's text is limited to lemmas, and above all a fluid text resting on a vast common base. This fluidity is to be seen in relation to the texts that influence the reading of the Priscian major: these are the texts that Guillaume de Champeaux teaches and comments on elsewhere, namely the Priscian minor, the *Categories*, the *De inuentione* and *Ad Herennium*. It is therefore not necessary to take a text of this set in isolation, but on the contrary to study them in their network dimension, because they share arguments and discussions. The history of one text is thus linked to that of all the others.

These texts are, for grammar, the *Glosulae on Priscian major and minor* (from now on respectively *GPma* and *GPmi*) and the *Notae Dunelmenses*, for logic what Yukio Iwakuma calls the *C8 Complex*, for rhetoric *In primis* and *G. Materia Tullii* commentaries on the *De inuentione*, and *Etsi cum Tullius* commentary on *Ad Herennium*; all these texts revolve around Guillaume de Champeaux.

The *GPmi* exist in two versions, one long, one short; the short version is the so-called *Glosa Victorina* (Fredborg 2011); Onno Kneepkens (1978) has shown that the long version is preserved in three manuscripts, London, British Library, Burney 238, BL Harley 2713, Orléans, Bibl. mun. 90. From the Orleans manuscript were detached pages 247-358, stolen by Libri in 1841, to become the manuscript Paris, BnF, n.a.l. 1623 (our witness *F*). This manuscript was the only witness to contain both the *GPma* and the *GPmi*.

The *C8 Complex*, as Yukio Iwakuma calls it, is a commentary on the *Categories* transmitted in several different states, but which belongs to the school of Guillaume de Champeaux. It is striking to note how parallel the developments are: as far as rhetoric is concerned, *ND VI* is in the same relationship to *In Primis* as *ND I* and *V* to *ND II* and *IV*, it has the same *accessus* and the same references to M.G., and this from the very first line, which begins by recalling William's position.

List of witnesses [here](#)

The manuscript tradition is divided into two branches, α and β . *F* is an essential manuscript, *descriptus* of the α manuscript used by Guillaume de Champeaux. *C*, a much-reworked descendant of the β antigraph, is very important, as its reworkings stem from William's changing views on many major doctrinal points. The *stemma* presented [here](#) summarises the advances that follow from the parallels observed between the *NDs* and the *GPma*, a comparison extended to the other texts of the network.

Editing a flowing text

The *GPma* being a fluid text inserted in a wide doctrinal and historical network, the different registers aim at highlighting at the same time its sources (Notes 1 *Fontes*), its evolution (Apparatus 2 and 3), and its use (Notes 2 L&T: *Loci paralleli and Testimonia*, in particular the *Notae Dunelmenses*, the *Gloses* of Guillaume de Conches, the *Summa* of Pierre Hélie). The common text should therefore be read with attention to Apparatus 2, which indicates the passages absent from the primitive tradition α , and Apparatus 3, which indicates the passages added, modified or substituted by this or that witness of the β family. Let us also note that Apparatus 1 gives the lessons of the Hertz edition of Priscian: it is indeed interesting to collect the lessons of manuscripts of the XIth century, insofar as Martin Hertz had limited his manuscript base to the oldest witnesses.