**Title**

The Allegari of Pierre Bersuire: Interpretation and the Reductorium morale

**Permalink**

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7x111254

**Author**

Hexter, Ralph Jay

**Publication Date**

1989

Peer reviewed

# THE *ALLEGARI* OF PIERRE BERSUIRE: INTERPRETATION AND THE *REDUCTORIUM MORALE*

BY RALPH HEXTER

From the perspective of the thirtieth century, the twentieth may well appear as another of several Western golden ages of criticism and interpretation. Perhaps somewhat sooner historians and cultural archaeologists will have established that peculiarly hypertrophic interpretation flourishes in those ages that perceive themselves not simply as transitional—for from the historical perspective, every moment is a transition between past and future—but as liminal, on the threshold of a new age, or as some say, "episteme" or paradigm. In this century a shift is underway from objective to subjective, analogous, indeed linked, to the shift from Newtonian mechanics to Einsteinian relativity—or more accurately, to the physics (simple and meta-) of Einstein, Bohr and Heisenberg.[1]

The mutual "horizonal changes" that the classical tradition and Christian doctrine have presented each other for nearly two thousand years now present just that sort of "special history" Hans Robert Jauss speaks of in the closing sections of "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory": "The multiplicity of events of one historical moment . . . are de facto moments of entirely different time-curves, conditioned by the laws of their 'special history' . . . ."[2] What the classical makes of the Christian appears the more intermittent story, and may yet prove the more complex. Why European Christians adopted the classical tradition and made it their own, and the myriad ways they subsequently try to come to terms with that tradition and that choice, however, continue to fascinate.[3]

To the extent that this is one on-going "horizonal change," it is in one view a synchrony or shaped history. But of course, it has its own complex history, its own diachrony composed of successive synchronies (now in the usual sense of the word). It was as one more attempt to understand this horizonal change that I began to study medieval Ovid commentaries. Much to my surprise, my studies of medieval commentaries and other ancillary texts, particularly those on Ovid, have afforded several insights I believe apply to interpretation in general. For the sake of argument, I cast these as baldly as possible:

(1) All interpretation is functional. Texts, among which I number commentaries, are written with a purpose, and to the extent they circulate and find

readers, they fulfill this intended purpose or some other one. Indeed, with time and/or in other cultures, they of necessity must serve another function.

(2) *Segmentation precedes interpretation.* In other words, how we articulate or subdivide a text as we read it, whether with or against any explicit or graphic divisions, is a prerequisite of interpretation. While this is most clearly true of large and complex narratives (e.g., Ovid's *Metamorphoses*), it is true of all texts. Before we interpret even the smallest utterance, we must make certain decisions, above all: Is it a complete utterance or a fragment?

(2') *Interpretation determines segmentation.* This seems to contradict (2), but it is in fact only another way of saying it, or of saying that in the matter of perceiving parts, as in most other matters, interpretation is circular.

(3) We don't actually interpret a text so much as our own paraphrase of it.

Set out as theses, they may seem alarming; one friend (not usually put off by self-fulfilling prophecies) called them apocalyptic. Perhaps they cannot be sustained for every text. Nonetheless, I find bracing the challenge they present to all- too-commonly held assumptions about interpretive texts, commentaries in particular. For a number of reasons, Pierre Bersuire's moralizations of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* offer particularly good exemplification of these convictions, as well as of two others of which I am less certain:

(4) All interpretation is intertextual (and therefore allegorical).

(5) Many texts that appear subordinate or ancillary, as I like to call them, are exuberant and active, and positively rejoice in their potency.

Bersuire has, of course, received a good deal of expert attention,[4] as one might expect of so prolific a figure who stands at the intersection of numerous histories. A partial list includes the interpretation of classical letters (Ovid in particular), translation of Livy, medieval science and encyclopedias, Biblical exegesis, mythography, iconography, preaching (and therefore medieval rhetoric), and *exempla* collections. For most of us, Bersuire will appear on one or more different horizons depending on our own disciplines or interests. For example, I first came to Bersuire and the *Reductorium morale* via its fifteenth book, the so-called *Ovidius moralizatus*, which references had led me to believe would be a late medieval commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Others may have arrived via one of Bersuire's sources (e.g., Gervaise of Tilbury, the *Ovide moralisé*, Petrarch, Bartholomaeus Anglicus, Mythographus Vaticanus III), via writers (e.g., Boccaccio, Chaucer) or painters who appear indebted to Bersuire, via some of the Dominican mythographers to whom Bersuire's works were attributed (e.g., Waleys, Holkot), or via the search for miscellaneous items from Dr. Bersuire's cabinet of curiosities to astound students of other, more famous texts (e.g., *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*).

Ultimately, so fragmented a vision frustrates the student of Bersuire; even to see him on all these disparate horizons at once will not do. It is necessary to

see him whole, and to realize that it is we who fragment our own perspective with these multiple and artificial optics or horizons. Indeed, the very nature of such "intersections" makes one question not only the autonomy but the very status of the various "histories" I sketched above. Every text may appear at an intersection—in *bivio, trivio,* or *multivio.* But it is textual *loci* that make the roads, or make us to perceive roads, rather than preexisting roads that intersect and create texts.

Not the least of the difficulties facing the non-specialist who would embark on such an enterprise is the relative inaccessibility of Bersuire's texts. Given their tangled transmission, the lack of critical editions is the more vexing. The bulk of Bersuire is still accessible only in early printed editions, not available in most libraries (in the United States at least). It is only book 15 of the *Reductorium morale,* the *Ovidius moralizatus,* which has benefited from modern reprints, both facsimile and diplomatic, and a translation,[5] and only portions of it have been edited critically.[6] Furthermore, much of the superb scholarship on Bersuire must still be devoted to technical questions of attribution, dating, and recension, to which ends biography, sources, and influence are adduced and subordinated.

While in the face of these difficulties, a complete study of Bersuire's interpretive strategies may well be regarded as premature, it is not too soon to begin investigations. It is as a preliminary study only, a sketch for a more complete study of Bersuire, that I have conceived the following. It offers Bersuire specialists no new answers to the technical questions that plague them, though it might serve others as a handy *vade mecum* to most of the bewildering Berchorian byways. That would be a happy accident. My main purpose is to suggest methodologies and strategies for analyzing Bersuire's text, strategies I believe useful for comparable ancillary texts, for Bersuire exemplifies, even dramatizes a number of general principles of interpretation other texts and other times are intent on obscuring.[7] However, those who balk at such theorizing might regard my hypotheses heuristically, as a set of headings—no less arbitrary if less traditional than many of Bersuire's own sets of *differentiae*—according to which we may begin to open up the *Reductorium morale* for further study.

## (1) Function

When I first began work on medieval interpretations of Ovid, it was Bersuire who taught me that interpretations, at least interpretations that are written down and passed on, have functions, that is, a functionality beyond explication of the original text. The function of many commentaries is obvious, whether explicitly stated or easily inferable from the level of comment. For example, I have elsewhere described a range of pedagogic purposes for selected medieval commentaries, from teaching Latin grammar to introducing classical poetry and mythology.[8] Other functions of just this sort of

commentary must be teased out of the text, and may prove more controversial, as do all demythologizing readings. For example, consider E. T. Merrill's classic school commentary, originally published in Boston in 1893 as part of the "College Series of Latin Authors" and frequently reprinted. Beyond providing sound instruction in Latin syntax and semantics, metrics, Catullan diction, and the explanations necessary to decode the surface sense, Merrill's commentary inculcates a view of philology as science. Doubt is not banished altogether; he provides in fact a critical appendix. The message throughout, however, is that science and reason can reduce doubt to a minimum. "Tum" in 2.8 is "entirely probable" (p. 4). Even when mentioned, uncertainty does not get in Merrill's way: "If the emendation *impotens noli* be correct, the adjective must mean 'weakling, the prey to his own passions'" (on 8.9, p. 18). The three "proofs" that the "puella" of Catullus 3 is "undoubtedly the Lesbia of the other poems" are numbered, but the third makes clear what Victorian twaddle is put into the positivistic framework: "Stronger than all other proof is the internal evidence from the poems themselves, for Catullus surely loved but one woman, and spoke of no other in words of such pure, tender, and all-absorbing passion as in 2 and 3" (on 3.3, p. 6; note "evidence"). Merrill's Catullus is never ambiguous; every apparent oddity of language is paralleled. At every turn the commentator suggests what he expected his students *vel* schoolboys themselves to grow up to possess: "The asyndeton adds to the tone of rugged determination" (on 8.11, p. 18).

This may seem far from Bersuire. But as Roland Barthes and others have illustrated, demythologizing is never more critical than when it unmasks our own cultural myths. We must reconstruct both the explicit and hidden aims of texts from all eras, especially pedagogical texts, for education has ever been the ideological battleground, from before the trial of Socrates to marketing textbooks and purging school libraries (not to mention staff) today.[9]

So much by way of reminder that function (along with other elements of a commentator's "agenda") is to be sought at every level of the text, from programmatic prologue to layout. When it comes to Bersuire, I must limit discussion drastically. On the one hand, the function of Bersuire's moralized Ovid seems obvious: It is the *Metamorphoses ad usum praedicatorum*. Bersuire incessantly revised and expanded his works with this function in mind, and in the numerous prologues which document this process, he describes not only the growing number of his sources but his method of composition, the organization of his work, and his intentions.[10] Admittedly, Bersuire's aims appear less clearly in the prologue to and text of the *Ovidius moralizatus* than in the enormous project of which it formed a part and on the horizon of which it must be viewed. However, in the prologue to the *Reductorium* Bersuire states explicitly how the fifteenth book fits into the structure[11] and what use he intends his work to find.[12] Furthermore, the structure and organization of his tripartite project—each part organized for user access according to different headings—is itself evidence for the intended functionality of the whole.[13] That functionality was appreciated: Bersuire was

first copied, then printed many times into the eighteenth century.[14] Finally, Badius' prefatory letter to the 1509 printing of the moralizations advertises the book's utility: "Opus videlicet ipsum predicatoribus idest diuini verbi decla-matoribus sane quam vtile futurum."[15]

On the other hand, there are complexities and tensions in the very inclusion of book 15 in the *Reductorium morale*. That this same 1509 edition attributed the *Ovidius moralizatus* to the Dominican Thomas Walleys, along with the fact that book 15 was never printed as part of Bersuire's *opera omnia* and never printed with a correct attribution until this century, testify to the detachability of book 15 from the *Reductorium* and Bersuire's entire program. I must reserve for another time a full analysis of the reception and transmis-sion of the *Ovidius moralizatus* as evidence for the range of actual functions it fulfilled. At the end of what would be a long and complex study,[16] one would have still to ponder whether the separate, pseudonymous transmission of book 15 was purely accidental, or whether, as I suspect, there was not a certain instability already in Bersuire's inclusion of *figmenta poetarum*, that is, *Ovidius maior*, in his own *magnum opus*.[17] Despite the neat and unproble-matic way he sets book 15 between books 14 and 16 in the prologue to the *Reductorium*, in the prologue to book 15 he apparently feels compelled to engage in special pleading, as always with frequent invocation of the author-ity of the *patres*.

That prologue begins by quoting 2 Timothy 4.4. Bersuire's audience could be counted on to recall the preacherly context. After having exhorted his reader to "preach the word, be urgent in season and out of season, convince, rebuke and exhort, be unfailing in patience and in teaching," Paul continues: "For the time is coming when people will not endure sound teaching, but having itching ears they will accumulate for themselves teachers to suit their own likings, and will turn away from listening to the truth and wander into myths" (4.2-4 RSV). It is the last verse that Bersuire quotes *cum auctoritate*: "A veritate quidam auditum auertent: ad fabulas autem conuertentur. ii. Thi. iiii. ca." "Thus saith the apostle Paul . . ." ("Dicit apostolus Paulus predicator & rigator fidei christiane")—not by accident called here preacher. By producing apostolic authority for the utter opposition of truth and fables at the very start, Bersuire would seem to have put himself in an impossible position. Instead, Bersuire claims to be able to adduce this very utterance to contend that "fables, enigmas and poems should be used so that from them some moral sense be extracted, so that falseness itself be forced to serve truth."[18]

Bersuire does not explain his maneuver here. No wonder! Instead, he first cites several Biblical fables and then finesses the rather different status of the Bible and secular poets with "simili modo fecerunt poete, qui in principio fabulas finxerunt: quia per huiusmodi figmenta semper aliquam veritatem intelligere voluerunt." He cites Rabanus, and in the course of his preface numerous other authorities (1509, ff.1-2r). This is of course not unparalleled; comparable special pleading underlies all the high and late medieval allego-ries of the poets. Unfortunately I cannot give here the detailed analysis

Bersuire's argument deserves. I wish only to focus on Bersuire's phrase "so that falseness itself be forced to serve truth" ("vt etiam falsitas veritati famulari cogatur"). The relationship he posits between truth and falsehood, in this context true faith and morals and poets' fables, coincides with an image Dante had used (not so many years before) of commentary itself. In the first book of the *Convivio*, in the process of defending his decision to write this vernacular commentary on his own vernacular *Canzoni*, Dante develops an elaborate conceit of "commentary" ("comento") as "servant" ("servo") to its "master" ("signore," sc. "text"; *Convivio*, I.5-7). The vernacular commentary is "subordinate," "well-versed," and "obedient" ("subietto," "conoscente," "obediente") towards its vernacular master, which a Latin commentary could not be. Instead, it would be "sovereign" ("sovrano") over a vernacular text.

On the basis of Dante's image, Bruno Sandkühler formulated the principle that "commentary is an ancillary genre."[19] His insight has already proved immensely helpful in advancing my understanding of commentary—how it functions, what its aims are, indeed, that it has aims. But the potency of the image is far from exhausted. We ought to extract from Dante's conceit as much as Bersuire, for example, does from each *fabula*. We might begin by refusing to restrict ourselves to the particular "qualities" (on which, see below) of the servant Dante highlights. It is surely not only Latin commentaries on vernacular texts that get "uppity."[20] From Menander to Beaumarchais (and beyond), no sooner does a servant strut the stage than conflict with the master arises. Well might one write the history of any number of struggles between master text and servant text. Not all would be battles royal of revisionism and strong misreading; there are Martha's among commentaries, too. But in these stories wily servants have their own wills, and most of them their way.

It may be that in the case of many commentaries, and certainly in the case of Bersuire's *Ovidius moralizatus*, we have instead another plot: "No servant can serve two masters," or as Dante and Bersuire read, "Nemo servus potest duobus dominis servire" (Luke 16.13; cf. Matt. 6.24). This might prove the best model for the tensions displayed by the *Ovidius moralizatus*, both in the text and across the centuries. In the text (and particularly in the prologue) we see Bersuire struggling to serve two masters, Ovid and Paul. This struggle, this instability, projected along the axis of the work's reception, is exemplified by the very fate of the *Ovidius moralizatus*. It was to provide moral material for preachers and devoted readers, was to serve them and the *Reductorium morale* of which it was a part. But the pull to serve readers of Ovid was stronger, drawing it out of the *Reductorium*, out of Bersuire's dominion altogether. With increasing force from Bersuire's time on, the *Metamorphoses* was proving stronger (as a master text) than the Bible.

## *(2-3) Segmentation and Paraphrase*

I have elsewhere described Arnulf's dependence on and conscious departures from the Lactantian divisions of the *Metamorphoses* and, on the basis of comparative analysis, established what in retrospect appears obvious, namely, the mutual dependence of segmentation and interpretation.[21] How one articulates a narrative, in other words, where one places the boundaries of one narrative unit or story, determines one's interpretation. It works the other way as well, within limits: If one has an interpretation in mind, one can usually juggle the story boundaries in such a way to support it, or one will simply see the story in that way. That we end up with a circle is no surprise to students of interpretation.[22]

The same phenomenon can be observed in Bersuire, as we shall see. And Bersuire's text has the further virtue of exemplifying at greater length than Arnulf's my third thesis, namely, that one interprets a paraphrase, not the actual text.[23] For obvious reasons, paraphrase involves segmentation, and one can hardly find an example of the former without the latter. For the sake of efficiency I treat both under one heading.

There is no certainty that Bersuire knew the Lactantian and Arnulfian divisions.[24] However, the practice of both fabulist and commentator-cum-allegorist provides a dramatic backdrop to Bersuire's. "Lactantius" and Arnulf follow what seems the "natural" organizing principle of the *Metamorphoses* and make change the constitutive element of each story, which Arnulf labels "mutatio." (I say "seems" because Ovid himself continually complicates matters and often plays against the expectations the opening verses of his poem have aroused.) In contrast, Bersuire has abandoned any pretense that each story must climax in, or even include, a metamorphosis. For example, the third *fabula* of book 1[25] is Jupiter's council of the gods (1509, f. 18.C), the fifth of book 9, Juno commanding the labors of Hercules (1509, f. 68.G). Nor is every *fabula* a "story" in the sense that it has a plot, a narrative shape. For example, the first "story" of book 2 is the palace of the sun, that is, a description (1509, f. 22.A). As Isidore says, playing on the etymology from "for, fari" ("to speak"), "Fabulas poetae a fando nominaverunt, quia non sunt res factae, sed tantum loquendo fictae."[26]

Bersuire's *fabulae* might best be understood as "interpretable segments" (cf. "praedicabilis") or "portions to be interpreted," unless they are in fact segments preachers are to speak ("praedicabilis" in another sense). The margins of the 1509 edition, for example, highlight each "Fa." (not intended as an ungrammatical command to speak, I'm sure). Bersuire incorporates the rhythm of "interpretable segment" and multiple interpretations in the text itself. Each successive story is told in about 100 words (rarely fewer than 65, rarely more than 135) and is regularly introduced by mention of Ovid, e.g.: "Dicit Ouidius," "Deinde dicit Ouidius," "Postea dicit Ouidius," "Consequenter Ouidius narrat," and so forth. Many others simply begin "Cum." Each is marked at the beginning by the symbol ("paragraphus") Bersuire himself

uses to denote "paragraph" or "section." (In Latin I expand the sign to the appropriate form of "paragraphus"; in my translation I use English "paragraph" in the sense of "article or subsection of a code or handbook.") This passage from the prologue to the *Reductorium* is worth noting:

> The properties of each creature, or of anything whatsoever, are divided into several paragraphs according as its diverse qualities appeared applicable to one or another proposition. And frequently it happens that the same text or the same paragraph is explained in several and different ways, according as was thought explicable by different means of understanding: now as good, now as bad, now allegorically, now mystically.[27]

In fact, these multiple interpretations themselves each form a paragraph and, at least in the copies I have been able to see, are so marked. Each begins with one of several recognizable formulae: "Dic quod," "Vel dic (quod)," "Sic (contigit)," "Istud potest dici," "Istud posset exemplariter exponi," "Per x potest intelligi," "Talis" or "Tales," "Applica," "Si vis applica," "Potes istud applicare," and "Allega" or "Si vis allega" (to list what appear to be the most common). Many of the moralizations or allegorizations end with a quotation from the Bible, just as many of the *fabulae* culminate in a brief citation from Ovid (on this, see [4] below).

Each and every page of the *Ovidius moralizatus* affords examples of tales multiply moralized. The giant Atlas (tale 6 of book 2) is in rapid succession a good prelate, Christ, and a contemplative (1509, f. 24.F-H). As Bersuire says, the same figure can be moralized both *in bono* and *in malo*. While this is typical procedure in the allegoretic tradition (*Physiologus*, for example), it is relatively rare that Bersuire gives the same figure contradictory significations *in the same fable*.[28] (On this important point, see below.)

Whether as multiple interpretations of the same fable or of successive fables, the range of possibilities for the same figure or set of figures is dizzying.[29] On the tail of the seventh tale of the first book, Phoebus slays Python:

> Phoebus signifies those who boast of their virtues whether in the world or in the cloister. The serpent signifies flesh . . . and fills the world with the poison of its pleasures. Some overcome it . . . but do not sufficiently reflect on the fragility of their chastity. Rather, they glory in it. God humiliates them by allowing them to be wounded by shafts of carnal desire . . . . (1509, f. 19.I)

Another interpretation equates Daphne and worldly glory, loved exceedingly by many knights ("milites"), who for its sake go to wars and tournaments (1509, f. 19.K; or "for her sake," "gloria" being conveniently feminine, as are most abstractions in Latin). According to an interpretation of the following *fabula*, Phoebus is the devil, Daphne a Christian soul, but she might also signify a religious person drawing on the bark of penitence (1509, f.20.L). In an allegorization of the next *fabula*, the laurel represents the cross (1509, f.20.N).

There is no idea of harmonizing explanations; each is intended as an alternative, a fresh start. If reading on and on induces vertigo, this is presumably not what Bersuire had in mind. Each different moralization is a potential sermon. But, notoriously, "vel," ubiquitous in Bersuire's as in so many commentaries, is more often conjunctive than disjunctive. Might one not compare a cookbook? I only plan to make one main dish for each meal, nor does the author expect otherwise. Nonetheless, the review of multiple possibilities is itself a mouth-watering experience. No wonder some people find cookbooks even better reading when they aren't actually searching for a recipe. Nor do we only have to imagine that *exempla* collections assembled *ad usum praedicatorum* aroused comparable reading pleasures, for we know for a fact that such collections both became and gave rise to other popular reading texts, e.g., the *Gesta romanorum*, the *Legenda aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine, and Caesar of Heisterbach's *Dialogus miraculorum*.

If one is only "supposed" to read one moralization at a time (and then compose and deliver one's sermon), nevertheless, it is only by reading larger swatches that one begins to see the critical importance of segmentation and paraphrase. For example, Bersuire divides the tale of Io (*Metamorphoses* 1.583-747, depending, of course, on where you draw the lines) into six *fabulae* (10-15 of book 1). The first (10) corresponds roughly to *Metamorphoses* 1.583-600: Jupiter espies Io, beautiful daughter of the river Inachus, catches up with her fleeing, and has his way with her under a veil of mists. "Jupiter in this place may signify the world's princes and thieves, who seize and extort the daughters of rivers, that is the possessions of the poor." They draw over their theft the mists of false excuses so that their crime is not discovered by Juno (not actually mentioned either in Ovid "yet" or *fabula* 10), that is, prelates and correctors (1509, f. 20.N-O).

The second (11) corresponds roughly to *Metamorphoses* 1.599-612a. The summary begins with Jupiter's fear that Juno will discover him, now the cause of his veiling his adultery; fearing his wife's approach, he changes Io into a beautiful cow. This receives two explanations: All thieves do thus. Fearing discovery, they change an innocent girl into a cow, that is, a lascivious woman, their mantle into a tunic, their tunic into pants (or hose), and their veil into a hood. Or ("vel") Jupiter is the devil who does not wish that Io, the soul, with whom he fornicated, be recognized and recalled by Juno, that is, the church; he changes Io into a cow, that is, a sinner (1509, ff. 20.O-21.Q).

The third (12) covers *Metamorphoses* 1.616-746. The summary begins with Juno's request that the cow be given to her, and Juno's entrusting Argus to guard it. Argus was a shepherd who was so vigilant he had 100 eyes, only two of which could sleep at any one time. A certain magician ("incantator"), Mercury—one sees that this summary already contains a good bit of interpretation—at Jove's command pretended to be a goatherd; with his sleep-inducing rod ("virga") and sweetly-sounding reed ("fistula") he is able to make Argus sleep and thus to kill him. In this way he frees Io, and Jupiter ultimately transforms her back to human form. This long and complex

segment inspires three distinct explanations. First Juno, the wife of Jove, signifies the church, bride of Christ. Io is the Christian people commended by Christ to the Church. Argus signifies the princes of the world and prelates. Mercury, who sometimes, according to the poets, changes himself from male to female—we see that Bersuire does not hesitate to import additional information—is a flatterer who says whatever is most pleasing, speaking vituperatively of people who are absent, like a man, and flattering those who are present, like a woman. The reed represents sweet and deceptive words. The second explanation apportions the roles roughly the same way, except that instead of Io we have "Ius," that is "regimen subditorum." Here the rod ("virga") of temporal jurisdiction makes religious bloody and fleshly and brings them to death and perdition. In the first two explanations of this fable, Argus is interpreted *in bono*, but in the third he is interpreted *in malo*, as the devil who has Io changed into a cow, that is, sinful souls. Not surprisingly, Mercury, interpreted *in malo* in the first two, is interpreted *in bono* here: He is Christ. When he overcomes Argus "per virgam crucis," he liberates human nature from the devil's power, and when he changes her from cow to woman, he is changing her from sinner to her own just self (1509, f. 21.Q-T).

The fourth (13) backtracks to cover a portion of the preceding *fabula, Metamorphoses* 1.639-733, now focussing on Io. She sees in the waters of her father Inachus that she has horns, has lost her beauty, and moos rather than speaks. Finally she flees to the Nile where she begs Jupiter to change her back to human form. (Ovid's Io requests "finem malorum" [1.733], which might be something quite different: a specific example of paraphrastic potency.) Here the sinful soul has been transformed from God's beloved ("amica dei") to a sinner, who approaches the river of sacred scripture, her father, in which she recognizes that she has horns of pride and haughtiness. Her mooing and bovine form betoken her bestial and carnal state. The Nile is the river of tears to which she comes to beg Jove, that is, God, for the restoration of her pristine state (1509, ff. 21.T-22.V).

The fifth (14) focuses on the reaction of another figure in the story, Inachus. The *fabula* is little more than a citation of *Metamorphoses* 1.653-654 and 658-660. In just such terms God or a prelate laments his daughter, the rational soul, when he sees it transformed into a cow, that is, a sinner. She ought to marry God and His angels; she, however, has chosen one of the infernal flock, that is, the devil (1509, f. 22.V-X).

Finally, the sixth (15) summarizes the tale from the point at which Io is delivered from Argus (*Metamorphoses* 1.724); it retells her approach to the Nile and her prayer to Jupiter, and concludes by quoting (with some transposition of words) *Metamorphoses* 1.738-743 and 745-746. Io has become human once again.[30] She is afraid to speak, lest she moo, and timidly tries broken utterances. These details are important for the two explanations which follow. In the first, Io serves as a model of young religious who flee from the dominion of Argus, the devil, to the river of devotion where they are changed from a cow to a female, that is, from a sinner into a just man.[31] And well are they silent, who

might otherwise speak like cows, that is, fleshly and irrational persons. The other explanation has Io the beloved of Jupiter represent the soul, bride and beloved of Christ. Christ frees the soul (himself; no intermediary here, since this *fabula* makes no mention of Mercury); the soul flees to the river which is either the sacrament of baptism or the river of tears, where Jupiter restores her human form. "And finally in death he gathers her to heaven where she is counted among the gods of heaven, that is, among the holy angels" (1509, f.22.X-Z). This of course depends on the next line of Ovid's text, "Nunc dea . . . colitur" (1.747), Io's ultimate metamorphosis into the goddess Isis,[32] which had formed part of none of the six *fabulae*.[33]

Such productive gerrymandering can be paralleled frequently throughout the *Ovidius moralizatus*. In many cases it would be fairer to say not that two successive fables cover exactly the same Ovidian ground, but that they overlap. So, for example, fable 9 of book 3 tells the story of Tiresias' two successive sex changes (1509, f. 33.M). The next fable, number 10, tells the story of Juno and Jupiter's argument, which includes Tiresias' own history, since it is his unique experience which qualifies him as a judge.[34]

Bersuire's treatment of the story of Phaethon provides a prime example of the interpretive consequences of paraphrase in particular. After Phaethon's mad career with the chariot of the sun was stopped by a bolt from Jupiter, Phaethon's sisters, the Heliades, bewail him. In *Metamorphoses* 2.340-365, they become trees whose tears turn to amber. This is one story, but it might count as two, if you base your enumeration on metamorphoses and distinguish—as neither Lactantius nor Arnulf, for example, does—the metamorphosis of girls into trees from the metamorphosis of tears into amber. Now Bersuire does extract two *fabulae*, but not in the way I have just outlined. He tells the same story twice, once as *fabula* 7 and then again as *fabula* 8, each time covering the same portion of the *Metamorphoses* but each time highlighting different details. Here is *fabula* 7:

> While Phaethon's sisters were bewailing his death, suddenly they were changed into trees. Their feet, sticking to the ground, were changed to roots, and by the roots his aforementioned sisters were stopped in their tracks. Wrapped in bark, their arms changed to branches, they were totally transformed into trees.     (1509, f.24.H)

Compare the summary listed as *fabula* 8:

> While Phaethon's sisters, daughters of the sun, were being changed into trees, bark covered their whole body except their face and mouth. Thus they still called for their mother's help and spoke like women. As Ovid says: "Only the mouths calling mother remained" [*Met.* 2.355]. But finally the bark covered their faces and they were totally turned into trees. They lost their human shape and voice and had the form of trees. And, according to Ovid, this is the tree from which, saplike, amber drips. "Whence flowed the tears, and the amber which has dripped from the new branches grows hard in the sun" [*Met.* 2.364-65]. (1509, ff. 24-25.I)

The two different "stories" inspire completely different moralizations. One sees this first *mutatio* (7) every day in the case of greedy people. Many men are "women" in their youth, carnal, that is, and loving luxury. But over the course of time they are made trees, i.e., avaricious men. The foot of affection is made a root insofar as it is placed by love in the ground, that is, in earthly goods. The outer bark of bad associations and bad habit covers them, and thus the devil changes them into trees, men, that is, who are not compassionate but rather insensible. Thus they are like the bad tree that does not bear good fruit, which Matthew 3 teaches us by rights should be burnt (1509, f. 24.I). However, the same episode, retold under the rubric of *fabula* 8, is the basis of another interpretation altogether: Such are many religious, who are human only in face and mouth, that is, appearance and speech, e.g., hypocrites, whose whole body and life and conscience are wooden, that is, unfeeling (1509, f. 25.K).[35]

Bersuire maintained that, as far as their interpretability and their utility for the preacher are concerned, the fables of the poets and the mysteries of scripture (as well as the wonders of the natural world) were on the same footing. As the following, final example of the interpretive consequences of segmentation and paraphrase shows, Bersuire performs the same operations on the Biblical text he does on Ovid's. (For the sake of economy in the following section, I will either summarize or paraphrase [!] in English or quote in Latin only from the sixteenth book of the *Reductorium*.)

The narrative of the destruction of Sodom is part of the story of God's special relationship to Abraham. The stories of Abraham and his kinsman Lot are bound together, and this portion of Genesis itself exhibits imbedded narratives of almost Ovidian complexity.[36] The sixteenth book of the *Reductorium* is divided into books corresponding to the Biblical books, and then into chapters of "moralities." At first it seems there will be one Berchorian chapter for every Biblical chapter, but this correspondence soon breaks down. Or rather, even though Bersuire skips Biblical chapters, he still attempts to give the impression that each of his chapters corresponds to a Biblical chapter. They do only very roughly. So *Reductorium* 16.1.14 is entitled "Capitulum decimum octavum. Textus. Apparuit autem ei Dominus in convalle Mambre. Moralitatum cap. xiv" (1712, I.8). As the quotation of Gen. 18.1 indicates, this is indeed Gen. 18. But Bersuire's chapter 14 reorganizes Gen. 18, which focusses on Abraham, so that it now is about Sodom. As a consequence of this reorientation, some of the narrative under this chapter heading includes events of Gen. 19.

Each chapter of book 16 is structured like a book (or chapter) of book 15: an alternation of narrative summary and one or more moralizations. It would be improper to call these narrative summaries *fabulae*, although they have precisely the same function. The first summary begins "Sodomitae populi pessimi dicebantur, qui scilicet, per horribilem infectionem luxuriae, viris abutebantur" (1712, I.8), and goes on to narrate the Genesis story as far as the interview between God and Abraham in which Abraham convinces God to

promise to save Sodom if ten just Sodomites can be found. This receives five explanations.[37] In the second portion of narrative Bersuire backs up tó the beginning of Gen. 18 to describe the sending of the three angels, Abraham's reception of them, his washing of their feet, the feast he provides them, and their promise of the birth of Isaac. This spawns two explanations: (1) Abraham is man, the washing of feet confession, and the shade of the tree the refreshing memory of the cross. (2) Abraham is God the father or a prelate who invites angels, that is, holy and just men, to the washing of confession.

The next narrative begins with the reception of the angels in Sodom, which in Genesis marks the beginning of chapter 19. According to Bersuire's account, Lot not only offers the Sodomites his daughters (Gen. 19.8) but his wife as well. This summary covers the blinding of the Sodomites by the angels so that they can't find the door to Lot's house, continues to the unbelief of his daughters' fiancés, and concludes with the destruction of the city (n.b., singular). This is rich in signification: (1) "Istud enim poterit allegari sine altera expositione ad tria, videlicet quod in peccato contra naturam mens hominis plus quam aliis vitiis excoecatur. Tales enim homines ducuntur coecitate percuti . . . ." The door they, in their blindness, cannot find is the door of paradise. "Et propter hoc Sodoma bene interpretatur muta, quia, scilicet, tales in judicio erunt muti pro eo quod excusationem non habebunt. Ps. 30[.19] Muta fiant labia dolore." (2) "Item allegari potest quod minus malum tolerandum est pro majori malo vitando, sicut Loth prostitutionem uxoris & filiarum sustinere volebat, ut crimen Sodomiticum vitaretur." (3) Lot's sons-in-law exemplify the fact that it is impossible for one to escape death after the hidden providence of God has determined to punish him (with reference to Ecclesiastes 7.14). (4) "Vel allega ista exemplariter ad bonum hospitalitatis" (with reference to Hebrews 13.2).

The first summary of the next chapter, "Capitulum decimum nonum. Textus. Veneruntque duo Angeli Sodomam vespere. Mortalitatum Cap. xv" (1712, I.9), begins: "Cum Deus civitatem Sodomae cum aliis quatuor . . . ." This first summary narrates the escape of Lot, his wife, and his daughters to the safety of a mountain, the command not to look back, and the sulphuric firestorm from heaven, for which Bersuire cites the authority of Solinus.[38] Lot's wife does turn and for her disobedience is changed into a pillar of salt. This introduces one long moralization, beginning "Civitates istae mundum designant." Recall that in no summary in the preceding chapter had there been any mention of the other cities of the plain, even though Gomorrah is mentioned at Gen. 18.20. I take it that the plurality of the cities is somehow more indicative óf the "world" than a singular city; this is neither logical nor strictly essential, but seems to be at play here. Opposing this world is the mount of religion, perfection and contemplation. We must not look back at the things of the world; nonetheless, some, like Lot's wife, cannot resist the temptations of the world. These religious abandon the contemplative life, the mountain, for the valley of the world.

By now we have learned to expect that the details of the interpretation are

adjusted to square with the details of the narrative. In the following section, which I quote in full, I believe we have a clear example of the reverse, a case where a predetermined interpretation has caused Bersuire to misread, or misrepresent, his original. "Cum Loth de Sodomis fugeret, ne igne & sulphure deperiret, petiit a domino quod liceret sibi civitatem Segor parvulam introiere; sed quia ibi fiebat creberrimus terrae motus, necesse habuit exinde fugere, & ad montem ascendere & ibi se salvare" (1712, I.9). Now as I understand Gen. 19.17-23, Lot never goes to the mountain. The angels instruct him to, but in 19.19 he tells them he will not be able to; he asks whether it would not be sufficient for him to go only as far as the nearby city (19.20). The Lord agrees, and it is to this city, Segor, that Lot proceeds and is saved. But for Bersuire, the mountain is holy, so Lot must go both to the city (as the Bible has it) and to the mountain. Only thus can Bersuire ground the three-stage career of the religious who passes from Sodom, pure carnality, to Segor, married life (despite the fact that Lot's own wife didn't make it that far), to the mountain of the contemplative life, whether in the church or the cloister. Thus:

> Sodoma est vita carnalis, quae igne & sulphure luxuriae foetet. Segor vita conjugalis, quae terrae motus multarum sollicitudinum sustinet, mons vero est vita contemplativa & Ecclesiastica vel claustralis, quae stabilis & tuta manet. Psalm 36. Loth igitur qui interpretatur declinans, est ille qui iuxta Psalmistae consilium, declinat a malo ut faciat bonum, qui scilicet ignem & sulphur carnalis vitae fugit, & in Segor, id est, in statu conjugali tutus manere credit. Sed finaliter attento, motu tentationum, tribulationum & miseriarum istius civitatis, ad montem religionis vel Ecclesiae ascendit, & sic a carnali inflammatione se liberat & evadit. Esa. 2[.3] Venite ad montem domini.

Neither chapter nor Lot's career is over. For, as Bersuire narrates, while in Sodom Lot was good and never gave way to lechery or drunkenness, nevertheless, when he reached the mountain he committed "incestum & adulterium" with his own daughters. The lesson of this tale is clear. Thus today many come from the valley to the mountain, that is, from the world to religion, or from secular to ecclesiastical ranks. And while they think they are escaping perdition and can find salvation there, giving way to luxury they become worse and all the more run the risk of perdition.

## (4) Intertextuality of Interpretation

Let me return to the last example but one, the case of Segor and the mountain. Is there not something besides Bersuire's particular interpretive bent at work here? Note that the explanation concludes with a tag from Isaiah 2, "Come to the mountain of the Lord."[39] Could it be that it was the Biblical text for which Bersuire was aiming, Isaiah 2.3, that caused him to twist the Biblical text from which he began, Gen. 19.17-23?

It would be rash to propose this on the basis of one instance alone. But in

fact, this very striking case of the spark that flies when one Biblical text is brought into conjunction with another can be paralleled not only through every part of the *Reductorium,* but in fact in almost all the texts of the genre. The *Physiologus* is the ultimate ancestor of the first fourteen books of the *Reductorium* and the entire intervening series of Christianized *de naturis rerum* or *de mirabilibus mundi.*[40] God, as creator of the visible world, wrote a book of nature that, when "read" properly—that is, according to His creatures' various properties and qualities—can yield a variety of allegorical, tropological, and anagogic senses of value to the Christian. But how are we to know what properties or qualities are significant? Not consistently in every section of the *Physiologus,* but frequently enough to suggest a significant tendency, it seems as if it is the range of scriptural references to each creature that determines at least some of the properties to be explained. Does the Psalmist say that the hart panteth after water (Ps. 41[42].2)? Then one of the properties of a hart is that it pants after water. And this has a meaning. Does Jeremiah say that the partridge sits on eggs it does not hatch (17.11)? This has a meaning, too.

In its purest form (which no version of the *Physiologus,* I hasten to add, exhibits, not even the Greek "original"), one text, scripture, would serve as a grid through which the interpreter would peer at the other text, the book of nature. This is of course a special case, for the book of nature is a very unusual book; furthermore, both texts are by God. In this model there is an implicit tension: Which text is glossing the other—in other words, which is the master, which the slave? Is not everything that a Christian needs to know about nature ("needs" in terms of salvation) in the Bible, or can natural history add any information to the Truth that is scripture? The idea of a book of nature is one way to begin to answer that second question in the affirmative.

In book 15 of the *Reductorium,* given the source of the material, the procedure of viewing one text through the lens of another becomes particularly interesting. For there also it is Bersuire's habit to conclude many of his moralizations with a Biblical tag.[41] In this way the *Ovidius moralizatus* rehearses hundreds of times, in fact probably a thousand times, the reinscription of the Biblical and Christian on the Ovidian and classical. This may appear to be that dearly beloved object of desire, the palimpsest, but does the analogy square? The Bible had long since effaced pagan letters in Christian Europe. It would seem that what we have here is a case of re-telling Ovid in order to map the Bible onto it yet once again. This seems to have been a recurrent habit; the *Ecloga Theoduli* is another example, perhaps the most influential, since it was widely used as a school text in the high and late Middle Ages and into the Renaissance.[42] Yet when one comes to Bersuire, one must indeed raise a question: What is being told, at this late date, for the sake of hearing what? Not to rescue the analogy, but to make a suggestive comparison with palimpsests, in the high and late Middle Ages one can find examples of lectionaries or patristic authors scraped clean to make way for a classical text.[43]

The sense of pitting one text against another is particularly keen in book

15, not only because each *fabula* represents a portion of Ovid's text, but because Bersuire concludes many of them with a brief quotation from the *Metamorphoses* itself, introduced by one of several tags: "Vnde Ouid" or simply "Ouid." Considering his use of "textus" for the Biblical text in the chapter headings in book 16, it is telling that after book 1, fable 8, Ovid's words are introduced with "Vnde textus" (1509, f. 20.K).

For the sake of efficiency, I limit my few examples to *fabulae* and moralizations already cited. The words in which Phoebus is described as those boasting of their virtues (1509, f. 19.I) turn out to be an echo of Judith 6.15. Thus at the beginning and end of the interpretation, the phrase "de virtute glorian-tes" rings out. Of course, despite Bersuire's intentions, it is the Biblical citation which, merely by virtue of appearing further along in the text, becomes the echo.

In the case of the longest *fabula* about Io, the third (book 1, *fabula* 12), there are several examples. Of these, no doubt the oddest is that Bersuire thinks to link Mercury as flatterer with Paul, who by his own admission "has been all things to all men" (1 Cor. 9.22). In the last of the Io fables (15), Io is a quiet religious. In support of wisdom and silence, Bersuire cites Proverbs 17.28 and Amos 5.13. Phaethon's sisters, turned into trees and moralized as greedy, pleasure-loving and hardened men, recall the tree that bears no good fruit in Matthew 3.10.

No doubt these Biblical hints would have been helpful to preachers. In our eyes, however, the very fact that the Biblical tags are so pedestrian, the connections not so much strained (they are that) as jejune, allows Ovid to emerge as the victor in the contest for textual dominance. As for the intertex-tual nature of all interpretation, the thesis I boldly proclaimed above, and no doubt an interesting topic: Even if you could prove it by Bersuire, you wouldn't want to.


## (5) *Bersuire's* Allegari *and the End of Interpretation*

If Bersuire is unenthusiastic about his scriptural *loci* in book 15, he is anything but when it comes to interpretation. The exuberance with which he describes the activity of the commentator borders on the scandalous, for those at least who expect commentators to be meek and subservient to the texts they serve. To begin with, the potential for meaning, for multiple and even contradictory significations, is endless. He himself speaks of the diversity of ways in which the material can be moralized, depending only on the applica-tion of the explicator's "ingenium."[44]

Bersuire the compiler always wants more. The addition of material from the French *Ovide moralisé* is often cited, but not as I wish to here, as a sign of Bersuire's Faustian *Tätigkeit*. When he first wrapped up book 15, he had heard about the French poem and regretted not being able to get hold of a copy (1509, f. 1v). Eventually he did, and he incorporated some of its moralizations in a

second version. Consider in the same vein the ceaseless tinkering, the "labor" of which he speaks repeatedly. The appropriation of new material, and the potential assimilation of even more material, is already foreseen in the open-ended series, potentially infinite, of "vel dic"'s. There is no such thing as too much. Overfullness, overinterpretation is impossible. There will be no moment to which he'll say, "Enough."

The terms he uses to describe his activities are most illuminating. Not just "significat" or "potest significare," "exponi" or "possunt exponi"—the latter of each pair already more Berchorian, since it suggests the potential of signification— but vivid terms: "reducere," "extrahi," "vtitur."[45] I find interesting the families of words that involve turning or bending (e.g., "conuertere," perhaps "applicare" and "applicari potest"), gathering ("colligat"), and joining ("adjungo").[46]

If any term seems to have been a particular favorite of Bersuire's, it is "allegare." "Allegare," "allega," most frequently "potest allegari"—one finds them all, not only in book 15 but in book 16 as well and throughout the *Reductorium*. It is a suggestive word, for a number of reasons. From "ad" and "legare," it meant first "to appoint" (a person), then to "adduce, allege."[47] In the examples cited above from book 16, on Gen. 18, we had the series "Istud enim poterit allegari sine altera expositione," "Item allegari potest quod" (twice), and finally "Vel allega ista exemplariter ad bonum hospitalitatis" (1712, I.9). We might translate these "This could be related" or "adduced without any additional explication," "Again it can be alleged" or "affirmed that," and "Or adduce these things as examples of the good of hospitality," respectively. We see how flexible a word this was for Bersuire. A more problematic usage, though common in Bersuire, appears in the *Ovidius moralizatus*, book 2, *fabula* 17, of the crow turned black: "Istud potest allegari de bonis monialibus & religiosis . . ." (1509, f. 27.T). Presumably we should translate, "This [sc. fable] can be adduced" or "can be alleged of good nuns and religious." There is a legal ring to it, not only in English, but in classical and medieval Latin, and in the Romance languages with which Bersuire was familiar.[48] Is there not something· of the advocate about Bersuire in the *Reductorium*? It is almost as if the particular Ovidian story was being adduced as evidence in a court of law, not merely in support of a principle, as in the case of the examples from book 15, but to indict bad prelates or defend bad princes, or what have you.[49]

So far the literal. The rest is "allegary."

What is allegary? An irresponsible etymologist of the Isidorian stamp might attempt a play on "allegari" and allegory. Of course, there is no connection: "Allegoria" is a Greek noun, "allegari" the present passive infinitive of a Latin verb.[50] Bersuire rarely writes the noun "allegoria," but often instructs his users, "Dic allegorice." But however frequently Bersuire has either phrase in proximity to "allega" or "allegari potest/possunt," he never lets on that the idea of making a connection ever entered his mind. But such a link would have been within the grasp of medieval etymology, at least

theoretically, and I continue to look.[51]

Another connection, still a ghost or echo, may perhaps appear more plausible. It is at least all Latin. In the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (*TLL*), s.v. "allego," one reads: "in codd. passim confunditur cum 'alligare' 'allegere' 'allicere.'"[52] It seems inevitable that in particular "allegare" and "alligare," "to bind together," would be confused. Indeed, a text composed to help readers and scribes make just this distinction, reads: "Alligare est rem rei coniungere, allegare causam iudicibus innotescere vel gestum monimentis publicis inserere."[53] Good students will not have fallen prey to this confusion. But there is a potential danger in the warning, "Remember not to confuse." It can bind even two opposites together in the mind: *a contrariis* was long a famous, indeed an infamous, form of etymology.[54]

Again, Bersuire knows the difference between "binding" and "adducing" or "alleging," and never to my knowledge confused them or played on them. Yet the connection is even more tantalizing than in the case of "allegoria," since "linking" and "joining" two disparate elements is precisely what Bersuire's interpretation is all about. He does in fact use "adiungam" and "colligo" (examples above). At the very least one might say that in Bersuire's interpretive mode, "linking" is an important part of "adducing." I certainly hear this ghost in Bersuire's "allegare," for example, when, in the prologue to the *Reductorium*, describing the immense labor of working through the Bible to construct his *opus*, he writes, "I labored then first and foremost, working through the text of the Bible four times, so that without concordances I might be able to 'allege' figures, authorities and histories, checking them with extreme care."[55] Subsequently, in the "Collatio pro fine operis," he writes of the *Repertorium*, "I have included only those words more pregnant [of meaning], more useful, and richer in 'authorities' and 'allegations.'"[56]

Certainly this family of words calls for more investigation, both in Latin and in medieval vernacular texts. Bersuire's "authorities and allegations" seems to find an analogue in Chaucer, who twice pairs "auctóritee" and "allegge,"[57] and one further time "autor" and "alegge." This last case is particularly tantalizing, and our speculations on Bersuire may complicate its interpretation. "Chaucer," the narrator of the *House of Fame*, in the midst of his account of the story of Dido and Eneas he saw engraved, assures the reader of the correctness of Dido's lament, which he has just quoted, by saying, "In suche wordes gan to pleyne / Dydo of hir grete peyne, / As me mette redely; / Non other auctor alegge I" (I.311-314). A dream his only authority? Of course the authority he should "allege," i.e., adduce, is Vergil, since the brass table he dreams has written on it, "I wol now singen, yif I kan, / The armes, and also the man . . ." (I.143f.). But Vergil is not the only authority: There is Ovid (i.e., *Heroides* 7). And what Chaucer does to these two very different accounts might be described as "alligare," "to link." In fact, "Chaucer" blithely sends any readers who might be interested in knowing more details of Dido's death and final speech, to Vergil or Ovid (I.378f.), despite the fact that these are two very different treatments. Chaucer, I think, is not only having his fun with the

adducing of authorities, but with the linking of incommensurable ones as well.

In a 1517 printing of the *Morale reductorium super totam Bibliam,* in other words, *Reductorium* book 16, the prologue three times replaces "moralizare" with "mortalizare":

> Restat post mortalisatas proprietates creaturarum figuras: necnon superadditas expositiones morales aenigmatum poetarum: mortalisare & exponere figuras & parabolas scripturarum . . . . Dignum mihi uisum est unum tractulum de mortalisatione aliquarum figurarum Bibliae huic operi meo inserere: & paucas e multis eligere: & praeter expositiones omnes quae positae sunt a doctoribus & a glo(sa) aliquam moralem expositionem: ad creatoris laudem & gloriam ordinare.[58]

Who can argue with the essential brilliance of certain mistakes, *lapsus linguae* or *lapsus pennae*? In a way "moralizations" are "mortalizations." Again, *TLL* reports not infrequent manuscript confusion (of "moralis" and "mortalis").[59] And yet, among all the medieval etymologizing I know on "mors" and "mortalis," I have yet to find this play.[60]

Of course, by any orthodox interpretations, moralizations are intended to be, and are, "immortalizations." Yet given his interpretive inventiveness, "ingenium" as he calls it, Bersuire or any other could have found it. As Bersuire makes us realize, the text is inexhaustible. That is both bracing and problematic. Is there no limit, either to the number or range of interpretations, the number of "allegations"? Bersuire's work of "alleging"— adducing and linking—continued unabated until his death. He seems to have been untroubled by the possibility of infinitely postponable closure, permanent incompleteness. Nor, within a framework of orthodox belief, need this be scandalous. Given the relative capacities of reader and author, humans are never likely to come to the end of reading and interpreting His book, whether book of nature or sacred scripture.

Not long after Bersuire's death, within twenty years at most, a subtler, keener mind, and more critical "alleger," meditated on the tradition of learning and the fables of poets. The third book of Chaucer's *House of Fame* may be read as Chaucer's critique of that unending accumulation of information and "alleging" Bersuire's *Reductorium* represents. As crazy as Fame's house is, there is still some method to her madness; either she or the narrator has been able to organize it in an at least communicable fashion. But the House of Rumor, the whirling structure of twigs that "Chaucer" compares with the "Domus Dedaly, / That Laboryntus cleped ys" (III.1920f.), defeats him. The noise is deafening. True tidings and false are inextricably mixed. In the midst of this insanity, Chaucer rushes to hear a man, unnamable, who "semed for to be / A man of gret auctorite" (III.2157f.). Notoriously, the poem ends at this point.

Is this a break in transmission or the promised end? Debates about "segmentation" aside, the text we have suggests that the unceasing accumu-

lation of information leads to cacophony and then silence. There is no ultimate authority except by accident, when an interpreter's life or text breaks off. One end is as abrupt and unforeseeable as the other. Perhaps, then, this "man of gret auctorite" is simply the next authority a Bersuire is always seeking to allege.

YALE UNIVERSITY

# APPENDIX OF TEXTS

## (1)
### *PETRI BERCHORII IN REDUCTORIUM SUUM MORALE, PROLOGVS*[61]

"Videte, quoniam non solum mihi laboravi, sed omnibus exquirentibus veritatem." Eccl. 24 [47].[62] . . . Circa conditionem operis notandum est, quod labores mei nihil aliud sunt, quam quaedam morales reductiones, quaedamqùe proprietatum moralizationes, & quaedam exemplares applicationes, quibus sc. conditiones virtutum & vitiorum possint ostendi, & quibus exemplis & figuris mediantibus, possint illa quae ad fidem & mores pertinent, manu duci. Et sic dico, quod in isto opere, proprietates rerum, figmenta poetarum, aenigmata scripturarum sint pro materia, applicatio vero ad mores, est pro forma; Deus est ibi pro causa efficienti, salus vero animarum est ibi pro causa finali.[63] Circa distinctionem vero notantur, quod generaliter labores mei in tria distiguuntur sc. moralitates, distinctiones seu divisiones, & iń themata & collationes. Est ergo primum opus meum circa moralitates simpliciter, ad finem scilicet, quod ad omne propositum póssit homo proprietates rerum adducere, & moralizàtas, expositas & applicatas ad omne quod voluerit, invenire. Et sic dico, q́uod ista prima pars continet librum de proprietatibus rerum, diversos libros muńdi mirabilium, fabulas, & aenigmata poetarum, quasdam̀ figuras sanctaŕum scripturarum. Ista enim omnia a me sunt excerpta, & ad mores etiam applicata, & propter operis quantitatem, in duo volumina sunt distincta. Secunda pars laborum meorum, circa materias tam literales quam morales, generaliter versatur, & secundum ordinem concordantiàrum Bibliae omnia vocabula per ordinem exponuntur, necnon secundum quod ad diversa possunt applicari proposita. Nunc autem per distinctiones, nunc per exemplorum inductionés, nunc per figurarum & proprietatum applicationes, nunc per auctóritatum divisiones, & per concordantiarum tam Bibliae quaḿ originalium multiplices adductionés, dicta vocabula dissecantur, ut sic quicunque de quórunque vocabulo praedicare vel collationem facere decreverit, & quocuḿque modo ipsum vocabulum volvere, vel

accipere voluerit, totum paratum & ordinatum inveniat, quod loquatur. Et ista etiam necesse est quod in duo volumina distinguatur . . . .[64]

Ultra librum autem de proprietatibus cum suis additionibus & adjunctis, tres particulares tractatus huic volui operi superaddere, & ad utilitatem legentium superioribus aggregare, videlicet quendam tractatum, qui intitulatur: de naturae mirabilibus [= 14], qui est de reductione fabularum, et poetarum poematibus [=15], alium vero qui est de expositione, & moralizatione figurarum, & scripturarum aenigmatibus [=16]. Istorum vero trium tractatuum ordinem, qui plenus scire voluerit, videat prologos, qui cuilibet istorum tractuum praeponuntur, in quibus de istorum librorum ordine magis plene tractatur. Nec moveat quemcunque, si in dictis libris de mirabilibus & de fabulis, multa extranea, quae forte falsitatis habent effigiem, multaque paganorum figment[a] apposuerim, & ad mores duxerim, ut est dictum; sed attendat, quod Aegyptiorum thesauri pro· aedificando tabernaculo fuerunt necessarij, & mulier pagana, si in praelio capiebatur, post lotionem aquae & unguium sectionem, poterat ab Hebraeo uxor accipi, & ad populum Israel aggregari.[65] Qua propter male non credo facere, si thesaurum Aegypti; mulierumque paganam id est poetarum & philosophorum, necnon gentilium & paganorum doctrinam accipio, & si ungues, id est, errores & superfluitates aufero, & si per reductiones, moralizationes & applicationes, ipsam in Israeliticam transfero vel converto. Adhuc autem circa ordinem huius operis est notandum, quod proprietates cujuslibet animalis, vel etiam alterius cujuslibet rei, in plures paragraphos distinguuntur, secundum quod diversae illius conditiones, ad unum vel ad aliud propositum, applicabiles videbantur. Plerumque etiam fit quod idem textus vel idem paragraphus pluribus & diversis modis exponitur, secundum quod per diversos modos accipiendi, nunc in bono, nunc in malo, nunc allegorice, nunc mystice, exponibilis putabatur.[66]

. . . & sic finitur ordo libri de rerum proprietatibus. Quartus decimus agit de naturae mirabilibus. Quintus decimus agit de poetarum fabulis & aenigmatibus. Sextus decimus vero agit de figuris Bibliae & earum expositionibus. Et sic patet ordo hujus Reductorij, quantum ad numerum suarum partium, & librorum. Advertendum tamen, quod postquam hoc opus reductorij penitus complevissem, quoddam volumen, quod intitulabatur de moralizatione libri de proprietatibus rerum, meas venit ad manus, in quo quidem non omnes libri, sed aliqui, & etiam non omnium capitulorum littera, sed aliquae proprietates de quolibet excerpuntur, quae procul dubio in locis pluribus notabiliter exponuntur. Paucas tamen proprietates accipit, quibus in locis suis quasi protracte utitur, & deinde adjunctis alijs materijs, in quolibet capitulo vel paragrapho multipliciter se extendit. Quem quidem librum, quia multa eleganter ibi exposita videbantur, totum volui perlegere, & siquid inveni quod non primitus posuissem in suo loco, statui in breviloquio collocare. Patet igitur, quod ad quatuor debet lector attendere, ut visum est, scilicet ad operis ordinationem, nominationem, distinctionem, & conditionem, quae quidem attentio ostensa est, cum dictum est. Videte, ut & sic ad attendendum omnes

generaliter invitem, dicens illud Thren. 10.[67] "O vos omnes qui transitis per viam, attendite & videte." Igitur dico quod hic excitatur attentio providi lectoris. 'Videte inquio. Secundo principaliter dico, quod hic recitatur afflictio ingentis sudoris, & hoc ostenditur dum dicitur laboravi. Et vere laboravi, & opera plena operibus & utinam utilibus incipere, volui, & ut verum fatear, ab ipsis primordijs juventutis, & ab ipsa janua vitae meae in laboribus plurimis, in poenis & miserijs superfui. Laboravi enim in gemitu meo, lavi quandoque lachrymis lectum meum, sciens quod ille qui laborem & dolorem considerat, nunquam ut communiter sine legitimo certamine, & sine bonis operibus coronam dat. Laboravi igitur primo & ante omnia, Bibliae textum quater studendo, ut sic sine concordantijs allegare scirem, figuras, auctoritates, & historias, diligentissime consignando. Laboravi postea librum illum de .proprietatibus cum alijs, qui de naturis rerum tractabant, diligentur videndo, & quicquid potui retinendo. Laboravi post haec audaciam moralizandi sumendo, & in hoc annis plurimis attendendo, dictas rerum naturas, ad mores (sicut dictum est) applicando, formam quoque & ordinem eis dando. Laboravi insuper, opus magis arduum & difficile, quod repertorium morale vocavi, aggrediendo, & ibi quasi per quinquennium insudando. Laboro vero nunc haec omnia corrigendo, & semper aliquid utile in diversis locis & materijs aggregando. Laborabo vero postea opusculum breviarij moralis, collationum scilicet & thematum compilando, & illos labores meos sub isto triplici ordine consummando . . . .[68] Revera dico quod imo nunc est beatius laborare circa talia, quam tunc erat. Quia scilicet tunc illi corruptibilem sperabant mercedem, nos autem incorruptam. Illi gloriam acquirebant humanam, nos autem gratiam promeremur divinam. Illi suae providebat virtuti, nos autem animarum militamus saluti. Illi in mundo coronabantur hedera, nos autem in coelo coronabimur aeternae gloriae fibula vel corona. Illi declamabant & tragaediabant in theatris, nos autem declamamus in Ecclesijs, & etiam in nostris cordibus nobis ipsis. Et sic ergo concludo, quod beatum est & utile laborare, & se in bonis operibus occupare . . . .[69] Ergo igitur post excitatam lectoris attentionem, post recitatam laboris vexationem, post exemplificatam amoris intentionem seu affectionem, jam intendo opus hujus reductorij recipere, a Deo sumens exordium, a quo necesse est omne principium inchoare.

(2)

*[REDUCTORIUM MORALE]*
*LIBER DECIMUS QUARTUS, IN QUO DE NATURAE MIRABILIBUS,*
*PROLOGUS*[70]

Quia Deus quotidie facit magnalia in Aegypto, mirabilia in terra Cham, terribilia in mari Rubro, ita quod illi, qui navigant mare in navibus facientes operationes in aquis multis, ipsi viderunt opera Domini, & mirabilia eius in profundo: hinc est quod de mundi mirabilibus intendo aliqua dicere, ipsaque ad mores, ad spiritualem intelligentiam reducere, ut sic quanto ipsae res magis novae, mirabiles, & insolitae praedicantur, tanto possint animam plus

movere, ut & sic natura hominum (quae secundum Pli. li. 12 [for "2"] c. 1 novitatis est avida) de inauditis rebus & insolitis admiretur, & tandem morali expositione percepta, in Dei laudem amplius elevetur. Moralizare ergo intendo secundum titulos regionum, quibus asscribentur ipsa mirabilia. Sed quia multa sunt, de quibus nescio in quibus regionibus fiunt, cum nomina regionum quae ponuntur a doctoribus nunc, ut communiter sint mutata, ideo post titulos regionum ipsa mirabilia sub particularibus rerum titulis finaliter distinguere, dignum duxi. Ista igitur quae hic pono, una cum infinitis aliis, quae supra in titulis diversis de rerum proprietatibus assignavi, inveni in Plinio, Soli(no), & Gervasio, in libris de voluminibus eorum. Notandum tandem, quod non intendo moralizare mirabilia fantastica, sed realiter in natura existentia, atque vera. Veruntamen dicerem, & moralizarem aliqua de phantasiis, de quibus mirabilia ponit Gervasius, nisi quia nescio an sint res in natura existentes, vel daemones hominibus illudentes . . . .[71] Ista stupenda & mirabilia videntur & moralizatione digna, nisi quia ignotum est, utrum sint daemonum illusiones, vel aliquarum rerum nobis incognitarum generationes, vel aliquae frivolae hominum fictiones. Melius ergo arbitror de istis tacere, quam de ipsis aliqua narrative asserere, ne forte videar fabulas hominum, vel etiam opera daemonum pro naturali veritate narrare. Ista ergo ad praesens omittam, nisi forte quando de fabulis poetarum tractabo, inseram aliquid de praemissis. Dicendum ergo puto de mirabilibus, & primo secundum ordinem regionum.

## (3)
## OPUS REDUCTORII MORALIS SUPER TOTA BIBLIA PROOEMIVM[72]

Cum jam preopacam[73] naturae silvam, flores proprietatum lecturus, percurrerim, & ipsius rerum naturae majestate scrutata, post laborum & sudorum molestias, jam appropinquem ad littus: Restat post moralisatas[74] proprietates creaturarum figuras, necnon superadditas expositiones morales aenigmatum poetarum, moralisare[75] & exponere figuras & parabolas scripturarum. Quia enim scriptum est, quod "auditor sapiens animadvertet parabolam & interpretationem: Verba sapientum & aenigmata eorum, occultaque Proverbiorum exquiret, & in absconditis parabolarum conuersabitur."[76] Dignum mihi uisum est unum tractulum de moralisatione[77] aliquarum figurarum Bibliorum[78] huic operi meo inserere, & paucas e multis eligere, & praeter expositiones omnes, quae positae sunt a doctoribus & a glossa aliquam moralem expositionem, ad creatoris laudem & gloriam ordinare. Protestor igitur, quod non intendo me intromittere vel curare de vero & litterali intellectu figurarum, historiarum[79] & aenigmatum. Cum re vera tenuitatem ingenii mei non deceat, quod mittat ad tam ardua manum suam, praesertim cum Sancti doctores nihil intactum voluerunt dimittere, nec justum sit, quod nitar Solem facibus adjuvare. Solum ergo aliquas figuras magis notabiles eligere intendo, quas solum superficialiter, quantum ad simplicium informationem utiles judicauero, ad mores applicare propono. Nec omnia quae

ponam hic, mihi attribuo, quinimo[80] multorum dicta me confiteor, & in multis
passibus ipsorum me verbis vel sententiis uti humiliter recognosco. Nun-
quam enim mihi placuit alienam gloriam mihi attribuere, nec aliorum ingeniis
derogare. Scio enim quod unusquisque in suo sensu abundat secundum
Apostolorum.[81] Et ideo non ignoro, quod homini naturaliter displicit, si alius
eius labores & opera sibi attribuat & ascribat, & alieno pallio sese tegat.


## NOTES

1. Bohr for complementarity, Heisenberg for uncertainty. Even the trio has become some-
thing of a cliché. Cf. David Bleich, *Subjective Criticism* (Baltimore, 1978), esp. pp. 10-37.

2. "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory," in H. R. Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic
of Reception,* tr. T. Bahti (Minneapolis, 1982), pp. 3-45, here p. 36; the original 1967 lecture,
"Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft," first in *Konstanzer Univer-
sitätsreden,* ed. G. Hess (Konstanz, ¹1967; ²1969), was reprinted in Jauss, *Literaturgeschichte als
Provokation* (Frankfurt, 1970), pp. 168-206; abridged, it appeared in Rainer Warning, ed., *Rezep-
tionsästhetik. Theorie und Praxis* (Munich, 1975), pp. 126-162, and in E. Benzinger's English
translation, in *New Literary History,* 2 (1970), 7-37, and *New Directions in Literary History,* ed.
Ralph Cohen (Baltimore, 1974), pp. 11-42.

3. Among the many treatments of the late antique period, critical for establishing the terms
of the ongoing debate, are: H. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity,* trans. G. Lamb (New
York, 1964); H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics* (Göteborg, 1958); C. N. Cochrane,
*Christianity and Classical Culture. A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine*
(Oxford, 1940); and Robin Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (Harmondsworth, 1986). Two
collections of essays are A. Momigliano, ed., *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in
the Fourth Century* (Oxford, 1963); and J. W. Binns, ed., *Latin Literature of the Fourth Century*
(London, 1974). The studies which treat the issue or some aspect of it in the succeeding centuries
are legion. For Bersuire's milieu, we are fortunate to have Beryl Smalley, *English Friars and
Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1960). Throughout, in the case of topics or
concepts adduced in passing, I will limit reference to one or two fairly recent sources selected to
provide interested readers with basic orientation and further bibliography.

4. Considerations of space and scale preclude a full account of research; for work to 1964,
readers may consult J. Engels, "Berchoriana I: Notice bibliographique sur Pierre Bersuire,
supplément au *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi,*" *Vivarium,* 2 (1964), 62-124, annotated and
with supplementary bibliography on many other authors and topics, so that it is a superb
introduction to the entire field. The publications on Bersuire by Engels and his students at the
Instituut voor Laat Latijn in Utrecht, most of which appeared in *Vivarium* and are noted below,
themselves constitute the bulk of work on Bersuire in the past quarter century, and provide, for
the period from 1964 to Engels' death at least, reference to other scholarship, albeit unsystemat-
ically. For 1966, however, see Petrus Berchorius, *Reductorium morale, Liber XV: Ovidius morali-
zatus, cap. i, De formis figurisque deorum,* Textus e codice Brux., Bibl. Reg. 863-9 critice editus,
WERKMATERIAAL-3, Instituut voor Laat Latijn, Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht (Utrecht, 1966), p. III.
(For a bibliography of Engels' own work, see L. M. de Rijk, "In Memoriam Prof. Dr. Joseph Engels,"
*Vivarium,* 13 [1975], 99-102.) Engels, "Berchoriana I," must be used in conjunction with F.
Stegmüller, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi* (Madrid, 1940[=1950]-1961), 4.235-244. Indispen-
sable for the particular focus of this study (largely *Reductorium morale* 15) remain: Charles
Samaran (with the collaboration of J. Monfrin), "Pierre Bersuire, Prieur de Saint-Eloi de Paris
(1290?-1362)," *Histoire littéraire de la France,* 39 (1962), 259-450; J. Engels, *Études sur l'Ovide
moralisé* (Groningen, 1945); Fausto Ghisalberti, "L''Ovidius moralizatus' di Pierre Bersuire,"
*Studi romanzi,* 23 (1933), 5-136 (also *separatim* [Rome, 1933]—his introduction in my view is still
the most balanced overview of the *Ovidius moralizatus*); B. Hauréau, "Mémoire sur un commen-

taire des *Métamorphoses* d'Ovide," *Mémoires de l'Institut National de France, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 30 (1883), 45-55. Smalley's brief comments (*English Friars*, pp. 261-264) are characteristically insightful.

5. A facsimile of *Metamorphosis Ovidiana Moraliter a Magistro Thoma Walleys Anglico de professione praedicatorum sub sanctissimo patre Dominico explanata* (Paris, 1509), i.e., Bersuire, along with "Albricus" (Basel, 1543), with introductory notes by S. Orgel, was printed by Garland (New York, 1979); a transcription, with abbreviations expanded, had already appeared in two parts: *Reductorium morale. Liber XV, cap. I. De formis figurisque deorum naar de Parijse druuk van 1509*, Instituut voor Laat Latijn, Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht, WERKMATERIAAL [-1] (Utrecht, 1960), and *Reductorium morale. Liber XV, cap. II-XV, "Ovidius moralizatus," naar de Parijse druuk van 1509*, WERKMATERIAAL-2 (Utrecht, 1962). The Garland Series facsimile is likely to be more widely accessible, in the United States at least, and my references to the *Ovidius moralizatus* will be to it in the format "1509, folio.Section as marked in margins." (Earlier, Ghisalberti had published extensive selections ["L"Ovidius moralizatus,'" pp. 87-132].) The *Ovidius moralizatus* has also been translated into English and is available in microform or xerox from University Microfilms: William Donald Reynolds, "The *Ovidius moralizatus* of Petrus Berchorius: An Introduction and Translation," Diss., University of Illinois, 1971. The honor of being Bersuire's first English translator almost goes to William Caxton, who translated Colard Mansion's French prose version *Cy commence Ouide* (Bruges, 1484) but never published it; the last six books (as found in Cambridge manuscript Pepys 2124) were published by G. H. Hibbert for the Roxburghe Club in 1819 (Engels, "Berchoriana I," p. 83). But except for the prologues, Mansion's text is now a translation of the *Ovidius moralizatus* but a prose reworking of *Ovide moralisé* to which bits from *Ovidius moralizatus* (among other things) have been added (Engels, *Études*, pp. 38f.); moreover, since Mansion's title page attributes the text to Waleys, whatever Bersuire Caxton rendered (now lost), he did so inadvertently. To complicate matters still further (if that is possible), there were in fact multiple French prose translations of Bersuire's *Ovidius moralizatus*; to unravel this, begin with Engels, "Berchoriana I," p. 104.

6. WERKMATERIAAL-3; Maria S. van der Bijl, ed., "Petrus Berchorius, *Reductorium morale, Liber XV: Ovidius moralizatus, cap. ii*," *Vivarium*, 9 (1971), 25-48; cf., for a list of manuscripts, Josef Engels, "L'Édition critique de l'*Ovidius moralizatus* de Bersuire," *Vivarium*, 9 (1971), 19-24. Engels has published Bersuire's dedicatory epistle to the *Reductorium* to Pierre des Prés (a fourteenth-century manuscript in Prague serves as the base, with corrections and variants from the eight other manuscript witnesses and the only printed edition [Paris, 1521]): "La Lettre-dédicace de Bersuire à Pierre des Prés," *Vivarium*, 7 (1969), 62-72. In 1962 Charles Samaran pointed out a hitherto unknown account of his work Bersuire wrote within a few years of his death (Engels: 1359), the *Collatio pro fine operis*; it was edited by Maria S. van der Bijl after a close examination of the ten manuscripts of the *Repertorium morale* J. Monfrin listed for Samaran (Samaran, "Pierre Bersuire," pp. 302, 434f., 441f.; edition: Maria S. van der Bijl, "Berchoriana. La Collatio pro fine operis de Bersuire, édition critique," *Vivarium*, 3 [1965], 149-170). Bersuire seems to use "collacio" and "prologus" as synonyms, elsewhere at least; the conclusion of the dedicatory epistle to the *Reductorium* refers to the prologue that follows as "sequentem collacionem" (Engels, "Lettre-dédicace," p. 72; the Koblenz manuscript [C] reads in fact "prologum" [but Engels calls C "defective," p. 69]), and in the *Collatio pro fine operis* itself, he writes "quando collacionem seu prologum Reductorii mei feci" (van der Bijl, "La Collatio," p. 158, both singled out by Engels, "Lettre-dédicace," p. 62).

7. I have only recently realized how much my own work owes to the work of Stanley Fish, which I read as a graduate student. Lest I commit further sins of omission, cf. "Interpreting 'Interpreting the Variorum'": "Professor Bush . . . views it [the *Variorum* commentary on Milton] as a document, while I view it as a text . . . . I am extending the scope of interpretation to include the interpreters themselves . . . ." In *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge, Mass., 1980), p. 175 (originally *Critical Inquiry*, 3 [1976], 183- 190).

8. *Ovid and Medieval Schooling. Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's Ars Amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto and Epistulae Heroidum*, Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung, 38 (Munich, 1986).

9. Cf. Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities. Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986).

10. While the basic facts of Bersuire's revisions of the *Reductorium* have long been known—Bersuire discusses this too in his successive prefaces—it required the exhaustive labor of Joseph Engels to establish firmly the relationships among versions on the basis of extant manuscripts and printed editions. In Engels' words, "ayant écrit un livre, il ne cessait d'y revenir l'amplifier" (WERKMATERIAAL-3, p. III). Bersuire's method of composition and his conceptualization of his own role must be seen in the context of medieval theories of authorship and compilation; cf. A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship. Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 1984), esp. pp. 94-117; and M. B. Parkes, "The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book," in J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson, eds., *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to R. W. Hunt* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 115-141.

11. In the prologue to the *Reductorium*, while noting the different sources of his material, Bersuire constructs a seamless progression of material from the natural history and natural/supernatural wonders of books 1-14 to the fables of the poets in 15 and the figures of the Bible in 16. This suggests an unproblematic parallelism: "that is, one treatise entitled 'on the nature of wondrous things,' another on the 'reduction' of fables and on the poems of poets, and a third, which is about the exposition and moralization of figures and the enigmas of the scriptures" ("videlicet quendam tractatum, qui intitulatur: de naturae mirabilibus, qui est de reductione fabularum, et poetarum poematibus, alium vero qui est de expositione, & moralizatione figurarum, & scripturarum aenigmatibus"). While the preface to book 15 is readily available (see above, n. 5), the prologues to the whole of the *Reductorium* and to books 14 and 16 are not. Readers may well be misled by Beryl Smalley's statement that Stegmüller "quotes the prologue" to the *Reductorium* (*English Friars*, p. 262). Quote it he does, but the nine lines he gives (p. 238) hardly do justice to what runs three full two-column folio pages in the 1712 Cologne edition I have used (in the Beinecke Rare Book Library, Yale University). A critical edition is needed; for the convenience of readers who may not have access to even an uncritical text, I include selections of the relevant portions of two prologues and all of the third below ("Appendix of Texts"). All citations from these texts, unless otherwise noted, will be from this edition, in the format "1712, Vol.page."

12. "Ut sic quicunque de quorunque vocabulo praedicare vel collationem facere decreverit, & quocumque modo ipsum vocabulum volvere, vel accipere voluerit, totum paratum & ordinatum inveniat, quod loquatur." At this point in the prologue to the *Reductorium*, Bersuire is in fact describing the *Repertorium*. But given the unity of purpose with which he presents the entire project, his remarks here should be applied to all three (*Reductorium, Repertorium, Breviarium*). See Appendix I, above.

13. One might even say that as Bersuire proceeded, he made his reference work increasingly "user friendly." The organization of the first section, the *Reductorium*, still bears the marks of his sources: the typically hierarchically ordered encyclopedia of Bartholomew "the Englishman" (books 1-13; also an anonymous moralization thereof, *Liber de proprietatibus rerum*); Gervaise of Tilbury, *Otia imperialia* (book 14; Pliny and Solinus are, as Bersuire tells us, also important sources); Petrarch, *Africa* 3.138-264 (book 15, c. 1); Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (book 15, cc. 2- 16); and the Biblical narrative itself (book 16). The *Repertorium* was even easier to access: Bersuire frequently advertises its alphabetical order. Cf. again "ut sic quicunque de quorunque vocabulo praedicare," etc. (from the prologue to the *Reductorium*, cited above, n. 12); later, in the prologue to the *Repertorium* itself, cross-referencing the earlier prologue, he writes: "Sicut enim jamdudum in prologo Reductorii mei promiseram, tractare propono de quolibet vocabulo predicabili secundum ordinem alphabeti, scilicet verbum quodlibet exponendo, dilatando, distinguendo, auctoritates dividendo, exempla naturalia, figuras et enigmata applicando et secundum naturam vocabulorum de diversis materiis pertractando cum efficacia ponebam" (cited in Samaran, "Pierre Bersuire," p. 351; "praedicabilis" is here likely a significant word, although of course it does not have to be translated "preachable"). Cf. also van der Bijl, "La Collatio," esp. pp. 156, 159. The *Breviarum*, though apparently never completed, was to have consisted of "themata," "collationes," and "auctoritates," elements directly usable by preachers (see Appendix 1, above). It is in

fact "user friendliness" he adduces to defend himself against the charge that he hadn't included sufficient authorities—and we must remember that Bersuire ran afoul of ecclesiastical authorities in the last stage of his life. He argues that he didn't want to be more prolix, especially when this material was readily available; moreover, "ut eciam legentibus exercicii locum darem" (van der Bijl, "La Collatio," p. 160). On "finding devices," cf. Richard and Mary Rouse, "*Statim invenire*: Schools and New Attitudes to the Page," in R. L. Benson and G. Constable, eds., *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), pp. 201-25.

14. Bersuire himself, in one of his many prefaces, gives evidence of his own awareness of the first stages of the reception of his work, noting that "some, on their own authority, call" the *Repertorium* the "dictionary" (van der Bijl, "La Collatio," p. 159).

15. The use of classical authors was in fact recommended by Alan of Lille, *De arte predicatoria*, i: "Poterit [praedicator] etiam ex occasione interserere dicta gentilium, sicut et Paulus apostolus aliquando in epistolis suis philosophorum auctoritates interserit, quia elegantem habebit locum" (*PL* 210.114 [quoted by Ghisalberti, "L'"Ovidius Moralizatus,'" p. 13]; the treatise runs *PL* 210.111-198; for an English translation, see Gillian R. Evans, *The Art of Preaching*, Cistercian Studies Series, 23 [Kalamazoo, 1981]). On Alan's use of classical authors in his sermons, see Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny, "Variations sur un thème de Virgile dans un sermon d'Alain de Lille," in Raymond Chevallier, ed., *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire offerts à André Piganiol* (Paris, 1966), pp. 1517-1528, and Peter F. Ganz, "Archani celestis non ignorans. Ein unbekannter Ovid-Kommentar," in Hans Fromm, Wolfgang Harms, and Uwe Ruberg, eds., *Verbum et Signum, I. Beiträge zur mediävistischen Bedeutungsforschung* (Munich, 1975), pp. 195-208. (Ganz's title— he now agrees—is misleading: It is in fact a sermon.) See also Jan Ziolkowski, *Alan of Lille's Grammar of Sex. The Meaning of Grammar to a Twelfth-Century Intellectual*, Speculum Anniversary Monographs, 10 (Cambridge, 1985), recent and penetrating on Alan in a wider context than its title suggests (with generous bibliography). Considerably later, Jacques Legrand, preacher to Charles VI and Isabel of Bavaria, used quotations from the *Metamorphoses* in his sermons (Engels, "L'Édition critique," p. 23). Bersuire's sermons, titles of several of which he himself transmits, have not been found, but in one of his last articles on Bersuire, Engels proposed that we already have them: "Il ne s'agit de rien autre chose que de lemmes particulièrement développés du *Repertorium*. Si le prédicateur trouvait dans l'*Ovidius moralizatus* des fragments déjà rédigés, prêts à être insérés, le *Repertorium* mettait à sa dispositions des sermons entièrement préfabriqués" ("L'Édition critique," p. 24). For an overview of medieval preaching in general, one might start with James J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages. A History of Rhetorical Theory from St. Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley, 1974), pp. 269-355. Three more recent and more specialized studies, with extensive bibliography, are: Siegfried Wenzel, *Preachers, Poets, and the Early English Lyric* (Princeton, 1986); Claude Bremond, Jacques Le Goff, and Jean-Claude Schmitt, *L'"Exemplum"*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental, 40 (Turnhout, 1982); and R. H. and M. A. Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons: Studies on the Manipulus florum of Thomas of Ireland* (Toronto, 1979). As one example of the recent scholarship on *exempla* collections and the interdependence of their didactic/devotional purposes and textual strategies, see Alain Boureau, *La légende dorée: Le système narratif de Jacques de Voragine (ob. 1298)* (Paris, 1984).

16. To begin with, one would need to be clear about the title. What was the range of Bersuire's own titles? Exactly when did it start to be referred to as *Ovidius moralizatus*? When as a commentary? Engels ("Berchoriana I," p. 92) and Ghisalberti ("L'"Ovidius moralizatus,'" p. 28, n. 1) blame Hauréau ("Mémoire," p. 45), but Badius calls it "commentatio" in the first sentence of his introductory letter. Even earlier, a fifteenth-century manuscript has most of book 15 under the title "Commentarius in Ovidii Metamorphoses" (Engels, "Lettre-dédicace," p. 64). Such a study would involve comparisons with the reception of all the various parts of Bersuire's work. The transmission histories of book 15's nearest neighbors, books 14 and 16, are also complex. Sixteen, on the scriptures, moved ahead in the sweepstakes (characteristically appearing first in collected editions, as the *Reductorium morale super totam Bibliam*). Fourteen sometimes disappears from the *Reductorium*, but no (extant) work suffered as extreme a fate as book 15. Very early on it began to circulate apart from the rest; with no internal reference to the name of the author, it was attributed to other mythographers, better known in other milieux (cf. Engels, WERKMATERIAAL-

3, pp. V-VI). For a neat summary of the manuscript diffusion of the various parts of Bersuire's work, see J. Engels, "Note complèmentaire sur les manuscrits berchoriens de Worcester," *Vivarium*, 7 (1969), 73-78, esp. 77 f. And beyond simply counting manuscripts of the books transmitted separately (as Engels of course knew), or examining the title(s) under which it appeared, one would have to consider in what context they were copied (e.g., with what other works), to what author they were attributed, and, finally, what spin was put on them by newly added prefatory material, page organization, and/or marginalia.

17. There is instability or tension even within book 15. Although the first chapter, "de formis figurisque deorum," formed part of the original version of the book, it has a different status and form. (On its different source, see above, n. 13.) Cf. Bersuire's introduction, "Sed antequam ad fabulas descendam . . ." (1509, ff. 1v-2r). This first chapter was "spun off" at least once. De-moralized, that is stripped of the moralizations, it became the *Libellus de deorum imaginibus*, ed. Hans Liebeschütz, *Fulgentius metaforalis, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Mythologie im Mittelalter*, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, 4 (Leipzig-Berlin, 1926), pp. 117-128. See Engels, "Berchoriana I," p. 119.

18. "Quod verbum ad hoc possum inducere quod plerumque fabulis: enigmatibus & poematibus est vtendum vt exinde aliquis moralis sensus extrahatur: vt etiam falsitas veritati famulari cogatur" (1509, f. 1r). Bersuire is careful to exclude from book 14 tales that might be fictional (see the penultimate sentence, Appendix 2, above), but says he might include them when he goes on to treat the "fabula poetarum."

19. "Der Kommentar ist eine dienende Gattung," in *Die frühen Dantekommentare und ihr Verhältnis zur mittelalterlichen Kommentartradition*, Münchener Romanistische Arbeiten, 19 (Munich, 1967), p. 13.

20. In fact, etymologically speaking, Dante's "vernacular master" is oxymoronic, since (Latin) "vernaculus," "native," derives from "verna," "slave born in the household." The shifting of senses in Latin, which Dante denies, only complicates and enriches the complex.

21. "Medieval Articulations of Ovid's Metamorphoses: From Lactantian Segmentation to Arnulfian Allegory," *Mediaevalia. A Journal of Medieval Studies*, 13.4 (forthcoming).

22. This is more often (but not always) sub- or unconscious. For example, our expectations—whether of "literature" altogether, of all stories, or of all examples of a particular genre (to which we have decided this example belongs)—lead us to "see" patterns and articulations, sometimes against the author's directives (as it seems from as objective a stance as it is possible to occupy). Our presuppositions and our drive for meaning lead us to athetize, reorder lines or fragments (e.g., the *Canterbury Tales*), lop off beginnings (e.g., *Waltharius*) and endings (e.g., the finale of da Ponte-Mozart *Don Giovanni*), even complete fragments. These drives can be cultural, personal, or gender-based (nor is this list exhaustive). Many studies of reader's/s' response(s) explore this; e.g., Peter J. Rabinowitz, "Shifting Stands, Shifting Standards," *Arethusa*, 19.2 (1986), 115-134 (cf. esp. his "rules of configuration," p. 123). Those interested in further reading in this burgeoning area of criticism may consult the bibliographies in this number of *Arethusa*, or in any of several reader-response "readers"; extremely helpful is the "Annotated Bibliography" in Jane P. Tompkins, ed., *Reader Response Criticism from Formalism to Post-Structuralism* (Baltimore, 1980), pp. 233-272 (heavily weighted to material in English). More broadly defined but terser of annotation is the "Annotated Bibliography of Audience-Oriented Criticism" in S. R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman, eds., *The Reader in the Text. Essays on Audience and Interpretation* (Princeton, 1980), pp. 401-424.

23. I am aware that "paraphrase," while referred to by many in the most casual way, is neither obvious nor simple. While I regret that considerations of space and scale alone compel me to pass on without devoting to it the careful attention it deserves, I don't believe this will obscure my point, as least as far as it applies to Bersuire and similar interpreters.

24. Engels claims to have shown that Bersuire did not know Arnulf's *allegoriae*, but the particular evidence he cites actually only proves that on two occasions Bersuire did not recognize Arnulf as one of the sources of the *Ovide moralisé* (Engels, *Études*, p. 28). Nonetheless, Bersuire seems not to have used Arnulf; had he, it would have been characteristic of Bersuire to have used him exhaustively and to have cited him. Cf. the conclusion to the prooemium to book 16, Appendix 3, above.

25. I continue the tradition of referring to chapters 2-16 of the *Ovidius moralizatus* as books 1-15, as do all printed editions I have seen. For example, what was originally chapter 2 begins "Incipit liber primus Metamorphoseos Ouidii Moralizate" (1509, f. XVIIv, *ad init.*). This makes cross-reference to the text of Ovid considerably easier. Of course, this was not necessarily one of Bersuire's original aims. Indeed, by my system of reference I participate in and continue the tradition of moving what was originally book 15 of the *Reductorium* out of Bersuire's own system and into the orbit of Ovid (as Ovid commentary). Our position is relative.

26. *Etymologiae*, 1.40.1, one of several Isidorian discussions of the term. Recent work on narrative also understands *fabula* as unplotted, in contrast to the plot (*szujet*).

27. For the Latin, which I have translated as literally as I could, see Appendix 1, above. This is of course precisely that mode of exegesis opened up for modern scholars largely by the work of Friedrich Ohly and his many students. Ohly's programmatic essay "Vom geistigen Sinn des Wortes im Mittelalter," based on his inaugural lecture (Kiel, 1958), first in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 89 (1958), 1-23, then *separatim*, Reihe Libelli, 218 (Darmstadt, 1966), and in Ohly's *Schriften zur mittelalterlichen Bedeutungsforschung* (Darmstadt, 1977), pp. 1-31. The impact of *Bedeutungsforschung* has been somewhat muted in America; that may change after the appearance of an English translation of a selection of Ohly's essays (to be published, I understand, by the University of Chicago Press). I have translated "conditiones" as "qualities." The relationships between "proprietates," "qualitates," and "circumstantiae" are complex and shifting; see Christel Meier, "Das Problem der Qualitätenallegorese," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 8 (1974), 385-435. "Conditio" appears to belong neither to the usual complement of technical terms nor to Bersuire's discussion of "qualitas" (see Meier, "Das Problem," p. 428, n. 181). Bersuire used it prominently earlier in the prologue; see Appendix 1, above, second sentence.

28. For an example, however, cf. the last fable of book 2, fable 23, where the tale of Europa is interpreted first as an allegory of the rational soul, then as the corruption of evil desires (1509, f. 30.F-H).

29. A fuller study of Bersuire would need to consider the various categories of interpretation under which Bersuire presents some (by no means all) of his explanations. The interpretation of fable 18 of book 2, the story of Pallas, Erichthonius, Cecrops' three daughters, and the crow (cf. *Metamorphoses* 2.542 ff.), is unusually elaborate and may serve as one example among many. In the section introduced "Ista fabula potest historialiter allegari: quia nihil opertum est quod non reueletur," the crows are talkative flatters who reveal the secrets, especially of the rich; the section introduced "Vel potest allegari fabula quod homo naturaliter nititur in vetitum" explains the fable as against the garrulousness of women; "Vel dicas allegorice" begins with the "dea semper virgo," Pallas, who is here interpreted as the virgin mother of Christ, and moves on to the three girls (the three vows of the religious: obedience, poverty, and chastity), finishing with the chest in which Erichthonius is hid, which signifies the first thirty years of Christ's life; in a fourth and final, uncategorized interpretation, Erichthonius is once again Christ, while the chest in which he is hidden is the Eucharist (1509, ff. 27.X-28.&). I suspect it would be difficult to articulate Bersuire's system of classification; indeed, it may prove impossible. However, even that negative finding would be significant.

30. None of the explanations reflects the fact that Io is actually a nymph (*Metamorphoses* 1.744), not human, although Ovid's fiction here also depends on our making no distinction.

31. "Religiosi" and "iustum" could, of course, refer to persons of either gender, but I suspect Bersuire means men. He is usually quite clear when he means women, about whom he has much bad to say. In either case, note that "foemina" is here representative of the good because it is human, set in opposition to "vacca," the bestial. On the principle of opposition, see Meier, "Das Problem," pp. 399-408 (p. 400, n. 55, for a diplomatic nod to linguistics, which has much to say about the role of binary opposition in processes of signification).

32. On the identity of Io and Isis, see P. Ovidius Naso, *Metamorphosen*, commentary by Franz Bömer (Heidelberg, 1969), 1.223. Bömer calls this "eine recht äusserliche Verknüpfung" (1.221), and refers the user to his brief discussion of "Uebergangstechnik" (1.328, on *Met.* 2.340), where he cites Quintilian (4.1.77) on Ovidian play with transitions as well as more recent secondary

literature. But the transition here is very different from that at 2.340. Ovid compresses Io's transformation into the goddess Isis into a line; after the protracted narrative of her bovine wanderings, this appears an extreme example of Ovid's love for tempo changes. But in fact, he elides the metamorphosis altogether: It falls between lines 746 and 747, for in line 747, she is already a goddess. In fact, line 747 only speaks of the goddess. How do we know it is Io? No looking at the commentators—that's cheating! Because, whether we segment or not, we expect continuity. Line 746 leaves us with one female being, 747 has a female being, and by rules of continuity we decide that they must refer to the same female being. In the end, then, it is the reader who creates Io's final metamorphosis. While the role of the reader in supplying links might well be described as "external," it can hardly be dismissed as such.

33. In sum, 165 lines of the *Metamorphoses* give rise to six *fabulae*, which in turn inspire ten explanations. Furthermore, Bersuire extracts Ovid's inset tale of Syrinx (*Metamorphoses* 1.687-712) to form the sixteenth and last tale of book 1 (1509, f. 22.Z).

34. "Tyresiam qui vir et foemina fuerat arbitrum elegerunt." Fable 10 goes on to tell of Juno's punishment and Jupiter's reward (1509 f. 34.O).

35. For further examples, cf. the story of Acteon as fables 5 and 6 of book 3 (1509, ff. 31.D and 32.F respectively), and the two accounts of the Palisci (fables 5 and 6 of book 5, 1509, f. 46.G and H).

36. Nonetheless, my reading elsewhere in book 16 convinces me that I have not unfairly stacked the deck in picking this narrative. It of course happens to be one of the most metamorphic of Biblical narratives. I analyze a much earlier poetic reworking of this narrative in "The Metamorphosis of Sodom: The Ps-Cyprian *De Sodoma* as an Ovidian Episode," *Traditio*, 44 (1988).

37. E.g. (1) "Ista autem possunt exemplariter allegari: quomodo mundi prosperitas causa est multorum malorum . . . ." (5) "Item potest allegari, quod pauci justi sunt" (1712, I.8 and 9, respectively; I have provided the numbers).

38. *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, ed. Th. Mommsen (Berlin, ²1895), p. 172 (35.7). This third-century (?) compendium was enormously popular: It had the virtue of brevity. For a collection of other naturalists' descriptions of the Dead Sea region, cf. Hexter, "Metamorphosis of Sodom."

39. In fact, the verse runs, "Come, and let us climb up to the mountain of the Lord." ("Venite, et ascendamus ad montem Domini"; Is. 2.3.) Bersuire uses "ascendit" in his own text just before he inserts the prophet's texts (quoted above).

40. We might call it "The Naturalist" or "The Natural Historian." This immensely popular and protean collection seems first to have been written down in Greek; subsequently it was translated into Latin and virtually every medieval vernacular, and reshaped numerous times in each language. There are several modern translations; Michael J. Curley, tr., *Physiologus* (Austin, 1979) is a convenient English translation of *versio* y of the Latin *Physiologus*. The exegetical ways of the *Physiologus* do not seem to be enjoying the scholarly attention the more popular animal fables and beast epics, both Latin and vernacular, perennially receive. Older but still immensely valuable in this regard is the work of one of Ohly's students, Dietrich Schmidtke, *Geistliche Tierinterpretation in der deutschsprachigen Literatur des Mittelalters (1100-1550)*, Diss. F. U. Berlin (Berlin, 1968); the first part in particular (pp. 51-118) details "the Latin tradition of animal symbolism." Nikolaus Henkel, *Studien zum Physiologus im Mittelalter*, Hermaea, germanistische Forschungen, n.F. 38 (Tübingen, 1976), is more recent but more superficial.

41. Cf. Engels, WERKMATERIAAL-3, p. XVII.

42. *Theoduli eclogam recensuit et ·prolegomenis instruxit* Joannes Osternacher, Fünfter Jahresbericht des bischöflichen Privat-Gymnasiums am Kollegium Petrinum in Urfahr für das Schuljahr 1901/1902 (Urfahr, 1902), pp. 1-58; Osternacher's text only, with minimal apparatus, is reprinted in Bernhard of Utrecht, *Commentum in Theodolum (1076-1099)*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, (Spoleto, 1977), pp. 9-18. Unfortunately, Huygens did not reprint here Bernhard's dedicatory epistle and the introduction to his commentary on book 1 from R. B. C. Huygens, ed., *Accessus ad auctores, Bernard d'Utrecht, Conrad d'Hirsau "Dialogus super Auctores"* (Leiden, 1970). The number of manuscripts, the *accessus*, and commentaries such as Bernhard's (his is not the only one) all testify to its popularity and influence. Among recent discussions, Hennig Brinkmann's is

notable for the fact that it sheds light on the *Ecloga Theoduli* in the context of analysis of Bernhard of Utrecht's commentary (*Mittelalterliche Hermeneutik* [Darmstadt, 1980], especially pp. 348-401).

43. Cf. L.D. Reynolds and N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars. A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford, ²1974), p. 99.

44. "Vocabula litteralía, que scilicet diuersimode possunt ad mores reduci, & nunc bonum, nunc ad malum, secundum exponentis ingenium applicari" (van der Bijl, "La Collatio," p. 158). I trust it did not escape Bersuire that Ovid too boasts of his "ingenium."

45. Many of these terms are difficult to render. How, for example, should one translate "reducere," not to mention *"Reductorium morale"*? Perhaps "apply" and *"Moral Applications,"* respectively? Bersuire often uses "applicare" in the same sorts of phrases as "reducere"; cf. "ipsaque ad mores, ad spiritualem intelligentiam reducere" and "ad mores applicare" (prefaces to books 14 and 16, respectively; see Appendices 2 and 3 above).

46. "Aliquas tamen in aliquibus adiungam fabulas quas in alijs locis repperi," prologue to book 15 (1509, f. 1v).

47. *TLL* I.vii.1666-1669.

48. Cf. Walther von Wartburg, *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bonn, 1928), p. 71, *s.v.* "allegare."

49. Another interesting link between the lawcourts and Bersuire might well have been made *a propos* of the interpretive consequences of paraphrase, for his *fabulae* or summaries are, in more ways than one, like the *narrationes* of judicial speeches. In the *narratio* the orator would lay out the facts of the case on the basis of which the jury was to make its decision. It is no secret that judicial *narratio* was "a statement of facts colored in the speaker's favor" (Donald Lemen Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* [New York,1957], p. 70). The *narratio* only purports to summarize the facts impartially; in fact, it should set up the interpretation the narrator wants, prejudice the jurors or judges in the truest sense of the word. Quintilian himself insists on the persuasive function of *narratio* in his definition of one of the senses of the word ("narratio est rei factae aut ut factae utilis ad persuadendum expositio," 4.2.31). Clark further notes: "The *narratio* need not be a chronological narrative. It may depart from a time sequence and be expository in design as well as in intention. And the 'facts' need not be facts, but what the advocate thinks it expedient that the judges or jury should believe to be facts" (p. 115). All of this is of course true of the paraphrase or summary which, in a text like Bersuire's, prejudices or predisposes the reader to favor his interpretation. For a more technical discussion, with further bibliography, see John D. O'Banion, "Narration and Argumentation: Quintilian on *Narratio* as the Heart of Rhetorical Thinking," *Rhetorica*, 5 (1987), 325-51.

50. It would be idle to attempt even a short bibliography of allegory. Recent is John Whitman, *Allegory. The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique* (Cambridge, Mass., 1987). For the derivation of the word, see "Appendix I. On the History of the Term 'Allegory'" (pp. 263-268). For basic bibliography, see "Abbreviations" (pp. xii-xiv) and the notes to pp. 3-6 (and the notes *passim* for additional titles; there is no bibliography *per se*). To these add Christel Meier, "Ueberlegungen zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Allegorie-Forschung. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Mischformen," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 10 (1976), 1-69, and now Richard Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian. Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (Berkeley, 1986), both of which offer access to additional specialized bibliography.

51. It is notoriously difficult for modern readers to credit the serious thought both ancient and medieval scholars expended on and based on etymological explanations, most of which are crazy by modern standards. Plato's *Cratylus* shows that any consideration of etymology or etymologizing must be set within a debate about language: Is it natural or conventional? Given the importance of the topic, how can we explain the relative scholarly neglect of "Etymologizing as a Category of Thought," as the title of Curtius' "Excursus XIV" runs (Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, tr. Willard R. Trask [Princeton, 1953], pp. 495-500)? The starting point for study of Western medieval etymologizing remains Roswitha Klinck, *Die lateinische Etymologie des Mittelalters*, Medium Aevum, Philologische Schriften, 17 (Munich, 1970), although many other studies adduce examples (e.g., Hartmut Freytag, *Die Theorie der allegorischen Schriftdeutung und die Allegorie in deutschen Texten besonders des 11. und 12.*

*Jahrhunderts*, Bibliotheca Germanica, 24 [Bern and Munich, 1982]; see index, *s.v.* "Etymologie").
R. Howard Block, *Etymologies and Genealogies. A Literary Anthropology of the French Middle Ages* (Chicago, 1983), has less about medieval etymologizing than the title might lead one to believe. On the other hand, Frederick Ahl, *Metaformations. Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets* (Ithaca, 1985), has more about etymology than his title suggests. Ahl is to be commended for grounding the principles with which he argues Ovid plays, in Varro and other ancient writers on language.

52. *TLL* I.vii.1666.67-68; cf. B. A. Müller, *s.v.* "alligo": "in codicibus multifariam confunduntur 'adalligare,' 'allicere,' 'allidere,' 'alligare,' 'allegere,' 'allegare'" (*TLL* I.vii.1680.37-38).

53. Quoted in *TLL* I.vii.1666.68-70 from Jan Wibertus Beck, *De differentiarum scriptoribus latinis* (Groningen, 1883), p. 34, n. 60, on pp. 29-90 of which Beck edits a collection of *differentiae* from a ninth-century manuscript (Montpellier H. 306, ff. 36a- 58b). I have not yet been able to see either Beck's edition or the Montpellier manuscript, all the more unfortunate, since the review of Beck by Gotthold Gundermann suggests that Beck's text must be used with extreme caution, even suspicion (*Philologischer Anzeiger*, 17 [1887], 506-508).

54. *Ex contrariis* or *per antiphrasin*. E.g., Isidore, *Etymologiae* 1.29.3; for a discussion, see Klinck, *Die lateinische Etymologie*, pp. 54-57.

55. "Laboravi igitur primo & ante omnia, Bibliae textum quater studendo, ut sic sine concordantijs allegare scirem, figuras, auctoritates, & historias, diligentissime consignando" (1712, I.275).

56. "Sola vocabula tamen pregnanciora & vtiliora & auctoritatibus & allegacionibus fecundiora acceperam" (van der Bijl, "La Collatio," p. 157).

57. "Ther nedeth noon auctoritee allegge," *The Knights Tale,* (A) 3000, and "He wolde noon auctoritee allegge," *The Merchant's Tale,* (E) 1658. Cf. John S. P. Tatlock and Arthur G. Kennedy, *A Concordance to the Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Gloucester, Mass., 1963), p. 22, *s.v.* "allege." Further, "A thousand olde stories thee alegge" (*Troilus* 3.297), and the instance from the *House of Fame* discussed in the text. For the complex echoes "allege" (from "adlegare") has in Middle English, see the discussion in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (I.229, *s.v.* "Allay"): Because "[i]n its two forms, *allege* and *aleye*, this vb. was formally identical with 4 other vbs. of Romance origin . . ., there was developed a perplexing network of uses of *allay* and *allege*, that belong entirely to no one of the original vbs., but combine the senses of two or more of them." Since there are no accidents in poetry, it is probably worth noting (1) that in *House of Fame* I.312 Chaucer mentions Dido's "peyne"; how does "alleging" (or "not alleging") an authority affect "allaying" the pain?; and (2) further links are possible between "alegge" and "a legende" (A 3141, B Sh 1335, D WB 742).

58. *Morale reductorium super / totam Bibliam: fratris Petri Berchorij Pictauiensis / ordinis diui Benedicti . . .* , ed. Adam Petri (Lyons, J. Mareschal [called Roland], for S. Vincent, 1520), "Prologus, Ca. I fo. 1" (= a[ir]). Petri printed editions in 1515 and 1517, hence the "1517" date at the end of the preface. On this printing, see H. I. Baudrier, *Bibliographie lyonnaise*, 11th ser. (Lyons and Paris, 1914), pp. 407-409. For the complete "correct" text of the prologue, see above, Appendix 3.

59. *TLL* VII.x (Leipzig, 1963) 1509.75-76, s.v."mortalis."

60. The most famous is no doubt that "mors" entered the world through the "morsus" of the apple in the garden. E.g., Ps. Aug., *Hypomnesticon* 1.4.5 (*PL* 45.1617); Ven. Fort., *Carm.* 2.2 (*MGH AA* 4.1.28); for other references, see *TLL s.v.* "mors" 8 (1960) 1503, and Klinck, *Die lateinische Etymologie*, p. 49, n. 56. This particular etymology was so popular that it was interpolated into many manuscripts of Isidore (ibid., p. 109, n. 34). On this and other etymologies of "mors," see ibid, pp. 108-111.

61. 1712, I.273-275. In this printing, the *Reductorium* occupies the first volume; the *Reductorium morale super tota biblia* [*sic*] in 34 books (in fact chapters, for this is *Reductorium morale* 16, though not marked as such) comprises the first half-volume (I.1-272), books 1-14 the second half (I.273- 994). Book 15 is of course missing. The separation of book 16 from the first fourteen books is traditional in editions of the *Reductorium* from that of Venice, 1575, to that of Cologne, 1730-1731 (Ghisalberti, "L'"Ovidius moralizatus,'" p. 50, n. 2; Samaran, "Pierre Bersuire," p. 444).

62. This verse from Ecclesiastes forms the basis for the *Collatio pro fine operis* as well. Here, after this beginning, other Biblical passages, and Plato via Cicero, Bersuire spins out a meditation on his labor "ad Dei laudem & gloriam, utilitatemque legentium" for almost the entire first column (of six). In the 1712 printing, this constitutes the first paragraph; the rest, one enormous second paragraph.

63. The terms of Bersuire's prefatory habit may be compared with those of standard *accessus*, with which he was familiar. The *accessus* commonly list "intentio auctoris" and "utilitas operis," in other formulae "finalis causa," as separate headings, but the two often overlap. Bersuire pairs "finis" and "intencio" in the *Collatio* (van der Bijl, "La Collatio," pp. 155, 159). The classic study of medieval *accessus* is Edwin A. Quain, S.J., "The Mediaeval Accessus ad Auctores," *Traditio*, 3 (1945), 215-64; the fullest collection is Huygens, *Accessus*. Recent analyses include Minnis, *Medieval Theory*, esp. pp. 9-39; J. B. Allen, *The Ethical Poetic of the Later Middle Ages* (Toronto, 1982); and Paul Demats, *Fabula. Trois études de mythographie antique et médiévale* (Geneva, 1973). For further bibliography, see Minnis, *Medieval Theory*, and Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, esp. p. 8., n. 14.

64. Bersuire next describes the *Breviarum morale* or *Directorium*, projected as the third and final panel of his great work but never completed ("nondum complevi"). Of its contents, he promises, "erit de diversis thematibus & auctoribus & quibusdam brevibus collationibus." The three parts correspond to the Trinity: "Quapropter in tres partes labores meos disseco, & sicut praeostensum est, omnia opera mea in tres particulas subdistinguo . . . ." Bersuire moves next to the names of the sections of his work: "Circa denominationem vero operum praedictorum notandum est, quod quia in isto primo opere proprietates naturales deducuntur ad mores, ideo ipsum opus morale reductorium nomino . . . ." He continues in the same fashion with the *Repertorium* and the *Breviarium* or *Directorium*. After discussion of the names of all three portions, and after lengthy expressions of his humility, he names himself and gives details of his life (over half a column). The section on the divisions of the books begins, "Circa vero operis ordinationem multa sunt attendenda." After *multa* on organization, he turns to his sources, naming Pliny, Seneca's *Naturales quaestiones,* Solinus, and Gervasius of Tilbury. The text resumes above.

65. Both *topoi* have been frequently discussed; an unusually complex analysis, focussing on the second, "La belle captive," is Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale. Les quatre sens de l'Écriture* (Paris, 1959), I.290-30.

66. There follows a summary of each of the sixteen volumes. The text resumes above, as he concludes his description of book 13.

67. Actually, Threni (= Lamentations) 1.12.

68. There follow general remarks on the value of labor, including intellectual labor; here Bersuire adduces examples of classical poets and scholars rewarded: Homer, Theopompus, Oppian, Simonides, Plato, Posidonius. He asks, rhetorically, "Sed quid mirum si tunc mundi potentes literatos & litteras honorabant? Tunc etiam Dij coelestes, secundum antiquorum opinionem, ipsos dignos honoribus judicabant." Among the examples: Apollo honored Socrates, Pollux and Castor saved "Pindar." In fact, the story of Pollux and Castor rescuing a poet from the house just before it collapses is usually told not of Pindar but of Simonides (e.g., Cicero, *De oratore* 2.353; Quintilian 11.2.11). Bersuire's text resumes above.

69. There follow apophthegms on labor from Seneca, Paul, and many books of the Old Testament. The text concludes as above.

70. 1712, I.900-901.

71. The balance of the prologue, about seven times as much text as I have so far translated, offers many examples of such uncertain wonders, ending with Gawain's trip to the underwater castle and his encounter with a giant there. The text concludes as above.

72. 1712, I.1. I include all but trivial variants of spelling and punctuation from the Lyons, 1520, edition (on which see n. 58, above). "Tota Biblia" sic; the 1712 has it as a neuter plural, the 1520 edition as a feminine singular, in both title and text of this prologue.

73. "preopacam" 1520; "per opacam" Stegmüller 4.238.

74. "mortalisatas" 1520.

75. "mortalisare" 1520.

76. Proverbs 1.6; cf. Ecclesiasticus 47.17-18. Here and throughout the preface, the 1712 printing merely italicizes the Biblical quotations, while the 1520 printing gives Biblical book and chapter in the margin.

77. "mortalisatione" 1520.

78. "Bibliae" 1520.

79. "hystoriarum" 1520.

80. "quinimmo" 1520.

81. Romans 14.