Intertextual and intersonic resonance in Richard de Fournival's *Bestiaire d'amour*: combining perspectives from literary studies and musicology

The *Bestiaire d'amour*, as its somewhat strange title suggests, is a multiply hybrid textual beast.[1] The bulk of the text comprises a list of animals whose behaviours it allegorizes: in this way, its title seems aptly to situate it within the bestiary tradition. A closer look, though, reveals that in contrast to the theological and moralizing allegories found in bestiaries, this text interprets all the animals to refer to different kinds of male and female lovers. Its initial appearance as a bestiary is deceptive and its plot, in which a desperate first-person male narrator despairs of his ability to persuade his female addressee to reciprocate his love, belongs to the conventions of lyric poetry—the *amour* of the title. Yet the *Bestiaire* itself is not strictly lyrical.[2] Indeed, not only is it in prose, but this fact is self-consciously discussed by the narrator, who claims to have lost his ability to compose and to sing love-lyrics and who is sending a prose letter—a *contreescrit* —as a last-ditch attempt to win the lady who has so far resisted his advances. Eliza Zingesser notes it as a « kind of palinode to the narrator's earlier lyric writings », which Sarah Kay called a « désenchantement » (both a pessimistic disenchantment and an « un-singing ») that is nonetheless « saturated with song ».[3] This saturation is precisely the concern of the present article and we will further tease out Kay's insight that the *Bestiaire d'amour* is preoccupied with the nature of vocal production as a means of communication that is troublingly shared between irrational animals and rational humans.[4]

Most modern study of the *Bestiaire d'amour* has focused on it as a written piece of literature and on the manuscripts of it as written—and illuminated—objects. Strong recent work has clarified its relation to related passages in a real bestiary, the long version of Pierre de Beauvais's *Bestiaire* (it is now thought to be a source for « Pierre » rather than deriving from it), as well as commenting on the manuscript tradition in terms of the principally didactic works that are found alongside the *Bestiaire d'amour* in the surviving sources.[5] An extensive series of publications by Christopher Lucken have examined the significance of Richard de Fournival's clerical erudition, in particular through a close reading of the opening two animals in the *Bestiaire*, as well as discussing the manuscript contexts of the copying of

[1] We have both been fortunate enough to research and write article with the generous support of the Leverhulme Trust, which has funded us with a Major Research Fellowship and an Early Career Fellowship, respectively.
[2] In taking the conventions of love poetry and transposing them into an extended narrative form, Richard de Fournival continues the narrativization of lyric tropes found in Guillaume de Lorris's *Roman de la rose*, which predates it by around twenty years.
[3] See Christopher Lucken, « Du ban du coq à l'*Ariereban* de l'âne (à propos du *Bestiaire d'Amour* de Richard de Fournival » in *Reinardus*, t. 5 (1992), p. 109-24, at p. 115; Eliza Zingesser, « Remembering to Forget Richard de Fournival's *Bestiaire d'amour* in Italy: The Case of Pierpont Morgan MS 459 », in *French Studies*, t. 69, 4 (2015), p. 439-48; and Sarah Kay, « Chant et désenchantement dans le *Bestiaire d'Amours* de Richard de Fournival », in *LMFR*, t. 76-77 (2015), p. 137-58. Zingesser notes the supplementation of the *Bestiaire* by actual lyrics in some sources, but she considers this a blurring between the voices of the lyricists and Richard de Fournival's, implicitly equating the latter with « the direct speech of the narrator » (p. 440), something we question here.
[4] For discussion of how bestiaries, including Richard de Fournival's, trouble categorical distinctions between humanity and animality, see Sarah Kay, *Animal Skins and the Reading Self in Medieval Latin and French Bestiaries*, Chicago, 2017.
[5] See Craig Baker, « Retour sur la filiation des bestiaires de Richard de Fournival et du Pseudo-Pierre de Beauvais » in *Romania*, t. 127 (2009), p. 58-85 and Christopher Lucken, « Les manuscrits du *Bestiaire d'Amours* de Richard de Fournival » in *Le Recueil au Moyen Âge: Le Moyen Âge central*, ed. Olivier Collet and Yasmina Foehr-Janssens, Turnhout, 2010, p. 113-38 [*Texte, Codex & Contexte*, 8]. Baker's thesis has not been universally accepted. See Jean Maurice, « *Le Bestiaire d'amour* et la *Version longue du Bestiaire* attribué à Pierre de Beauvais: retour sur la question de leur filiation », in *Le Moyen Age*, t. 115/1 (2009), p. 9-27.

the work in its various sources.[6] Art historians have rightly pointed out how the text itself unusually decrees its own illustrative programme (which is remarkably stable across the majority of the more than twenty surviving manuscripts), and also engages with Aristotelian discussions of the senses.[7] Meanwhile, literary scholars have explored the literary text's reliance on other texts, notably various Latin bestiary materials, but also Classical authors.[8] Some scholars have combined the two approaches, noting the « audio-visual poetics » of the text and thus integrating manuscript-specific analysis of the iconographic programme into a reading of the prose work.[9] Musicologists, however, have nearly all ignored the *Bestiaire d'amour*, on account of its ostensibly having little or no directly musical content: it is a French prose work, with no musical notation. Here, we will argue from our combined perspectives in musicology and French literary studies that not only does it explicitly cite a musical work, but that it also creates meaning using a variety of sonic, musical, and verbal intertexts, real and imagined. Moreover, it uses these intertextual (and, for non-literate *vox*, intersonic) resonances to reflect on how it is that texts make meaning.

Medieval thinking about intertextuality occurs not through explicit theorization but by means of literary textual artefacts themselves. Through the work of receiving such texts, audiences participate in a theorization of textual meaning-making that is itself a practice. While medieval memory technique is explicitly theorized using models that are predominantly visual,[10] Richard de Fournival's *Bestiaire d'amour* proposes a model for memory that relies not only on the visual, but also extensively on the sonic, and in particular on the relation between these sight and sound, the two teachable senses as represented in both the verbal text and in its illuminations. The medieval Book of Memory thus relies on the sense in which the medieval book is not only visual but a repository of sounds. The *Bestiaire d'amour* is, then, a resonant text that puts forward a model of intertextuality bound up with various types of sound: writeable and unwriteable, articulate and inarticulate, and sound produced *viva voce* from the text itself or summoned mentally in memory or imagination. Some of this resonance comes from the echoes of earlier texts contributing to the meaning of the work at hand and the *Bestiaire* deliberately provokes such echoes with its incessant textual allusion. Other resonances come from memories of sound, including the virtual sounds prompted to resonate by the sight of sound-producing agents depicted in the manuscript illuminations. These illuminations thus have an intertextual—or, more literally, an *intersonic*—power, since they cue not verbal meanings, but specifically sonic ones: the inarticulate, unwriteable *voces* of animals. When Isidore of Seville notes in his *Etymologies* that « unless sounds are held by people's memories, they perish, because they cannot be written down », he is not simply reflecting a period that lacked stand-alone notation for the pitches of a melody.[11] Instead, and as the continued citation of his statement well into the

[6] See Christopher Lucken, « Du ban du coq »; « Les manuscrits du *Bestiaire d'Amours* »; « Richard de Fournival ou le clerc de l'amour », in *Senefiance*, t. 37 (1995), p. 399-416; and, especially, « Entre amour et savoir. Conflits de mémoire chez Richard de Fournival », in *La mémoire du temps au moyen âge*, ed. Agostino Paravicini Bagliani, Florence, p. 141-62 [*Micrologus' Library*, 12].

[7] See Elizabeth Sears, « The Iconography of Auditory Perception in the Early Middle Ages: On Psalm Illustration and Psalm Exegesis », in *The Second Sense: Studies in Hearing and Musical Judgment from Antiquity to the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Charles Burnett, Michael Fend, and Penelope Gouk, London, 1991, p. 19-38; and *eadem*, « Sensory Perception and its Metaphors in the Time of Richard of Fournival », in *Medicine and the Five Senses*, ed. W. F. Bynum and R. Porter, Cambridge, 1993, p. 17-39.

[8] Jeanette Beer, *Beasts of Love: Richard de Fournival's Bestiaire d'amour and a Woman's Response*, Toronto, 2003.

[9] See Sylvia Huot, *From Song to Book: The Poetics of Writing in Old French Lyric and Lyrical Narrative Poetry*, Ithaca, 1987, chapter 5; and Helen Solterer, « Letter Writing and Picture Reading: Medieval Textuality and the *Bestiaire d'amour* », in *Word and Image*, t. 5 (1989), p. 131-47.

[10] See Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, Cambridge, 1991.

[11] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*, ed. W. M. Lindsay, Oxford, 1911, 3. 15.

period of staff notation for musical pitch proves, Isidore is expressing a deeper and more important truth: musical *sound* cannot be *captured* in *writing*, since it is not writeable in the specific sense that late antique grammarians also frequently noted when defining the sounds proper to grammar as those that could be written in letters.[12] The analysis below will explore how Richard's *Bestiaire* evokes the words of the grammarians on the tricky subject of *vox* in its own engagement with the different kinds of voice: writeable and unwriteable, meaningful and meaningless. An account of the interplay of such voices that variously echo in the minds of the text's audiences must be as psychological as it is intertextual. It is apt, then, that the blurring of sensation, memory, imagination, and text takes place from the *Bestiaire d'amour*'s opening lines, cementing the association of text with the sonic, and then continues into the narrative of seduction. It demands that intertextuality be thought of through an idea of resonance that is not simply auditory and physical in the simplest sense. In addition to that sense, resonance serves as a metaphor to make sense of the interpenetration of meanings in overlapping textual traditions conceived of as competing or even harmonising mental echoes so that individual human memory and the collective memory of a textual tradition constitute a mutually referential system of meaning-making.

***

The structure and focus of the current article requires some explanation. Unlike the bestiaries that it mimics, Richard's text is deliberately confusing in its complexity, often repeating animals previously mentioned, contradicting and undermining itself, and circling back to issues raised earlier on. However, the listener who encountered the text being read at a medieval court would have encountered it in unfolding sequentially in real time. The sounds of this sequence of words and images would have been held in memory and could have inflected the appreciation of the work at later encounters, perhaps supplemented by repeated readings and/or sight of the book from which the reading was made. The meanings that audiences can make of the text depend on the unfolding in real time of the phantasmatic and remembered echoes that are conjured in their minds as it progresses. Therefore, in order to make an argument about these echoes, it is necessary to show how they operate in a sequential discussion of a part of the text. For reasons of space, though, we will limit our discussion by and large to the first quarter of the work, where the fundamental mechanisms of the textual and mental resonance are established.

Thus the present article lays out the basis of our more general claims about the role of sound in the work as a whole through a distinct focus on the opening two sections of the *Bestiaire*. The first two parts treat the *Bestiaire*'s prologue section and the initial series of animal comparisons, which involve two different, but not totally distinct, narratorial voices. The first, a clerkly one, establishes the focus on knowledge in relation to memory, and sets up an initial series of resonances within a field of textual operation that is insistently sonic. The second is that of the lover-protagonist, who comes to the fore in the initial series of animal comparisons, which invoke through pictures a range of species, both sonic and zoological, that highlight the intertwined issues of rationality, language, and desire. The third and fourth parts depart from following the *Bestiaire*'s sequential unfolding to pinpoint later moments in the work that return to issues set up in the opening two sections: the power and dangers of song and desire.

1. *…aussi con s'il fussent present*: Intertextual Resonances

[12] See Blair Sullivan, « The Unwriteable Sound of Music: The Origins and Implications of Isidore's Memorial Metaphor », in *Viator*, t. 30 (1999), p. 1-13; and Helen Deeming, « Music and the Book: The Textualisation of Music and the Musicalisation of Text », in *The Edinburgh Companion to Music and Literature*, ed. Delia da Sousa Correa, Edinburgh, expected 2017 (forthcoming).

The prologue to the *Bestiaire d'amour* offers its audience words and images with which to construct a text about textuality that is also about the impossibility of ever abandoning sound, music, and song even in a purely physical object like a book. This is because of the significant role of memory in intertextual and intersonic practices that ensure ongoing noisiness. In the prologue these are the meaningful specifically human noises of verbal speaking and singing; as the text gets going, these come to include the irrational voices of animals, which can acquire meaning through their human explanations, which are themselves often textual.

Richard de Fournival is known as a musician, specifically as a trouvère. His own songs survive in a large number of manuscripts with musical notation; reciprocally, perhaps, his *Bestiaire* is sometimes copied within trouvère chansonniers.[13] Stanzas from three of his songs appear as the upper voices in polyphonic motet complexes in various motet collections.[14] While the authorship of the songs is frequently clarified by rubrication, the motets are, as typically, copied anonymously, so that it is unclear whether Richard adapted them for this purpose himself or not. Richard's literate compositional ability is pictured in the author portrait of *TrouvA*, in which he is one of only two trouvères represented as an author, at his writing desk, with a rubric that emphasizes his making of the songs.[15] Picturing the making of song as an act of writing immediately hints at the chief way that music and sound are thematized in the *Bestiaire d'amour*: as a tense but pleasurable interplay between the eye and the ear, between writing and song.

Music in the thirteenth century had a particular interest in intertextual play and quotation, as is noticeable in the pervasive use of « grafted » refrains in lyrics and motet texts, which either quote other known texts or, sometimes, masquerade as quotation-like elements through their disruption of metrical and/or generic norms and patterns.[16] Taking into account this practice from his lyrical compositions in reading Richard's musical prose will allow a better understanding of how the intertextual can be thought of as resonant. The hidden but pervasive presence of sound (both music and other kinds of *vox*) in the *Bestiaire* animates many of the intertextual games the work plays and has a particular role in opening a gap between author and narrator that allows for irony, uncertainty, and pleasurable reflection.

<INSERT FIGURE 1 NEAR HERE>

Figure 1: Opening initial to the *Bestiaire d'amour*: the eye and ear as the two doors to memory in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fr.412 (*Bestiaire B*), f.228r. [Permissions to follow]

The *Bestiaire*'s opening Prologue describes Memory as having two doors: the eye and the ear, organs of the two teachable senses sight and sound, which are served respectively by

[13] The songs are in the following manuscripts: Arras, Bibliothèque municipale 139 (*TrouvA*), Bern, Stadtbibliothek, 389 (*TrouvC*), Modena, Biblioteca Estense 45.R.4, 4 (*TrouvH*), Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 5198 (*TrouvK*), Bibliothèque nationale de France, fonds français 844 (*TrouvM*), 845 (*TrouvN*), 846 (*TrouvO*), 847 (*TrouvP*), 5191 (*TrouvR*), 12615 (*TrouvT*), 20050 (*TrouvU*), nouvelles acquisitions français 1050 (*TrouvX*), Rome, Vatican Library, Reg. lat. 1490 (*Trouva*), and Reg. lat 1522 (*Trouvb*). See *L'Oeuvre lyrique de Richard de Fournival*. The *Bestiaire* MSS *O* (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 308) and *A* (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 25566) are respectively Trouvère MSS *I* and *W*.

[14] Song 13 in Lepage's edition forms part of a motet in the « La Clayette Manuscript » (*Cl*; Bibliothèque nationale de France, n.a.f. 13521); songs 3 and 21 are in the motet manuscript Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Guelf.1099 Helmst. (*W2*).

[15] The other is Adam de la Halle; see Huot, *From Song to Book*, 59-63. Shelfmarks for the sigla used in this article are given in n. 12 above.

[16] See Ardis Butterfield, *Poetry and Music in Medieval France: From Jean Renart to Guillaume de Machaut*, Cambridge, 2002; *eadem*, « Enté: A Survey and Re-Assessment of the Term in Thirteenth and Fourteenth-Century Music and Poetry », in *Early Music History*, t. 22 (2003), p. 67-101.

Depiction and Description (see Figure 1). The narrator will ensure that his work keeps both doors open, by having both words (for the ear) and pictures (for the eye).[17] The distinction between visual and oral media breaks down almost immediately, however. While the book itself is a visual object, the sonic is very much cued by it. The silent reading of this text would have been unusual; texts were usually sounded out vocally, even if the person reading them was alone. And because the usual way in which a medieval « reader » encountered texts was through hearing them read aloud to a group, the *words* of the book are themselves a picture of, and instruction for, the production of sound. This is so different from the solitary, silent reading that counts as normative today, that it is worth emphasizing: text was heard sonically, issuing from a live human performer, in a space shared with other listeners. From that description, it is easy to see how this mediated performance situation makes medieval literature already far closer to music and more insistently sonic than is the case with literature today.

The letters of a medieval text cue its reading aloud and for Richard's contemporary, Robert Grosseteste, the letters of grammar were representations of the mouth-shape used to produce their sounds.[18] Illuminations, similarly, can represent sounds by picturing the agent of production in the act of producing the sound, specifically the kinds of sounds that cannot be written in letters.[19] According to the classification of sound in grammar treatises, this includes human shouts and groans, animal noises, the sounds of inanimate objects, and the melodic component of music. In the Middle Ages, the term *vox*—voice—was used both quite loosely to mean any kind of sound and—by more educated writers—more strictly, following Aristotle's definition in the *De anima*, to mean specifically « the sound of a thing with a soul », that is, something living (since for Aristotle plants, animals, and humans all have souls of differing kinds).[20]

Despite existing in a relatively large number of manuscripts, the explicit and noteworthy mandating of the illustrative programme within the text itself means that the pictures are generally fairly similar between the illuminated sources (which are the vast

---

[17] This text thus goes beyond the usual propensity of narratives to generate mental images, and becomes a narrative that *prescribes* the presence of actual pictures in the text, and indeed most surviving manuscripts have a fairly similar programme of illuminations for the fifty or so animals that are discussed; see Lucken, « Les manuscrits », Solterer, « Letter Writing and Picture Reading », and Huot *From Song to Book*, p. 164-173.

[18] « *Sed cuidam voci dat speciem et perfectionem ipsa figuratio actualis instrumentorum vocalium et figuratio motus spirituum motivorum instrumentorum vocalium. Cuidam vero voci non dat figuratio perfectionem. Illa vero, cui figuratio praedicta dat speciem et perfectionem, erit vox litterata. Et vox, quam complet figuratio unica, erit littera. Quam vero complent figurationes multae, erit ex litteris composita.* » (Robert Grossteste, *De generatione sonorum*, in *Die Philosophischen Werke des Robert Grosseteste, Bischofs von Lincoln*, Münster i. W., 1912., p. 7 - 10, at p. 8; text also online at http://www.grosseteste.com/ (accessed 25 Aug 2015). See also Amelia Carolina Sparavigna, « The Generation of Sounds According to Robert Grosseteste », in *International Journal of Sciences*, t. 2 (2013), p. 1-5 at p. 2 and Cecilia Panti, « Robert Grosseteste's Theory of Sound », in *Musik—und die Geschichte der Philosophie und Naturwissenschaft im Mittelalter: Fragen zur Wechselwirkung von 'musica' und 'philosophia' im Mittelalter*, ed. Frank Hentschel, Leiden, 1998, p. 3-18.

[19] These images sound only in the mind and inasmuch as they provoke a viewer's memory of having heard that animal noise. Therefore, although the sonic performance of the work being read is not a form of singing, the audio-visual implications of an extensive sequence of illuminations in most of the manuscript copies of this popular work make these voices sound in conjunction with memory, which has a particular relation to sound: in medieval terms, memory is a « machine for invention ». It is not either like the rote memory placed at the very bottom of Bloom's taxonomy, the standard paradigm of modern learning, nor is it like the nostalgic memory of modernity. (See B. S. Bloom, M. D. Engelhart, E. J. Furst, W. H. Hill, D. R. Krathwohl, ed., *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain*, New York, 1956. Instead, it is active, bodily, emotional, and involves the two teachable senses of seeing and hearing (see Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*).

[20] See Aristotle, *De anima*, II. 8, 420b5; see also Elizabeth Eva Leach, *Sung Birds: Music, Nature, and Poetry in the Later Middle Ages*, Ithaca, 2007, p. 25; Daniel Heller-Roazen, « De Voce », in *Du bruit à l'œuvre. Vers une esthétique du désordre*, éd. Christopher Lucken and Juan Rigoli, Genève, 2013, p. 37-48 [Voltiges].

majority of the surviving manuscripts), especially with regard to the animal depictions.[21] While the *Bestiaire d'amour* specifies that the words are a visual memory of something spoken in the past (which can be spoken again when the work is read aloud to its audience), the pictures, too, contain a memory of something sonic: nearly all of them connote some kind of sound, vocal or otherwise (which can be « heard » again, if silently, in the minds of the viewers). Even more than through the eye and ear depicted on Memory's doors—both receptive organs of sensory perception— the combined verbal-visual text produces a phantasmatic resonance through the fairly constant presence—in pictures and words—of the mouth, the noisy organ of performance and production that becomes a multifarious locus for eating, vomiting, speaking, singing, and even birth.

The incessant, obsessive way in which parts of the body in general and the mouth in particular are reworked and re-invoked with different functions and significance throughout the text is of particular importance for the *Bestiaire d'amour*'s project of staging confusion (and confused desire). Meaningful sound is not simply a tool for the clear and rational communication of knowledge or thoughts, but rather its different resonances interfere with and disrupt the mental processes of knowledge-acquisition that are understood as fundamentally visual. Language, in its inescapable polyvalence, is shown not simply to produce mental images that can easily be processed and turned into knowledge, but to produce images that are multiple, that become merged and confused with each other. This is a text that dramatizes or enacts how it is that *vox*—whether real, because performed out loud, or virtual and *in potentia*, because visually represented on the page—conjures up mental images that are far from reliable for all their beauty and complexity. Through its discussion of the mental faculties of memory and the imagination, the *Bestiaire* makes available the parallel between literal resonance as sound and metaphorical resonance as a means of thinking about the intertextual processes of making meaning and conveying knowledge.

How knowledge can be both preserved and transmitted is the central preoccupation of the text's opening section.[22] Before any discussion of love or animals takes place, the work famously opens with a rendering into French of the opening of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*: *Toutes gens desirrent par nature a savoir*. (All people desire by nature to know.)[23]

The *Metaphysics* has the following in the Latin version that would have been available to Richard:

> Omnes homines scire desiderant natura. Signum autem est sensuum dilectio; et namque sine utilitate diliguntur propter se ipsos, et maxime aliorum qui est per oculos.

[21] For details of the illuminations, see the relevant MS entries in Alison Stones, *Gothic Manuscripts 1260-1320: Part One*, 2 vol., London, 2013 and *eadem*, *Gothic Manuscripts 1260-1320: Part Two*, 2 vol., London, 2014. A listing of the manuscripts with links to online surrogates can also be found at https://eeleach.wordpress.com/2013/09/12/richard-de-fournivals-bestiary-of-love/.

[22] The opening to the *Bestiaire* and its presentation of the relationship between psychology and knowledge is treated at length in Christopher Lucken's important article « Entre amour et savoir » and Sarah Kay has looked closely at the Aristotelian psychological theory at stake in the passage in « Medieval Bêtise: Internal Senses and Second Skins in Richard de Fournival's "Bestiaire d'amours" », in *Uncertain Knowledge: Scepticism, Relativism and Doubt in the Middle Ages*, ed. Dallas G. Denery II, Kantik Ghosh, and Nicolette Zeeman, Turnhout, 2014, 305-32 [*Disputatio*, 14]. While Lucken's focus is more on Richard's preoccupation with memory and Kay especially considers the games he plays with Aristotelian discussion of the imagination, both make clear the blurring between memory and imagination that take place in this prologue.

[23] Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour et la Response du Bestiaire*, ed. and trans. Gabriel Bianciotto, Paris, 2009 [CCMA, 27], p. 154. Citations from the *Bestiaire* are taken from Bianciotto's edition, although readers can usefully consult that of Cesare Segre: *Li Bestiaires d'amours di maistre Richart de Fournival e li response du bestiaire*, ed. Cesare Segre, Milan, 1957.

> (All people desire by nature to know. An indication of this is the pleasure that comes from the senses, for they are desired for their own sake even beyond their being useful, and of them all this is most true of sight.)[24]

Richard's text gives only the translation of the opening dictum *Omnes homines scire desiderant natura* while leaving implicit the following claim that the evidence of the universality of human desire for knowledge is the pleasure that we derive even from the gratuitous use of the senses. Foremost among all the other senses for its capacity to bring knowledge is vision and Aristotle notes that it is most prized. Citing a small fragment of a text that would have been familiar to members of his audience who would have studied it as part of the Arts curriculum would have had (or at the very least could have had) the effect of prompting a memory of the subsequent lines. Though not literally inscribed on the page of a manuscript of the *Bestiaire d'amour*, Aristotle's discussion of the primacy of vision in *Metaphysics*, I.1 could have been brought to the memory of his audience by the sentence that precedes it about the universally human desire for knowledge, in the same way that, for an audience familiar with Tolstoy, hearing the statement that « all happy families are alike » might prompt the memory-echo of the following part of the dictum that opens *Anna Karenina*: « every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way. » Such a practice was standard in Scholastic texts, such as *quaestiones* or *lectiones*, where citations from Biblical, philosophical, or theological authorities generally give only the opening few words of the relevant verse or passage, obliging readers or listeners to fill in the lacunae with text from their own memories. Even before the discussion of the *visual* aspects of memory, this triggering of a remembered truth-bearing textual statement at the very outset suggests a particularly textually or intertextually *sonic* aspect of memory in the transmission of knowledge. The letters of the unwritten, implicit text would not be visualized but sounded out internally; here the opening of the Latin version of the *Metaphysics* is remembered sonically rather than visually, even if, in an irony typical of Richard, the unsaid but resonating dictum concerns the value not of sound but of vision for the acquisition and preservation of knowledge. This strategy of producing an intertextual echo, available to some of the text's audience but not others, recurs throughout the *Bestiaire* and it will be discussed more fully in what follows.

The first chapter of the *Metaphysics* goes on to discuss memory and knowledge in relation to the faculty of sensation, in particular using vision. Carruthers notes the importance, according to Aristotelian accounts of memory, of the mental representation of concepts, so that all thinking happens by means of mental images and thus, in a certain sense, visually. In the *De memoria*, for example, the Philosopher notes that « [m]emory, even the memory of objects of thought, is not without an image. »[25] Memory is closely linked with the imagination, which also depends on the production of mental images. In the *De anima*, for example, Aristotle describes how imagining something terrifying can result in viewing the mental image of that thing without fear, in the way that one might calmly view a painting of a dangerous event.[26] Both the Aristotelian and the Galenic models of the mind that arrived in Europe by way of Arabic writers, in particular Avicenna, gave a tripartite account of making sense of the world in which sense organs produced sense-impressions in the imagination—for Galen, this was the front ventricle of the brain—which are assessed by the deliberative, rational part of the mind in the middle, before being transferred to the storehouse of memory

[24] Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, I. 1, 980a, trans. James of Venice. *Aristoteles Latinus Database* website (Brepols): http://clt.brepolis.net/ald/Default.aspx (accessed 18 August 2015).
[25] Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p. 51; Lucken, « Entre amour et savoir », p. 143. *Cf.* Aristotle, *De memoria*, 450a10-15.
[26] *De anima*, III. 3, 427b21-24.

at the back of the brain.[27] There are various different models of human thought-processes available in twelfth- and thirteenth-century texts, but rather than suggest that Richard is drawing in particular on any single one, our aim is to show how in the *Bestiaire d'amour* the introduction of the sonic leads to the breakdown of the rational workings of the faculties according to medieval psychological models, as the mind calmly processes phantasmatic images in order to store them as memories.

The *Bestiaire d'amour* departs from an Aristotelian account of memory as dependent on mental images when discussing the power of memory that God has bestowed upon humans, Sight is not made preeminent but is given equal prominence to hearing, the former accessed by means of *painture* (painting) and the latter by *parole* (speech). Memory, described as the storehouse of the treasures *que sens d'omme conquiert par bonté d'engien* (which human sense conquers through the power of intelligence),[28] is that which makes the past appear just as if it were present (*fait che qui est trespassé aussi comme present*) but, almost as soon as it is mentioned, *la forche d'ame qui a a non memoire* (the power of the soul that is called memory) becomes elided with an illuminated manuscript, painted with pictures and inscribed with words, that also makes the past appear as if present. Richard's narrator goes on to mention the use and value of books for preserving the memory of events by prompting the appearance of mental images in the minds of listeners, either by seeing images of past events painted on the page or hearing voiced accounts:

> car quant on voit painte une estoire ou de Troies ou d'autre, on voit les fais des preudommes qui cha en arriere furent aussi con s'il fussent present. Et tout aussi est il de parole, car quant on ot .j. roumans lire, on entent les fais des preudommes aussi con s'il fussent present. Et puis c'on fait present de che qui trespassé par ches .ij. choses, c'est par painture et par parole, dont il apert il bien que par ches .ij. choses puet on a memoire venir.
> (for when one sees painted a history, either of Troy or something else, one sees the deeds of noble men which happened then as if they were present. And it is just the same for speech, for when one hears a romance read, one hears/understands the deeds of noblemen as if they were present. And since one can make present that which has come to pass by both these things, i.e. by painting and by speech, it is most apparent that by these two things one can enter into memory.)[29]

What is seen and what is heard both bring to mind the past event as if it were present but this example is very problematic and reveals not simply the narrator's unreliability as an authoritative voice, but a disjunction between the processes involved in seeing and those

---

[27] Giorgio Agamben, *Stanzas: Word and Phantasm in Western Culture*, trans. Ronald L. Martinez, Minneapolis and London, 1993, p. 73-80; Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p. 52; Ruth Harvey, *The Inward Wits*, London, 1975, p. 10-13; Herbert A. Davidson, *Alfarabi, Averroes and Avicenna on Intellect: Their Cosmologies, Theories of Active Intellect and Theories of Human Intellect*, New York and Oxford, 1992.

[28] Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 156. *Cf.* John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon*, I. 11, from which Richard draws, and whose tripartite mental model uses the term *ingenium* (for Richard: *engien*) to mean intelligence or perhaps imagination: « *Excitat enim primo ingenium ad res aliquas percipiendas; et cum eas perceperit, deponit quasi in custodia et thesauro memoriae.* » (Nature first evokes our intelligence, and then, as it were deposits these perceptions in the secure treasury of our memory.) John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon libri III*, ed. Clement C. J. Webb, Oxford, 1929, p. 28. Translation (emended) from *The Metalogicon: A Twelfth-Century Defense of the Verbal and Local Arts of the Trivium*, trans. Daniel D. McGarry, Philadelphia, 2009, p. 34. John is drawing on Isidore, *Sententiae*, I. 13. 7, *Patrologia latina*, 83.564C (cited by Segre as the source in his edition): « *Rerum omnium thesaurus memoria est. Ipsa est custos rebus inventis, ipsa cogitatis.* » See *Li Bestiaires d'amours*, ed. cit., vii-viii, n. 3.

[29] Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 156. The narratorial evocation of the visual in recounting battle-narratives is common in *chansons de geste* and Richard may well be drawing on such a tradition. See Sophie Marnette, *Narrateur et points de vue dans la littérature française médiévale: Une approche linguistique*, Bern, 1998, p. 60-63.

involved in hearing.[30] It might be possible, at first glance, to understand the first example given by Richard's narrator, the painted *estoire* of Troy as provoking the mental image of the battle in the mind of the audience or viewer. Whether or not that is a viable account of the mental processes involved in viewing an image, the discussion of hearing events read out loud is particularly baffling. What might it mean to hear or to understand the deeds of noblemen *as if they were present*?[31] Hearing the deeds carried out by knights and armies, understood literally, would mean hearing confused shouts, clashing of metal, groans of pain, and so on, which is to say a memory that is purely sonic rather than a visual construction or reconstruction of the events being recounted. This is surely not meant to be an accurate representation of the mental processes that take place when hearing a story, depending as they do on mental images, at least according to medieval accounts of mental processes.[32]

Here, as elsewhere in the *Bestiaire*, the limitations of the narrator, who is quite distinct from the erudite author Richard, are made very clear. We are not getting the accurate transmission of philosophical teaching but instead their misremembered echoes by a confused and confusing seducer, attempting to secure for himself clerical authority. Nevertheless, it might still be possible to distil the theory that books work in relation to memory by preserving the event and then producing the mental image that is then impressed on the audience's imagination and thus transferred to the memory (Figure 2 shows how one manuscript pictures this). However, if the idea of « painted history » is somewhat synesthetic, simultaneously implying images and words, the example of the narration of the events of Troy or of any romance-story, whether painted or performed, presents confusion between sight and sound, and, in fact, between memory and imagination. Neither the painting nor the telling of the events of Troy or of a romance are to do with recalling memories so much as they are to do with producing images in the imagination that may or may not be true but that may, nonetheless, pass into memory.

<INSERT FIGURE 2 NEAR HERE>
Figure 2: Imagining Troy from a book in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 308 (*Bestiaire O*), f. 86d v. [Permissions to follow]

If a romance can be fictional but can nevertheless, being heard, create mental impressions of things *aussi con s'il fussent present*, the prologue to the *Bestiaire d'amour* has slipped almost imperceptibly from the discussion of knowledge and how to gain it to raise the possibility of falsehood and potential deception. The text's audience should be cautious, as a confusing and potentially mendacious discussion of knowledge has already occurred just after the opening line, citing the *Metaphysics*. Having opened with the declaration that all people by nature desire to know, the following confused reasoning is presented:

> Mais pour che que nus ne puet tout savoir, ja soit che que chascune chose puist estre seue, si couvient que chascuns sache aucune chose, et che que li uns ne set mie, que li autres le sache, si que tout est seu en tele manière qu'il n'est seu de nului a par lui, ains est seu de tous ensamble.

[30] Richard's narrator may be reworking the experience described by Quintilian as *visiones*, « whereby things absent are presented to our imagination with such extreme vividness that they seem actually to be before our very eyes » (*per quas imagines rerum absentium ita repraesentantur animo, ut eas cernere oculis ac praesentes habere videamur*). Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, VI. 2. 29. For Quintilian, as for Aristotle, this act of envisioning takes place by means of the faculty of the imagination and not through memory. Lucken notes the link between the narrator's claim here and such a principle of *enargeia* or *repraesentatio* in rhetorical theory in « Entre amour et savoir », p. 149.

[31] It is possible to read *entent* as « understand » rather than as « hear » but the parallel between « voir » and « entendre » strongly suggests hearing, the sense of which translation as « understanding » would efface. In any case, rendering « *entendre* » as « understanding » does not resolve the difficulties.

[32] See Kay, « Medieval Bêtise », p. 315.

> (And inasmuch as no one can know everything (although everything can be known), it is fitting that everyone know something, then what one person does not know, let another one know it so that everything is known in such a way that it is not known by one person singularly, but rather it is known by all together.)[33]

This model by which each individual knows one thing so that everything can be known is impractical not to mention nonsensical.[34] How, for example, would the knowledge of each thing be assigned without someone else already knowing that which is to be known? How would one check the things that are known or not known? Most importantly for the example of the *estoire* or the *roumans*, how can one individual convey the things it knows truthfully to another, whether through speech, writing, or image? How could that second individual verify that they shared the same idea of the thing described or verify the truth of the account given? Rather than engaging seriously with this tongue-twisting riddle, perhaps it is better to ask what work it is doing in its performance. Even as *Metaphysics* I.1 has been alluded to, with its discussion of the delight taken in the use of the senses, especially vision, that give rise to the certain knowledge of things, the audience must make sense of sentence bafflingly full of echoes—not least, four mentions of the far from innocent participle *seu* (known), as well as repetitions of *chascun* and *chose*. It seems to promise philosophy but ultimately resists logical sense. For all that the senses can give access to a truth that can be processed by the triad of imagination, reason, and memory, speech is slippery. The *Bestiaire d'amour*, which is framed as an attempt by a male lover to convince a female addressee of the truth of his love for her and to persuade her to reciprocate, demonstrates a scepticism about language's ability to convey truth, with human *vox* being confused, confusing, and polyvalent, full of echoes and resonances.

Both the mind that remembers or imagines and the book that records or transmits are made synesthetic or else multimodal, combining as they do virtual sight and potential sound, *veoir* and *oïr*. The less-than-secure opposition between sight and sound becomes one of the key themes in the descriptions of animal natures and encounters between lovers throughout the *Bestiaire* (even if both sight and sound are often understood metaphorically rather than literally). Although the narrator makes it clear that he intends the book he is composing to be illustrated with pictures of animals, even the acting of writing combines both the visual and the implicitly sonic:

> Quant je ne serai presens, que chis escris et par painture et par parole me rende a vostre memoire comme present. Et je vous mousterrai comment chis escris est et painture et parole. Car il est bien apert qu'il ait parole, pour che que toute escriture est faite pour parole moustrer, et pour che qu'on le lise ; et quant on le list, si revient ele a nature de parole. Et d'autre part qu'il i ait painture, si est en apert pour che que lettre n'est mie s'on ne le paint.
> (When I am not present, let this writing put me in your memory as if I were present, both by painting and by speech. And I will show how this writing is both painting and speech. For it is very clear that there is speech, because all writing is made to show speech and so that it is read; and when one reads it, it returns to the nature of speech. And on the other hand it is clear that there is painting, because there is no letter that is not painted.)[35]

The narrator is sending this text to his female addressee so that, like the events at Troy, he may appear present in her mind when he is in fact absent, and so that the written (or painted)

---

[33] Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 154.

[34] This passage could be read less literally as invoking a more general community of knowledge, but it is our contention that the *Bestiaire d'amour* in general, and this proemium in particular, are imbricated with the textual practices of contemporary Scholastic philosophy of the Schools and University, which demands close attention to the syntax and logic of truth-claims. It is our claim that a non-literal reading of this passage obscures its very deliberate paradox, which places it in relation to—and partly in opposition to—more orthodox discursive practices for discussing knowledge.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 156-58.

word produces a sound of that word read aloud. The sound of the word read aloud, in turn, will produce either a mental image of the speaker in the mind of his addressee or a mental echo of his speech (he will soon go on to represent himself as producing sound in the text: *jou i parole* (I speak in it).[36] The individual speaking or writing this individual text seems to merge with the text and with a textual tradition that the *Bestiaire* itself represents as a kind of collective memory of things past, although the textual processes of memory also depend problematically on the imagination. Technically, any mental image of the narrator, provoked by the meaning of his sounded text, should appear first in the auditor's imagination *as if they were present*, like the noisy combatants imagined from narratives about the Trojan War, before being transferred to the memory. The blurring of sensation, memory, imagination, and text takes place from the *Bestiaire d'amour*'s opening lines. The *Bestiaire* demands that intertextuality be understood not just as a network of written texts but in relation to text in performance and thus as resonant, both literally and metaphorically as provoking a variety of associations, sometimes faintly, sometimes more loudly, in the minds of a text's audience.

<INSERT FIGURE 3 NEAR HERE>

Figure 3: The *Arriereban* in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 308 (*Bestiaire O*), f. 87r. [Permissions to follow]

An example of just such a resonance is presented immediately after this confusion between text, sight, and sound as the purpose of the *Bestiaire* is revealed. There is an added irony to the narrator's desire to be inside the addressee by means of his text despite his absence; it conjures an image of a mental penetration engineered by the text, implicitly sexual, and framed as a deceitful assault. In tracing this idea, we can start to see how the *Bestiaire d'amour*'s meaning depends on its suppressed intertextual resonances. The narrator compares himself to a king who has gone to war, taking his best men but leaving his rear-guard (*arriereban*) behind (see Figure 3). All his best soldiers, his songs, have failed to persuade the lady to love him and so now the prose *Bestiaire* is his rear-guard action by which he will make himself present in the mind of the addressee and so conquer her heart. This metaphor of a seduction as warfare sits uneasily with the association of the Trojan War that has been conjured up in an apparently throwaway comment when discussing painted histories.[37] The Trojan War had come to a standstill at the point when the Greeks, unable to penetrate the walled city of Ilium sent a fake gift, a horse full of soldiers, thus taking the city by stealth in a way that they could not by force. Richard's narrator, having discussed how sight and sound are the *portes de memoire* (gates of memory) has made himself metaphorically into a king unable to defeat his enemy and thus sending the gift of the *Bestiaire d'amour* so that he can, hidden inside the Trojan horse of his text, enter the doors to the mind of his addressee that are her eye and ear to be present virtually in her memory and thus to conquer her love. He may also, like the Greeks, be ill-intentioned and deceitful and, like the Greeks, destroy the castle that he intends to invade. Throughout the *Bestiaire*, the narrator transforms himself and his lady into animals through allegorical artifice. The Trojan horse is itself an animal and an artifice, inside which the Greeks hide themselves masking

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

[37] The very superfluity of the Troy reference calls attention to its inclusion. Why of all historical military clashes should it be chosen and not, say, Roncesvalles? A partial but insufficient answer is that Richard may have in mind Benoît de Sainte-Maure's *Roman de Troie* (ca. 1155-60), whose own prologue, thematically cognate with the *Bestiaire*, discusses the importance for books in preserving the memory of true knowledge thanks to which humans do not live like irrational beasts. See Benoît de Sainte-Maure, *Le roman de Troie*, ed. and trans. Emmanuèle Baumgartner and Françoise Vielliard, Paris, 1998, v. 1-44 [*Livre de Poche*].

their intentions until they have penetrated the castle. That the female addressee is herself being made into just such a castle is suggested by the image of the two *portes de memoire*, the eye and the ear, through which sensory data can reach the intellect (see Figure 1). Implicitly, the narrator will act on his desire to penetrate her mind by offering this Trojan horse of a text, pleasing and apparently given out of love. However, it may be simply the addressee's body that he wishes to penetrate, sweet-talking his way in, only for his seminal homunculi troops to spill out to pillage the « city » once he has tricked his way inside. Like any other user of language, the narrator is not in control of all the associations of the words he uses and the stories he invokes. The intertextual resonance suggests that human *vox significativa* more broadly and text more specifically always carry more meanings than those deliberately willed by individual speakers, singers, or writers and that careful interpretation can reveal the unintended meanings that nevertheless betray a deceiver. That the echo of histories of the Trojan war suggests the need for scepticism about the figure of the narrator is made clear at the very end of the text when, after a whole series of animal comparisons, he reintroduces the theme of war and conquest in relation to love. The final animal nature discussed is that of the vulture who follows the army looking for carrion.

> Chis outoirs senefie les faus amans qui sievent les dames et les damoiseles pour faire leur preu d'eles, combien qu'eles en doivent empirier.
> (This vulture signifies false lovers who follow ladies and maidens to prey on them, however much damage it may cause them.)[38]

The narrator says that he is not one of the false vulture-lovers but that he cannot prove his good intentions with words alone, bringing the text uncomfortably to its close (see Figure 4). If at the end of the *Bestiaire* there is a suspicion that the narrating figure is malevolent, this has been suggested right at the beginning by the similarity between the *Bestiaire*, an artificial construction concealing the desire for sexual conquest and the Greek gift of the horse.[39]

<INSERT FIGURE 4 NEAR HERE>

Figure 4: The vulture following the host in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fr.412 (Bestiaire B), f.236r. [Permissions to follow]

The narrating *je* of the *Bestiaire d'amour*'s opening suggests two modes of discourse: the first implies a confident but flawed clerical and pedagogical persona that brings together fragments of Aristotle and, later, various elements of bestiary material in an imperfect and confusing fashion without imparting real knowledge.[40] The second, by no means inconsistent with the first, is a discourse of seduction, emanating from a despairing but quite possibly malevolent seducer who wishes to win the love or his female address. This double discourse, clerical and lyrical, can be seen clearly in the miniatures that run through Richard de Fournival's text in MS *O*. In each representation of an animal, the same male figure stands explaining its significance to a female figure, teaching her but also seducing. In this eroticized and suspect pedagogy, the central problem for any audience is whether or not to trust the narrator, while enjoying the unreliable teachings of his ingenious speech (see, for example, Figure 5). Our particular concern in this article, however, is to show how this speech is designed to resonate for an audience, to trigger echoes or resonances of other texts. In this way, rather than take any of its claims at face value, those who receive it make

[38] Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 274.
[39] The comparison between an untrustworthy lover and the Trojan Horse occurs more explicitly in the *Consaus d'amour*, also attributed to Richard, its unique copy bound with the *Bestiaire* in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 25566 (*TrouvW = BestiaireA*). See Gian Battista Speroni, « Il "Consaus d'amours" di Richard de Fournival » in *MR*, t. 1 (1974), p. 216-78, at p. 269-70.
[40] For a useful discussion of this issue focusing on medieval English texts, see A. C. Spearing, *Textual Subjectivity: The Encoding of Subjectivity in Medieval Narrations and Lyrics*, Oxford and New York, 2005.

themselves intertextual as they compare the explicit material at hand with the associations and suppressed intertext deliberately encoded within the narrative. The second part of this article will suggest how these echoes work and what kind of readings they might make available.

As its prologue—and, in *O*, the rubricated speaking man and woman—might suggest, the *Bestiaire d'amour* is conceived of as text for performance (which is not to say it would not also have been read privately). To understand better how the resonances that it generates work, it is necessary, in the first instance, to go through the text in a linear manner. Passages read or heard two minutes before will resonate more strongly and as the text goes on the interplay between resonances becomes more complex. The first section that follows the prologue is particularly concerned with different kinds of sound, understood literally and metaphorically. In discussing it, our aim is both to demonstrate the workings of the text's resonance and to show how its sonic aspects are essential for understanding its own resonant mode of conveying meaning. After proceeding through the *Bestiaire*'s first five animals in this section, we will go on to widen the scope of inquiry in the next by considering how song is used as the basis of an intertextuality that is at once lyric and narrative.

2. Unwriteable Animal Voices: Intersonic Resonances

Having paralleled himself inadvertently to a Greek offering a deceitful gift with his Trojan War reference, Richard's narrator begins the descriptions and depictions of animals that form his textual « *arriereban* » of which the first few contain echoes that continue to hint at the danger he poses. He compares himself first to the cock who sings at hours when day and night are intermixed, which he allegorizes as times when there is hope if not security for his love. He then compares the force of his « singing »—metaphorically the writing of his *Bestiaire*—to the sound of the wild ass braying in desperate hunger and it is here that the overlapping textual resonances can be clearly seen.[41] The mention of Troy made available the echo of its deceptive horse, with its treacherous Greek soldiers lying hidden within it waiting to spring out. The description of the somewhat less grand wild ass suggests a parallel of a kind; the literal meaning of its hungry braying likewise contains hidden within it the figural sense of the narrator's desperate desire, and it recalls and overlaps with the earlier historical horse (not least because of the equine resemblance in an illumination accompanying the entry). The ass carries with it its own intertextual resonances from the bestiary tradition, which like the *Metaphysics* and like the Troy story, would have been available to some, while not necessarily all, of the text's audience. In the *Bestiaire d'amour*, all we are told about the ass is that it never brays until it is driven wild by hunger and then it brays so hard that it bursts apart. Compared to the accounts given of the *onager* or the wild ass in bestiaries, Richard's text omits some key details. For audience members familiar with wider bestiary material, such knowledge would give an added significance to the entry. In the B-Is *Physiologus* (but not in Richard de Fournival's text), the *onager* is described as braying twelve times in the day and twelve in the night on 25 March, which signals that it is the spring equinox, when day and night are of equal length. The *Bestiaire d'amour*'s narrator has just compared himself to the cock who sings when day and night are mixed together, which chimes with the *onager*'s intertextual echo, that of an animal which makes noise just when night and day are evenly matched. Memory thus plays a fundamental part in the passage's

[41] As Lucken notes in « Du ban du coq », in moving from the cock to the donkey, Richard is drawing on the expression *saillir du coq a l'asne* (to leap from cock to ass), meaning to switch topics abruptly. The earliest record of its usage is *ca.* 1370, and while it seems likely that Richard's switch from cock to ass shows that the phrase was probably already in use in the mid-thirteenth century, it is possible that it may have arisen from the *Bestiaire*'s idiosyncratic mode of switching from one animal to a taxonomically unconnected one on the basis of its narrator's metaphorical and thematic associations.

intertextuality. The text shares a small fraction of material with another text, which can then spark off a memory of any previous encounter(s) with that material, including their larger uncited contexts. Through memory, these ostensibly silent contexts can thus become part of the present text at that moment *as if they were present*. That the cock's mixing of night and day might prompt memory of the bestiary intertext of the *onager*'s spring equinox noises, despite this reference being absent, which can further prompt greater attention to more of the details of the *onager* in the bestiary tradition that are missing from the *Bestiaire d'amour*. The wild ass in wider bestiary materials stands for the devil (*Onager igitur figuram habet diaboli*), because, just as the ass brays with hunger when night and day are equal, with the day about to surpass the night, so the devil roars with hunger for the food that is escaping him when the number of those who live in the night of sin is equalled and then surpassed by those who live in faith.[42] To a reader familiar with the bestiary tradition, the narrator's account of himself as a wild ass thus suggests him as a devilish predator and not just a courtly lover.

Throughout the *Bestiaire d'amour* Richard takes the natures of animals from their descriptions in bestiaries (while occasionally adding some of his own, such as his account of the monkey putting on shoes). In bestiaries, natures are allegorized so that they convey messages about doctrinal truths or about correct Christian behaviour, whereas Richard adds his own allegoreses, which are all to do with the situation of his narrator and addressee or about courtly love more generally. In this sense, the *Bestiaire d'amour* is not a real bestiary but a fake one, a pleasurable trick or game, or even a sly assault, essentially a textual Trojan horse.[43] The suppressed allegorical meanings of the bestiary tradition subsist nevertheless as intertextual resonances. Here, for example, the meaning of the devil braying with hunger for losing his meal is eerily analogous to Richard's narrator, whose *arriereban* of a text is a last-ditch desperate attempt to snare the lady it addresses, in a way not dissimilar to the Trojan horse. The *Bestiaire* is both mimetic of the half-remembered snatches of association that take place in memory that are triggered by *voces* (speech or animate sound) and generative of further such associations and there is quite a notable difference between the kind of spiritual *sens* (sense) conveyed in bestiaries and the fleeting impressions, mental images and sounds, that collide and overlap in the *Bestiaire d'amour*.

The series of animals that comprises the first quarter of the text contains verbal descriptions and pictorial depictions of animals producing *voces* of different kinds, but this evocation of sounds is no less bound up with intertextual resonances than the introductory discussion of knowledge, memory, and the imagination. Real bestiaries tend to start with the noblest animal, the lion. As noted above, the *Bestiaire d'amour* starts, far less nobly, with the narrator comparing himself first to a cock and then an ass (see Figure 5). Just as the cock sings loudest in the darkest part of the night, the narrator sings loudest now his love is the most dark and devoid of all hope.

> Ensi comme on conte de le nature du coc, que de tant comme il cante par nuit plus pres de l'avespree ou de l'ajournee, de tant cante il plus souvent; et de tant comme il cante plus pres de la mienuit, si cante il plus esforchiement et plus engroisse se vois.
> (Just as it is told of the cock's nature that the closer to dusk or to dawn that it signs, the more often it sings; the closer it is to midnight, however, it sings more fiercely and with the loudest voice.)[44]

---

[42] Luigina Morini, *Bestiari medievali*, Turin, 1996, p. 50. *Cf.* Philippe de Thaon, *Le bestiaire de Philippe de Thaün*, v. 1827-88, in Morini, *Bestiaire medievali*, p. 103-285 ; Pierre de Beauvais, *Le bestiaire de Pierre de Beauvais, version courte*, ed. Guy R. Mermier, Paris, 1977, p. 47.

[43] That it could nevertheless be seen as a bestiary is shown by the inclusion of some of its passages in the long version of Pierre de Beauvais's bestiary, so that it is fair to say that Richard's text can be both a bestiary and not a bestiary, depending on the reader.

[44] Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 160.

The Picard inflection that produces the verb *canter* (to sing) in *Bestiaire* MS *A*, Gabriel Bianciotto's base manuscript for his edition, brings out more starkly the parallel with *conter* (to tell). Here, the narrator is himself *contant* (telling) the nature of the cock, which, he tells us, stands for him because he is at the darkest part of his night with almost no hope. Thus, according to what he tells (*conte*), the cock's loud singing (*cantant*) is itself a metaphor for his prose bestiary that itself tells of the cock's song. Such prose performs its confusing echoes on a syntactic level given the difficulty of distinguishing between *cante* and *conte* when heard being read aloud. While such confusion suggests a certain indistinction between speech and song, accompanied by a picture of a crowing cock, such prose, framed metaphorically as loud song, can also prompt the resonance of a crowing cock. In fact, in the reading of this description of a cock crowing in this article, it is relatively likely that for many readers the memory of a cock crowing will be evoked at some point. The narrator later notes that *chis escris n'est mie fait en chantant mais en contant*. (This writing is not made through singing but through telling.)[45] Most modern readers understand *en contant* to mean made « through writing », but given the frequency in medieval composition of writing through typically took place through dictation, the phrase functions equally as a reference to just such a practice, i.e. to the verbal telling of the story.[46] Thus even the non-singing text is sonic, sounded out to the scribe who writes, and the prose that the narrator offers should not be understood as verse's quiet or even silent cousin but as itself redolent with sounds.

<INSERT FIGURE 5 NEAR HERE>

Figure 5: Cock and Ass in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 308 (*BestiaireO*), f. 87v. [Permissions to follow]

Not just an analogue to the cock, the narrator's loud (prose) song makes him resemble the ass, which *plus a laide vois et orible* (has the ugliest and most horrible voice) and when it is hungry and unable to find food *met* […] *si grant paine a recaner que il se deront tous* (puts such effort into braying that it bursts asunder).[47] Even while the wild ass can provoke a whole range of sophisticated intertextual connections, the image and the discussion of its braying also prompts the memory or the imagining of the violent sound of the donkey itself, irrational, furious, and insistent. The miniatures typically depict the animals open-mouthed so that the cock visibly crows, and the ass visibly brays, prompting the seeing listener or reader to the knowledge—through the silent internal « hearing » in memory—of both noises, while perhaps also nervously imagining the noisy and noisome mess that would result from the ass exploding with the effort of braying.[48]

As well as the association with bestiary material detailed above, these two animals potentially open doors to further memories. The first makes available the multiply copied didactic fable of the cock and the fox in which the cock's susceptibility to the fox's praise of his loud singing proves nearly fatal.[49] The ass, on the other hand, opens the door of memory

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 164.

[46] Here we disagree with the readings of Kay, « Chant et désenchantement », p. 142 (following Huot *From Song to Book*, p. 141) and Lucken, « Du ban du coq », p. 112, agreeing instead with Bianciotto's translation, « récit » (Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 165).

[47] Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 162.

[48] The donkey's bursting open to reveal its noxious insides can, also, recall the Greek soldiers bursting out of the Trojan horse once it has entered into the stronghold of Ilium.

[49] In a Francophone context, this salutary story could be heard in versions by Marie de France, the Isopet tradition, and branches of the *Renart* story. See Jeanne-Marie Boivin, *Naissance de la fable en français: L'Isopet de Lyon et l'Isopet-Avionnet*, Paris, 2006; E. P. Dargan, « Cock and Fox: A Critical Study of the History and Sources of the Mediæval Fable », in *Modern Philology*, t. 4 (1906), p. 38-65; and Robert A. Pratt, «

onto a different didactic situation: the medieval song-school. All those learning to sing notated chant in medieval Europe would have known the catchily rhythmic opening lines of a treatise by Guido of Arezzo, which outlines the differences between singers who are mere singers—who just sing—and singers who are proper musicians—who not only sing but understand *how* to sing, by knowing the underlying rational principles of *musica*.[50] The mere singers are the kinds of idiots who would rate the ass's song above that of the nightingale just because it is louder: « if one praises the loudness of a thundering voice, a she-ass in full bray will surpass the nightingale, on account of which logic declares that they lack their essence. »[51] A knowledge of music theory and the grammatical definition of sound on which it relies thus allows the audience for the *Bestiaire* to understand that Richard undermines his narrator, implying that he is a mere singer, singing with the irrational—and horrible—*vox* of two farm animals. What is more, it allows such a knowledgeable audience to reaffirm its own rational humanity, grounded in a knowledge of the principles of harmony that are, importantly, conveyed through the reading or memorialization of Guido's text.

3. On the powers (and dangers) of song

Despairing lovers are not fully rational. Like irrational beasts, they are somewhat out of control and harm themselves through their song at the risk of their death. At stake throughout the whole of the unsung *Bestiaire* is the status of song and this constant preoccupation is an important part of its idiosyncratically spectral lyricism. Song and text, for all their transience, can outlive the singer, and, once uttered, resist authorial control, shared as they are in the memories of their audience or addressee. After discussion of the wolf (whose sight renders humans speechless), the cricket (which forgets to eat in its singing), and swan (which sings before it dies),[52] the narrator compares his former songs to a dog's vomit. He wishes that, like the dog which returns to its sick, he too could eat up the song he has emitted, taking it back into himself as sustaining food rather than fatal sound. In the accompanying picture the dog is noisily sick and then eats—again noisily, as dogs do. The narrator's song, like vomit, has been expelled from the body but cannot, like food, be re-ingested—once the singing voice is outside the singer, it has been uttered, entered memory, and cannot be taken back. This interpretation effectively turns on its head the passage in Proverbs 26:11, in which the dog figures the fool who returns to his folly. Another canine, the wolf, then serves to amplify the most significant difference between the dog's ability to re-ingest its vomit and the singer's inability to de-sing his song. The wolf's reappearance does not this time cause the narrator to lose his voice, but instead to recognize the impossibility of cancelling vocal sounds already made, which can never be unheard because they are stored in memory. The wolf's mouth does not now serve for eating (as with the ass, cricket, and dog), for vomiting (as with the dog), for making loud horrid noise (as with the cock and ass), or for singing sweet song (as

---

Three Old French Sources of the *Nonnes Preestes Tale* », in *Spec.*, t. 47 (1972), p. 422-44 (Part I) and p. 646-68 (Part II).

[50] The universal prevalence of this text is undoubtedly responsible for the various iconographical representations of asses attempting to sing, often to the accompaniment of the lyre, in proximity to illuminated *Beatus* initials. The singing of the Psalms was the fundamental way in which boys instructed in medieval song schools learned both *grammatica* and chant.

[51] « Ceterum tonantis vocis si laudent acumina, | superabit philomelam vel vocalis asina. | Quare eis esse suum tollit dialectica. » Guido of Arezzo, *Regulae Rithmice, Prologus in Antiphonarium, and Epistola ad Michahelem: A Critical Text and Translation*, ed. and trans. Dolores Pesce, Ottawa, 1999, p. 330–33. This translation Leofranc Holford-Strevens; see Leach, *Sung Birds,* p. 44-48 and *eadem*, « Grammar in the Medieval Song-School », *New Medieval Literatures*, t. 11 (2009), p. 195-211. Between them, therefore, these two animals speak to both the vernacular, courtly constituency who have read Marie de France and the clerics at court (or the clerical court of Richard's patron, Robert Somercote), who have read Latin and vernacular versions of the fable, taught Aesop, and been taught *cantus*.

[52] In some sources, the cricket is replaced by the nightingale; see *Li Bestiaires d'amours*, ed. Segre, p. 10-12.

with the cricket and swan), but for an act of senseless violence: the wolf bites its own leg for cracking a twig while stalking its prey. While the dog can eat up its vomit, the wolf cannot delete the sound of the twig from the aural memory of the sheep, just as the narrator is not able to take back possession the sounds of his songs which remain stored in the memory of his addressee.[53] In the allegoresis that explains this self-destructive scene, the narrator strangely compares the wolf's biting of its own leg to a woman's ability to use speech to recover from a potentially compromising oversharing of her desire so that the remedy to the production of compromising sounds lies only in the production of still more sound.[54] Eating, like singing, involves the overdetermined locus of the mouth, just as important in the *Bestiaire* as the eye and the ear mentioned in the prologue, and the focus on eating and physical death underlines song's physicality, differing from the phantasms and memories evoked by *voces*, immaterial manifestations of speakers and events.

Human *vox significativa* clearly has a different relationship to memory and the imagination than the noises made by animals but one of the most immediately unnerving aspects of these sonic animals is how they are constantly mapped onto humans. The cricket, wild ass, and dog, to give just three examples, are analogues for the narrator, suggesting an unnerving closeness and a potential blurring between the human and the animal. Such anxiety about human irrationality is, though, counterbalanced by the essentially linguistic nature of the blurring. The animal braying or crowing can provoke the thought of the amorous human for whom they stand, making the same kind of inarticulate moaning whether out of despair or enjoyment. However, the analogue between the desperately singing cricket, for example, and the narrator is only made possible through the very linguistic capability that differentiates the human from the animal. The *Bestiaire*'s zoomorphic transformations imply simultaneous closeness and abyssal distance between human and animal *vox* and such metamorphoses take place through metaphor and allusion, that is by means of the articulate, human *vox*'s ability to signify multiply. This can be seen in particular in the extended play around sleep and singing that is occasioned by the narrator's comparison of his addressee with the dangerously singing siren.

Attempting a commentary on the *Bestiaire d'amour* soon reveals that the narrating voice does not seem to be fully in control of his reason or his speech, and is unable to remain consistently on either the literal or the figural level.[55] Song is described first literally and then metaphorically, just as the narrator and his lover are made into one animal or another before being described as human again. If metaphorical language is a distinctively human characteristic,[56] it can lead to a breakdown in rational communication and the proliferation of confusing allusion. We have suggested how an image of sound, the picture of a singer (human or non-human), can provoke a mental image or a mental sound of their song. At the same time, the polyvalent use to which the concept of song is put results in the distinctive double-speak of the text and its restless intertextual resonance. We turn now to a later sequence in the *Bestiaire* in which the motif of song and sleep provokes intertextual echoes of the kind discussed above, which themselves contribute to the semiotic polyphony that may

[53] The twig's cracking completes the array of sound types in the work's opening section that, according to grammarians, cannot be expressed in letters, by adding the sound of something inanimate. Grammarians typically use examples of waves breaking or the 'crash of debris,' but here the twig joins the unwriteable sounds of animate creatures—the loud, indiscrete *vox* of the ass and the cock, and the melodic, wordless song of the cricket and swan.

[54] *Le Bestiaire d'amour*, p. 168-70.

[55] An alternative reading sees the confusing passage between the literal and figural senses in the text as part of the narrator's textual ruse by which he seeks to trap the female addressee. It is perfectly plausible, of course, for the narrator to be both devious and confused.

[56] See Jonathan Morton, « Wolves in Human Skin: Questions of Animal Appetite in Jean de Meun's *Roman de la rose* », in *MLR*, t. 105 (2010), p. 976-997 (p. 972, n. 2).

in fact be semiotic cacophony. Throughout, it is precisely the mental confusion caused by the competing mental images that leads to the pleasurable confusion by which the text seduces its audience.

The hybrid monsters called sirens, women-birds or women-fish in the *Bestiaire*, play trumpets, harps, or simply sing and a siren's song is so beautiful that it will draw a man towards it and send him to sleep at which point the siren kills him.[57] The narrating lover bewails that in just such a way he was entranced and sent to sleep by his addressee's song before going on to recount the story of the asp, which guards a tree that produces balm and which stops up its ears so as to prevent hunters lulling it to sleep. The narrator, one moment paralleled with a devoured man, now with a snake, says that he should likewise have stopped his ears rather than being put to sleep by the song of the siren. After comparing himself to the tiger captivated by the sight of herself in the hunter's mirror, the narrator recalls the prologue in saying that he was

> pris a l'oïr et au veoir : dont ne fu che mie merveille se je perdi mon sens et memoire, car oïrs et veoirs sont les deus portes de memoire.
> (taken by hearing and by sight; it was not at all surprising if I lost my sense and memory because hearing and sight are the two doors of memory.)[58]

The narrator was captivated by the sweetness of the song, but that song is revealed not to be literal but only in fact to be phantasmatic and(/because) metaphorical and only to exist in the imagination. Rather than being literal, the song stands for

> la douchour de vostre acointance et de vostre bel parler a cui oïr je fui pris.
> (the sweetness of your friendship and of your fair speech by which, listening to it, I was taken).[59]

The addressee has been made phantasmatically into a predatory and monstrous siren by the analogy that has conjured up such a mental image. Song is now a metaphor for speech (« *bel parler* ») and behaviour, while the narrator's sleep is only a figure for the state of being in love. However, as soon as the *image* of song has been evoked, its literal sense is reasserted. Singing and its power are discussed in the lines that follow, describing the beauty of the blackbird's song followed by a more extended discussion of the power of harmonious, rationally proportionate song to move the emotions and even to move bees who cannot hear it but only sense its proportion.[60] The narrator then returns to discuss being *endormis a forche de chant* (sent to sleep by the power of song), although the referent of « song » here is once again metaphorical as once more he lurches away from the literal. This « song » is so powerful that even had the narrator had as much *pourveanche* (providence, foresight) as that figured by the eyes on the peacock's tail,[61] he would have succumbed to the « song » that figures his social interactions with the addressee. Song, then, has become both seductive music and the seductive presence and speech of the lady which interferes with his reason. This irrationality is then reproduced in the narrator's inability to stay securely in either the

---

[57] In the text of the *Physiologus*, the sirens are not gendered.
[58] Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 200.
[59] *Ibid.*, p. 188. (NB: this text is lacking in MSS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 12786 (*Trouvk* = *BestiaireC*) and Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, 526 (*BestiaireH*) and comes from Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 1444 (*BestiaireE*).)
[60] *Ibid.*, p. 188; p. 196-98; The bees might be presumed to « hear » without hearing by feeling the striking of the air (« *percussio aeris* ») that sound creates. On *percussio aeris*, see Gilles Rico, « "Auctoritas cereum habet nasum": Boethius, Aristotle, and the Music of the Spheres in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries », in *Citation and Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Musical Culture: Learning from the Learned*, ed. Suzannah Clark and Elizabeth Eva Leach, Woodbridge, 2005, p. 20-28. Richard must have been familiar with Boethius's discussion of this phenomenon in his treatise on music and the library catalogued in his *Biblionomia* contained a copy. See Léopold Delisle, « La *Biblionomie* de Richard de Fournival », in *Le Cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, 1874, t. 2, p. 518-35, at p. 527.
[61] Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 208-10.

literal or figurative discursive planes. The obsessive blurring of the boundary between humans and animals insistently recalls the definition of the human as an *animal rationale* (rational animal) in medieval thought, and while memory and the imagination have been signalled as a means of preserving knowledge, it is clear that they are unreliable tools when desire overpowers reason.[62]

It is at this point, the siren-like dangers of song and the various things signified by song having been interwoven, that the prologue's interplay between memory and textual transmission returns once again. A muted allusion to song in Ovid suggests the importance of intertextual echoes for understanding Richard's literary project. The mention of the peacock whose many-eyed tail figures foresight leads immediately to the retelling of the story of Mercury, Argus, and Io from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, I.568-747, although the episode is framed not as coming from a book that the narrator has read but rather as a remembering of a story that he has heard and is now echoing

> car j'ai oï conter .j. conte d'une dame qui avoit une trop bele vaque, qu'ele amoit tant que ele ne le vausist avoir perdue pour nule chose.
> (for I have heard a story told of a lady who had a very beautiful cow that she loved so much that she would not have lost it for anything).[63]

The distorted echoes of the apparently misremembered Ovidian text obscure the fact that in the source text, the *dame* in question is the goddess Juno and the beautiful cow is the nymph Io whom Jupiter raped before turning into a heifer in order to disguise her from his jealous wife. Juno, suspecting some foul play, has the heifer guarded by Argus who had a hundred eyes, closing only two at a time.[64] In the *Bestiaire* as in the *Metamorphoses*, Mercury sends many-eyed Argus to sleep with the power of his music (recalling the song of the sirens) and then cuts off his head before stealing the cow. Richard's reworking, like his use of bestiary material or, indeed, Aristotle is marked by significant lacunae while, nevertheless, provoking its audience to remember precisely those significant details that the literal text occludes and thus to participate themselves in creating the *Bestiaire*'s meaning through their acts of memory. It is not made explicit that the *hom qui la vache avoit enamee* (man who had loved the cow) and who sends his son to get it is Jupiter sending the god Mercury, although this oversight would have been clear to a very wide range of medieval audiences.[65] It would only take one person present to pick up on the Ovidian intertext to be able to point out the omissions. Likewise, it would just take one person present to remember, despite its omission of that detail in the *Bestiaire d'amour*, that in the *Metamorphoses*, the many eyes on the peacock's tail (the cue in Richard's text for the story of Mercury and Argus) came from Juno's transposition of Argus's eyes onto the bird's tail when he died. This resonance of Ovid's etiology of the peacock's tail, linked with sight, then chimes with the signification of the peacock as meaning foresight mentioned only moments earlier in the *Bestiaire*.

On the one hand, this story is a joke about the narrator's loss of *sens et memoire* that he claims has come from his being taking by sight and by the power of song, understood as his

---

[62] See also Kay, « Chant et désenchantement », p. 156.
[63] Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 212.
[64] Such a playful and deliberate retelling of Ovidian story, depending for its humour on what it conceals and changes from the *Metamorphoses*, is thus similar to the telling of the Narcissus and Echo story in Guillaume de Lorris's section of the *Roman de la rose*. See Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le roman de la rose*, ed. Félix Lecoy, 3 vols., Paris, 1965-70 [*CFMA*, 92, 95, 98], v. 1437-1501. Guillaume significantly reworks the story, most significantly removing the mythographic and metamorphic elements of the narrative so that Echo prays to God who punishes Narcissus (in Ovid it is a male admirer whose curse is granted by Nemesis). In Richard's telling of the Echo and Narcissus story in his Chanson 9, it is *Amor* (Love) who punishes Narcissus. See *L'Oeuvre lyrique de Richard de Fournival*, p. 67-69, and Michèle Gally, « Entre *fin'amor* et Ovide: Richard de Fournival "Soutius parliers" d'amour », in *Cahiers de recherches médiévales*, t. 9 (2002), via http://crm.revues.org/872; DOI : 10.4000/crm.872 (accessed 18 August 2015).
[65] Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 212.

attraction for his addressee. He has forgotten the details, familiar to those of his audience who have studied, read, or heard the story of Mercury, Argus, and Io. The repressed details of the Ovidian intertext nevertheless resonate, unspoken but present in their memories. Throughout the *Bestiaire* the narrator has been using the power of speech (whether as actual *parole* or as the virtual *parole* that is the *escrit*) to conjure exotic beasts and birds whose identities overlap with both himself and his siren addressee in a phantasmatic, allegorical game. Introducing elements of the *Metamorphoses* adds Roman mythology to bestiary material, musical theory, and Aristotelian philosophy, and increases the potential for competing resonances and meanings to confuse identity and to trouble meaning. Even if the *Bestiaire* does not mention it (or, maybe, precisely *because* the *Bestiaire* does not mention it), Jupiter's act of transforming Io into a cow demands to be read next to the narrator's discursive strategy of metaphorically metamorphosing both himself and his addressee into different animals. Io's loss of her articulate *vox*, replaced only by the lowing of a cow (I.635-37) certainly recalls the despairing animal noises suggested in earlier entries. The echoes of Jupiter's rape attempt, moreover, may lead an audience to suspect violent, physical urges lurking under the richly woven exterior of the narrator's speech. This is not to say that his true character (whatever that might mean) can be determined, but rather to demonstrate how the *Bestiaire* stages the impossibility of accessing truth through language, at least through the kind of allusive, resonant language of an art that is sonic both literally and figuratively.

The Ovidian subtext of animal metamorphoses is further extended by a specific use of particular vernacular song later in the work as the web of allusions grows ever denser and more complex. The narrator cites lines from a troubadour song to support his views about the necessity of equality in love and the socially equalizing effect of true love. The passage hosting this citation has been most recently analysed by Sarah Kay, who points out the unusual juxtaposition of the two authority figures cited: the first Ovid, a genuine Latin *auctor*, a written authority; the second, a *Poitevin*,[66] a medieval vernacular inventor of songs in Occitan. The citations enable this troubadour to be identified as Bernart de Ventadorn.[67]

<INSERT EXAMPLE 1 NEAR HERE>

Example 1a: Bernart de Ventadorn PC70.42 in the *Bestiaire d'amour* (ed. Bianciotto, pp.254, 256)).

1b. Bernart de Ventadorn, PC 70.42, stanza 3 (ed. Nichols and Galm).

1c. Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, Bk 2, ll. 846-7.

The passage in question is given in full in Example 1a.[68] The narrator declares *qu'il n'est riens c'Amours ne fache yevel, et est aussi comme mers sans ondes* (that there is nothing that love does not make equal like a wave-less sea). To assert his point, he turns first to this *Poitevin* whom he quotes (X on Example 1a), taking up the idea of the wave to say *que «*

[66] Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 256.

[67] Kay's argument is that lyric is important as laboratory of both citation and translation because lyric songs are first vernacular texts that are cited in great numbers by vernacular authors, who cite the textual object in the text or who translate it as we cite and translate them still today. Sarah Kay, « La seconde main et les secondes langues dans la France médiévale », in *Translations Médiévales: Cinc siècles de traductions en français au Moyen Âge (XIe-XVe siècles). Étude et Répertoire*, ed. Claudio Galderisi and Vladimir Agrigoroaei, Turnhout, 2011, p. 461-85 at p. 485. This is extraordinary, not just as Kay notes because vernacular lyric functions as a « laboratory of both citation and translation », but also because the citation from Bernart's song suggest that despite being a song, it also functioned as a literate, written authority.

[68] NB: it shows considerable variation between different sources and is omitted entirely in some others; the text is given here is that from *Bestiaire A*, which is Bianciotto's base text, omitting the text he supplies from other sources, which he gives in italics; *cf.* Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 254-256.

riens ne val l'amour qui ensi ondiele » (that « a love that wavers is worth nothing »).[69] This has been identified as a slightly varied version of the third line of the third stanza of one of Bernart's songs, *Quan' vei la flor, l'erba vert e la foilha* (PC 70.42).[70] The line actually reads *que re no vol amors qu'esser no deya* (that love wants nothing that is not proper). The words *no deya* (not proper) have become *ondele* (wave) in the quotation. Because the narrator uses the quotation in the *Bestiaire* specifically to support the earlier claim that the equality of love is like a wave-less sea, this reading— *ondele* (wave)—is what is intended in the *Bestiaire*. But compared to Bernart's text, it is either a scribal misreading that was in the version of the song Richard knew, or it is Richard's manipulation of his source to make it appear to be a misreading from or in a written copy. This reading is not present in any of the surviving sources of the song's text, but one of these does enable us to see how it might have come about.[71] The earliest surviving copy of Bernart's poem, which happens also to be the sole musically notated version is in the first layer of the St-Germain-des-Prés chansonnier (the northern French source, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr.20050 (*TrouvU* or *TroubX*), which was copied some time in the 1230s.[72] The *-eya* rhyme is rendered as *-eie*, which, if the undotted *i* ascends a little too far, could be misread as *-ele*. Although this part of the book was copied well within Richard's lifetime in Northern France, it would only be a candidate for being the copy Richard knew if we agree that he made his narrator make a pseudo-scribal misreading, perhaps as a way of piquing the memory of the reader or audience so that the misreading, when recognized, serves as a way of stimulating a memory that the entire stanza rejects pride and lordship in love.[73] Otherwise it would suggest that there were written copies of troubadour song in Northern France dating to Richard's lifetime that no longer survive. Either way, one notes that the song cited as an authority here is a song that is specifically written in letters, in contrast to the unwriteable animal songs of the illuminations.[74]

---

[69] Even the sources Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fr. 24406 (*TrouvV = BestiaireF*) and *BestiaireG*, which give another quotation here (*Qu'a rebours non est l'amours*), offer the line from Bernart's song later in their texts.

[70] *The Songs of Bernart de Ventadorn*, ed. and trans. Nichols and Galm, p. 163-165 (no.42).

[71] See the variants listed in *Bernart von Ventadorn: Seine Lieder mit Einleitung und Glossar*, ed. Carl Appel, Halle a. S., 1915, p. 242.

[72] See Robert Lug, « Politique et littérature à Metz autour de la Guerre des Amis (1231-1234): Le témoinage du Chansonnier de Saint-Germain-des Prés », in *Lettres, musique et société en Lorraine médiévale: Autour du Tournoi de Chauvency (Ms. Oxford Bodleian Douce 308)*, ed. Mireille Chazan and Nancy Freeman Regalado, Geneva 2012, p. 451-86. and further here in n. 73 below. While not accepting Lug's dating of 1231, Madeleine Tyssens notes that the first part of the manuscript « ne pourrait […] être antérieure de beaucoup à 1240 » (see *Le Chansonnier Français U, publié d'aprés le manuscrit Paris, BNF, fr.20050*, ed. Madedeline Tyssens, t.1 [*SATF*], p. xix-xxi; the text of the song is n.168 on p. 372-3. Images of the manuscript can be viewed on Gallica; the song starts on f. 88r (see http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b60009580/f183.item [accessed 1 August 2017]).

[73] Lug (*ibid.*, p. 456-7) dates the first layer up to f. 177 (which includes Bernart's song) to 1231 and insists that it is a copy of an earlier book, enabling the beginnings of notated vernacular song in the 1220s. Most musicologists have dated the manuscript much later. « Sources, MS », Section III. 4 of *Grove* online (http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/50158pg3 [accessed 13 Mar 2017]) suggests « after 1240, probably by 1250, Lorraine; Everist (1989) argues on palaeographical grounds that it was produced as early as c1225, but it contains songs by several composers who could not have worked earlier than the 1240s. » This ignores the various layers, which *Grove* itself notes, but which only Lug has studied in detail.

[74] Segre considers it a « manipulation » (*Li Bestiaires d'amours*, ed. Segre, p. xi, n. 1), similar to the manipulation of the other quotations in this section. Bianciotto reports this (Richard de Fournival, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour*, p. 257, n. 80) and says it is perhaps an adaption of a variant or a bad reading. Beer, *Beasts of Love*, p. 100 goes for a different song of Bernart's, two lines from *Tant ai mo cor ple de joya* (PC 70. 44): *C'atressi.m ten en balansa com la naus en l'onda* (she holds me balanced like a ship on the waves). Kay, « La seconde main », p. 480 objects that this is a loose translation and agrees with the earlier identification of PC 70. 42 on the specific grounds that this song is in *TrouvU* and thus circulated nearer Amiens/Paris, whereas Beer's suggested song only circulated in southern sources.

This passage of citation started with the narrator wanting his lady to value his love equal to her own. He then switches this focus on the quantity and quality of the love offered by the two members of the couple, via a citation from Ovid, to construe equality specifically in terms of *social quality*, that is, the status of the persons involved. The narrator claims (Marked Y on Example 1a) *c'« amours et signerie ne puent longes demourer ensanle en une caiiere »* (« that love and lordship cannot remain together for long in one seat »), taking his text from the end of *Metamorphoses* Book 2, v. 846-7: *Non bene conveniunt, nec in una sede morantur | maiestas et amor* (Example 1c).[75] This dictum is used to introduce Jove's ploy of changing himself into a fair white bull in order to seduce and carry off Europa, who, unsuspecting, is guarding her father Agenor's cattle. Ovid's supposed « equalization », therefore, is only assumed temporarily by a very fickle and untrustworthy lover indeed and must inflect our reading of Richard's translation of his ironic teaching. As with the story of Argus, the Ovidian intertext carries the resonance of a predatory and deceptive sexual assault that disturbs the courtly discourse of refined love. Earlier we were given a version of the story of Io transformed by Jupiter into a cow for the purposes of seduction and now we have the echoes of a story in which Jupiter transforms himself into a bull, the male equivalent. Fine speech betrays the faint echoes of a violent subtext suggesting the narrator as a second malevolent Jupiter. These echoes depend specifically on the written nature of his *vox* and the transformations and betrayals that occur in the memory of past stories and earlier songs, both literal memory and the figural written memory of textual traditions.

While these undertones lurk underneath, the literal surface of the text offers a parallel meditation on textual resonance. Ovid's text is immediately glossed by a return to Bernart (Z on Example 1a): *et li Poitevins, qui ensievy Ovide, si dist: « Ne puest l'orgueil od l'amour remanoir.* » (And the *Poitevin* who followed Ovid says, « Love cannot remain where there is pride. »)[76] The Latin and Occitan authorities are placed on a par here, not simply because they are interleaved and the *Poitevin* is deemed to be following Ovid, but also because the second quotation from Bernart is a later line from precisely the same stanza in the same song as the earlier citation: effectively the entire stanza of Bernart's song is being credited as an extended lyric gloss on one point in Ovid's narrative, as a way of proving the narrator's point that true love makes the lovers equal. Example 1b gives Bernart's entire third stanza, marking the quotations; the underlining shows words that additionally feature not in direct quotations but in the directly surrounding passage in the *Bestiaire d'amour*.[77] In the context of the *Bestiaire*, Bernart and Ovid together are used first to insist that the lady love the narrator as much as he loves her, and second to evade any hint that their love is impossible because of their relative social statuses. Since both Ovid and Bernart are known primarily as love poets, they, too, are being equalized, despite their status ordinarily being as unalike that of Jove and Europa: the difference between the Latin authority and the vernacular composer blur or even join together to form one erotic textual body. Ovid, a written authority, is being lyricized in the sense that his poetry has been turned into a snatch of vernacular discourse susceptible to combination with other songs, irrespective of status, echoing in the co-dependent storehouses of Memory and the textual tradition.

<INSERT EXAMPLE 2 NEAR HERE>

[75] For a number of other texts that contain the same sentiment, see *Li Bestiaires d'amours*, ed. Segre, p. ix-xi.
[76] Lordship (*seignorie*) and pride (*orgueil*) are equated, since those who wish to retain their superior social status in love are deemed proud—not necessarily a negative quality, but indicative of not having been made equal to the other in the love relationship (and thus not fit for loving). The idea that there is no lordship in love but rather equality is found in many other texts from this period, as Bianciotto and Segre note.
[77] For example, *parage* and *signorage*. Also, the version in *TrouvU* starts with *Qu'amours*, thus strikingly similar.

Example 2: Melody of Bernart de Ventadorn PC70.42 with stanza 3 underlaid.

While it cannot be proved incontrovertibly (and probably did not pertain for all readers or audiences), the lines cited from Bernart de Ventadorn might readily, for certain audiences, have cued their respective melodies, thereby prompting further memory of the entire stanza and even the entire poem.[78] Example 3 shows our transcription of the music, with the text of stanza 3 underlaid from the Saint-Germain-des-Prés chansonnier throughout.[79] For lines 3 and 6 of the song the cited versions of these lines in the *Bestiaire d'amour* are additionally underlaid. It seems likely that recall of these two lines—lines 3 and 6 from a third stanza—was facilitated by their musical profile in memory. While the first three pitches of line 3, for example, make it start with a rising contour like a modified version of the first line's melody (only a tone lower; compare the boxes labelled X1 and X2), the ascent continues the upper limit of the range of piece (*aa* labelled X3) for the one and only time each stanza, and has the only tonal termination to the pitch *c* (labelled X4).[80] Line 6 is the only line that starts with a prolonged descent (Y1), down from the highest note that starts any line (upper *g*; labelled Y2), and also collects and anticipates a number of smaller motivic features from earlier to draw together the melody ready for the final line of the stanza. For someone who knew the song, the quotation of these lines, despite being inner lines from a later stanza, had a distinct melodic profile whose memory would be evoked by the words, evoking in turn the rest of the stanza's melody and probably, too, the other stanzas of the text.[81]

Having said he is not going to sing, the narrator of the *Bestiaire d'amour* thus imports a significant sung subtext. At its full extent of seven stanzas, Bernart's song has a narrator who is fickle in love and is returning to his first lady having earlier changed his affection but found his new lady too opposed to his suit.[82] The veiled revelation of this narrative in the *Bestiaire* is significant in suggesting why the lady might now be refusing the narrator, and the intertextual resonances of Bernart's song could suggest its applicability to the prose work's *je*-narrator: maybe he too has been a fickle lover, now returning like the dog to his vomit. And his unreliability emphasizes further the work's final warning about the flattering untruth of those who claim to be true lovers but who are really vultures. The background singing of

[78] Here we differ from the view in Sarah Kay, *Parrots and Nightingales: Troubadour Quotations and the Development of European Poetry*, Philadelphia, 2013 and *eadem*, « Chant et désenchantement », p. 143, that the use of excerpts from troubadour lyric in florilegia and similar sources necessarily distanced them from their melodic performance, although they might also have been known and performed as unmelodic verbal texts by readers unfamiliar with the melodies. Modern psychological studies have shown not only the persistence of melody for even short textual snippets and the ability to reconstitute a melody from scrambled sonic data, provided the original is known (see Diana Deutsch, « Octave Generalization and Tune Recognition », in *Perception & Psychophysics*, t. 11 (1972), p. 411-12). While this example does not relate specifically to Occitan song, the general point about the interaction of memory and knowledge is suggestive. One might add to this the evidence from a lyric-interpolated narrative like Jean Renart's *Guillaume de Dole*, in which the narrator presupposes melodic knowledge of songs by various troubadours, including Bernart de Ventadorn.

[79] In the manuscript, as is usual practice in notated *chansonniers*, only the first stanza of text is placed under the music like this, but one may assume that the version here approximates what was sung.

[80] Pitches are given in italics using the Guidonian gamut, i.e. with upper-case letters for the lowest octave (the *graves A* to *G*), lower-case letters for the next octave (the *acutes*, *a* to *g*) and doubled lower-case letters for the *superacutes* pitches above that. The pitch *C* is roughly equivalent in level to the middle C on a modern piano, although it should be noted that there was no fixed pitch standard in the Middle Ages.

[81] As a test, the reader should choose a stanzaic song (preferably not a refrain song, so a national anthem or religious hymn would work better than pop music), pull up the lyrics online and write down two, separate inner lines on a blank sheet of paper. On a different occasion, look at the lines again and see whether they evoke their own melodies, the melody of the rest of the song, and the words of the rest of the song.

[82] Although the version in *TrouvU* has only 3 stanzas, the other versions mainly have 7, usually in the same order (although 4 and 6 are transposed in Bibliothèque nationale de Paris, fr. 856 (*TroubC*). The thrust of the poem seems rather different after stanza 3 in any case.

Bernart's song negates the narrator's opening disavowal of sung lyric and prompts the *Bestiaire*'s audience mentally to perform song that is physically absent except phantasmatically in the memory. What is more, like the pedagogical subtexts of the animal voices, the troubadour intertext further undermines the stability and truthfulness of Richard's narrator at just the point where he tries to claim the authority of citing textual *auctoritates*—and, as with the Trojan war or the Ovidian intertext, it is the memory of the full text of that song that goes against his attempt to invoke it. Nonetheless, like the stories from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, this song cannot serve as any kind of written proof of the narrator's guilt but only as one of a series of hints, suggestions, or suspicions, demanding the active memorial engagement of the text's audience or reader given to animate a sound that text alone cannot convey, since only in memory can sounds (ambiguously) endure.

Conclusion

Opening with Aristotle's dictum that *Toutes gens desirrent par nature a savoir*, the *Bestiaire d'amour*'s meaning depends on the interplay between desire and intertextuality, and on the relationship between pleasure and knowledge. It is a work whose resonances baffle the subject who is desirous of understanding it, and it leads its audiences to make intratextual and intertextual connections that generate pleasurable understanding or pleasurable confusion. For a work designed to be performed, as the *Bestiaire* undoubtedly was, the words on the page themselves are not the end of the process of making meaning. Potential meanings and resonances are encoded within the text that are only activated by participants and, particularly, by audiences in receiving the text. This is true on a collective level as different members of any audience will have different mental echoes triggered by moments in the text. The continued discussion that the enjoyably complex *Bestiaire* was designed to cause leads to a collective work of reception as different members bring their own remembered intertextual memories to bear on the text. The prologue, with its play on Aristotle, faculty psychology, and the processes of knowing and remembering, also suggests a more individualized, internal way in which a text's meaning is only fully realized in its reception. Each individual mind will have different remembered or imagined echoes that will interact with the signifying *voces* of a text whose meaning depends on song and sound that is absent and phantasmatic, wholly bound up with the written memorialisation of a textual tradition. The *Bestiaire* is obsessively self-reflexive about its own status as a written prose work infused with lyric resonance on which its meaning depends. A problem that it implicitly poses at the beginning of the work but explicitly leaves unresolved is how, given the confusing and overdetermined nature of human utterances, we can learn anything from such seductive text. The initial promise of a collective knowledge shared by all humans leads rather to a destabilising loss of identity as individual voices and assertions become lost in the proliferation of other half-remembered snatches of song.

The *Bestiaire* elides the division between one text or one speaker and the larger textual tradition within which they must be situated to be understood. Identity is destabilized further as it continuously blurs the frontier between humans and other animals. However, even while suggesting how appetites and the lures of the senses can render humans bestial, its very textuality reminds its audiences of their human distinction from the mute beasts, rooted in the operation of the intellect that depends on the senses. The scene of seduction and the scene of literature are both spaces in which the roles of speaker and audience are contested, fluid. The range of echoes prompts continued discussion, reiteration, and reworking, both of the text at hand and of its sources and analogues amongst its audience, whose members bring to bear the resonances of different animal sounds, human songs, and written and recited texts that have been set off by the *Bestiaire*. The roles of the conjured, constructed, imagined narrator and addressee shift continually as they are understood against one textual tradition and then

another, from one moment to the next and often simultaneously. Those sources which cue a motet opening at the end make concrete the text's fundamental mode: medieval motets are distinctive for their juxtaposition of songs from different domains, melding the liturgical together with the love lyrical.[83] In the same way, the multivocal, resonant text of the *Bestiaire* juxtaposes divergent mythographic, allegorical, lyric, natural philosophical, and historical motifs and echoes against each other to provoke its audiences into forming new associations and making new meanings in their reception of the text.

ELIZABETH EVA LEACH
Oxford University
&
JONATHAN MORTON
King's College London

[83] MSS *O* and *B* append the text *Merci de qui j'atendoie secours et aie m'est si del tout eslongie*. This refrain (number 1308 in the standard catalogue of refrain texts by Nico H. J. van den Boogaard) forms the opening of the upper voice of a fairly widely copied thirteenth-century motet (in four medieval sources).