CHAPTER 1

BETWEEN DIASPORA AND CONQUEST:
NORMAN ASSIMILATION IN PETRUS
ALFONSI'S DISCIPLINA CLERICALIS
AND MARIE DE FRANCE'S FABLES

Suzanne Conklin Akbari

This chapter examines Norman identity and diaspora comparatively, through texts composed in Sicily and England.

In 1760, an editor named Étienne Barbazan published a volume titled Le Casonnement du pere a son fils, a dialogue of father and son containing, in Barbazan's view, a compendium of learning to be devoutly absorbed by the attentive son. The editor presents the son's filial attention to his father's wisdom as a model for the reader, who should similarly embrace the paternal authority of eighteenth-century French civilization and government. In the brief remarks that immediately precede the text of the Casonnement, Barbazan states that this work is exemplary in that it "has as its object simply to inspire religion, good values, good conduct, submissiveness and respect for those persons of dignity who are installed by Goy to govern and protect us. Such are the sentiments of the anonymous author, which I offer here to the public." Barbazan prefaces his edition with three learned essays on philology, describing how the use of etymology to disentangle the French language from Celtic and Germanic interpolations enables a fuller knowledge of the foundations of French culture. In Barbazan's view, the filial learning enacted in the narrative of the Casonnement epitomizes the work of the philologist: "nothing instructs us better than the usages and the values of our fathers, and moreover
nothing more fully clarifies for us both the origins and the variations of our language."

It is enchantingly ironic that the text Barbazan chooses as an exemplar of essentially French national identity is an early vernacular rendition of the *Disciplina Clericalis*. Petrus Alfonsi, a Sephardic Jew educated in Muslim Spain and transplanted to Norman England, is the "Auteur anonyme" to whom Barbazan assigns this quintessentially French text. On two occasions in the text of the *Cestoïent*, however, the heterogeneous cultural background of the *Disciplina Clericalis* emerges to challenge the philologist's assertion of the paternal authority of the French nation. On one occasion, Barbazan is puzzled by the allusion to the precious stone "jagome" in the story of the bird who escapes from the farmer who traps him in a net.3 Barbazan writes, in puzzlement, that this word "cannot be found in any dictionary." In the closing lines of the *Cestoïent*, another philological obstacle presents itself with the phrase "Roi et Conor et Aumocor." Barbazan is mystified by the final word and writes in a footnote, "I have only seen this word here, and I can find no point of origin in Latin." He goes on to add that he has consulted one of the authors of the *Journal des Savants*, who tells him that the word is in fact Arabic.4 Barbazan says no more; he does not draw out the implications of finding an Arabic word in the closing lines of this French text. Presumably, he would argue that this term has somehow strayed into a national literary tradition, that it is simply a foreign element that must be expunged in the search for the essential linguistic substrate of the French nation. As Barbazan puts it in one of his prefatory essays, "The art of etymology is that of stripping away that which is, so to speak, foreign [étranger], and by this means to recall [the words] to that simplicity which they all have at their origin."

I have recounted this little fable of nationalist philology in order to illustrate the dangers of reading literature as a transparent reflection of culture. It is easy to see the pitfalls of Etienne Barbazan's effort to read the dialogue of the *Disciplina Clericalis* as a straightforward manifestation of the French nation in its infancy, and the paternal authority of the interlocutor as a virtual personification of that nation. We are perhaps somewhat less attentive to the potential pitfalls of reading the *Disciplina Clericalis* as a manifestation of an "Oriental" literary form: over the last few decades, several critics have described the *Disciplina Clericalis* in precisely these terms.6 In the following pages, therefore, I will discuss some features of the *Disciplina Clericalis* in an effort to consider the ways that its frame-tale narrative is less an essentially Oriental form than a form that emerges from the phenomenon of cultural mediation. To put it another way, it may be useful to read the narrative structure of the *Disciplina Clericalis* within the framework of diasporic Norman culture rather than interpreting it as a straightforward importation of "Eastern" forms into a "Western" milieu. To this end, I will juxtapose the *Disciplina Clericalis* with the twelfth-century Anglo-Norman *Fables* of Marie de France, arguing that the cultural assimilation seen in Norman England can be fruitfully compared with that found in other medieval sites of Norman rule, such as Sicily. Descriptions of appetite and eating in the *Disciplina Clericalis* and the *Fables* reflect the culture of assimilation that is the matrix of twelfth-century frame-tale narratives, distinguishing them sharply from the later medieval frame-tale narratives with which they are often grouped, such as the *Decameron* and the *Canterbury Tales*.

**Norman Diaspora**

Norman culture of the Middle Ages spanned a wide geographical range, linked by sea routes that provided a source of economic and cultural continuity. This continuity has led some scholars to refer to the "Norman diaspora," that is, the fanning out of Norman communities across Europe and the Mediterranean, giving rise to a range of hybrid communities that share certain societal and cultural features. There are several reasons why we might want to hesitate in deploying the term Norman diaspora. It is first of all debatable whether the term "diaspora" can be appropriately used other than its original context, that is, with diaspora referring to the forced dispersion of Jews from Jerusalem in the first century, a usage popularized by Flavius Josephus in his Greek-language chronicle of Jewish history. Nonetheless, over the last two decades, the term diaspora has been extended to refer to a range of other manifestations of ethnic migration, perhaps most famously in the descriptions of the "African" or "black diaspora" described by Paul Gilroy.7 We now find in the critical literature a range of diasporas: the "Irish diaspora," the "Italian diaspora," the "Indian diaspora," and—a rather ironic example—the "Israeli diaspora."

This generic use of the term to signify any dispersion of peoples is problematic. In the earliest adaptations, such as Gilroy's use of the term black diaspora, the analogy to the Jewish experience of oppression and violent removal from a homeland is paramount. Gilroy's account of the long-term effects of the Atlantic passage on African American slave communities takes pains to highlight the self-reflective identification of those peoples with Jewish communities living in exile or in captivity.8 Other usages of the term diaspora, however, are far less scrupulous, neglecting what must surely be the most fundamental aspect of diaspora: like exile, diaspora is inexorably forced upon persons, not a state that one chooses freely.9 In addition, the
The dispersal of peoples from Troy was clearly understood by medieval readers as being something like the diaspora described by Josephus. Medieval readers familiar with the popular fourth-century Latin rendition of Josephus's account attributed to Hegesippus read accounts of the forced dispersal of the inhabitants of Troy with a strong sense of the repetitious, cyclical nature of history, in which urban destruction is followed by the scattering of peoples to the four corners of the earth. It is consequently unsurprising that a whole series of medieval chronicles integrate the history of diaspora within the history of *translatio imperii*. This is evident not only in the many medieval redactions and continuations of Orosius's universal history, in which the account of the exile of Jews from Jerusalem in the first century serves as a template for the subsequent dispersal of peoples from cities after siege, most especially, Troy, but also in histories of national origin. Both narratives of British descent (such as the eighth-century *Historia Brittonum* of pseudo-Nennius and the twelfth-century *Historia Regum Britanniae* of Geoffrey of Monmouth) and narratives of Norman descent (such as the tenth-century *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum* of Dudo of Saint-Quentin and its later iterations, as the *Gesta Normanorum ducum*, by Guillaume de Jumièges, Odo of Bayeux, and Robert de Torigny) recount the foundation of the nation in terms of the arrival and lineage arising from warriors escaping the ruins of Troy. The fall of Troy and subsequent dispersal of its inhabitants follows the model of the fall of Jerusalem, in an implicit comparison that is only heightened through each city's supersessionist relationship to Rome: Troy gives rise to Rome in the national narrative first inscribed in the *Aeneid*, just as Jerusalem gives rise to Christian Rome in the ecclesiastical narrative recounted in the many redactions and adaptations of Josephus's *Bellum Iudaicum*. The alignment of the fall of Troy with the fall of Jerusalem, and their common participation in the larger trajectory of Orosian *translatio imperii*, is perhaps most fully expressed in the *Flores historiarum* of Matthew Paris, in which the chronologies of Jewish and Trojan history are alternately recounted until both give way to the linear sequence of successive imperial powers as they devolve from Babylon, to Persia, to Greece, to Rome.

It is through the model of Troy, then, that we can draw upon medieval historiographical models in order to conceive of Norman diaspora, a migration of peoples throughout the world that gave rise to a range of communities scattered across Europe and the Mediterranean. Unlike the simplistic narrative of nation implicit in the myth of Trojan descent, however, in which each exiled Trojan warrior serves as the father of a single, homogeneous people, the historical narrative of what we might choose to call Norman diaspora is far more heterogeneous. If there is a distinctive quality to be singled out in Norman culture, across Europe and the Mediterranean,
it is precisely the quality of adaptability; that is, the chameleon-like ability to blend in, to assimilate, to take up numerous elements already present in a local culture, and to embed them within a layer of “Normannitas” that binds them all together. In making this argument, I want to stress the importance of not overlooking those qualities that serve to distinguish Norman culture in each of its various settings. One has only to look at recent scholarship illustrating how Norman identity evolved in dramatically different forms in France, England, Italy, and Sicily. We can say, nonetheless, that the ability to assimilate local forms was part of a shared practice common to Norman societies, a practice that Karla Mallette has traced with remarkable eloquence in her recent study of medieval Sicily, and which has long been the object of study among scholars working on late eleventh- and twelfth-century England.

It is in this framework—not in a nebulous Oriental context—that we might fruitfully place the *Disciplina Clericalis* of Petrus Alfonsi. Reading the *Disciplina Clericalis* in the context of Norman diaspora accomplishes three things. First, it allows us to stop reading literary forms as unproblematic cultural booty translated from one environment to another, and instead read them as the products of a rich history of cultural interaction. Second, it keeps constantly before the reader a memory of the migration of peoples—both imagined and actual—that lies behind the movement of stories, narrative forms, and modes of interpretation. Finally, it locates that memory of migration within the framework of diaspora, within the template of civic destruction and human dispersal that so powerfully informed the premodern imaginary. This final element is particularly apposite to the *Disciplina Clericalis*, which reflects a view of diaspora that is at once rooted in knowledge of Rabbinic tradition concerning Jewish exile, and embedded in a specifically Christian understanding of the role of the destruction of Jerusalem in sacred history. This latter understanding is painfully evident in the *Dialogi contra Iudaicos*, in which Alfonsi goes far beyond the Augustinian perspective on the continued Jewish presence in Christian culture, describing the diaspora not as a necessary reminder to medieval Christians of the supersession of the Old Law but rather as a violent collective punishment of the Jews for their knowing slaughter of the Son of God.

Although some critics have suggested that the *Disciplina Clericalis* was composed by Alfonsi in Spain prior to his migration to England and France, there is no evidence for this assertion. The preponderance of surviving manuscripts are northern European, which is, if anything, evidence against this hypothesis. Vernacular translations of the *Disciplina Clericalis*, beginning with the Anglo-Norman adaptations of the twelfth century such as that republished by Étienne Barbazan, are also evidence of northern circulation, if not—strictly speaking—of northern composition. It remains possible, of course, that Alfonsi assembled the *Disciplina Clericalis* in Spain and then disseminated it only after his journey to Norman England. The dialogic style of the treatise, however, links it with other productions linked to Norman England and northern France, such as the *De eodem et diverso* of Adelard of Bath and the *Dramaticum* of William of Conches. The latter work is, like the *Disciplina Clericalis*, a dialogue of teacher and pupil: the *Dramaticum* is a conversation between William himself (“Philosopher”) and his student, the young Henry II (“Duke”). Like Petrus Alfonsi, Adelard of Bath and William of Conches were associated with the courts of Henry I and Henry II, both monarchs known for their patronage of science and philosophy as well as literature. Alfonsi’s *Disciplina Clericalis*, therefore, can be appropriately read not just in the context of so-called Oriental wisdom literature, but in the context of the fusion of intellectual and cultural currents that characterized the twelfth-century Anglo-Norman court.

**Court Literature and the Frame Tale**

Of the many remarkable facets of the *Disciplina Clericalis*, perhaps one of the most remarkable is the way in which the text metaphorically describes its own narration in terms of appetite and food consumption. It is nothing remarkable to describe the acquisition of knowledge in terms of the consumption of food. Such analogies appear in the Bible, as well as in literature of biblical exegesis. Among twelfth-century expressions of this trope, perhaps the most famous appears in Bernard of Clairvaux’s *Sermons on the Song of Songs*. There, Bernard describes the basic, literal understanding of scripture in terms of the milk that even an infant can consume, but characterizes the more substantial allegorical understanding of scripture as bread, or even as meat. These spiritual foods require a mature appetite and a more fully developed ability to assimilate such metaphorical foodstuffs. Even in Boethius’s fifth-century *Consolation of Philosophy*, the teachings of philosophy are described as a kind of intellectual milk. Petrus Alfonsi repeats this trope in a passage early in the *Disciplina Clericalis*, in which the pupil asks his instructor: “If you have something in the recesses of your heart that the philosophers have said about this particular subject, tell it to me and I will retain it in my memory, which is very good, so that I can someday pass these tidbits on to my schoolmates, who have been brought up on the milk of philosophy.”

Here, the metaphor is a rather standard one: that is, the intellectual milk of philosophy that nourishes the mind. There are two unusual features here, however. First, the pupil presents himself not just as the recipient of intellectual nourishment, but as a potential donor: give me these “tidbits,” he says, so that I can pass them on. Second, he distinguishes
between the "milk of philosophy" (which is, as noted above, a common trope), and the remarkably tantalizing morsels offered to him by his teacher ("delicatissimum alimentum," most delicate foodstuffs).

Metaphors pertaining to food—both the appetite for food and the consumption of food—appear throughout the Disciplina Clericalis. In some cases, the appetite for food (whether satisfied or frustrated) serves as the medium of instruction, as both the fable's protagonist and the attentive reader learn when body appetites must be controlled and when they must be obeyed. For example, in the story of "the two city dwellers and the country man," three men go on a pilgrimage to Mecca and try to outwit one another in order to secure the last scraps of bread in their communal store, and subsequently learn the following moral: "These two city men, when they decided to behave as animals, should have copied the nature of the gentlest animal. They deserved to lose their food." Here, the didactic end of the fable is conventional; what is unusual, however, is the narrative thread to which it gives rise. The moral of the fable, in this case, is uttered not by the teacher but by the pupil; and the narrative closes not with the usual appeal by the pupil to his teacher for yet another tantalizing tale, but rather an appeal by the teacher to the pupil, "Tell me, my boy," says the teacher, the story you have heard: "Such a story should be very amusing!" Here, the conventional order of the fictional banquet is overturned, with the pupil begged by his teacher to recount an "amusing" tale.

The appetite for tales continues to be expressed throughout the narrative, with appeals for tales couched in terms of food and drink: "You have instructed me well," says the pupil, "and I have commended to my thirsting and eager mind all that you have told me about feminine tricks."22 Another time, the teacher rebukes his overeager student, saying, "Are these not enough for you? I have already told you three parables." The student responds, "When you say three parables, you exaggerate the number, for they were short ones. Now tell me a long story which will fill my ears and will thus satisfy me."23 Note that, in the first example, the acquisition of edifying knowledge is described in terms of the satisfaction of the appetite, while in the second, it is the delightful pleasure of the story itself that is said to satisfy the appetite. Among the many examples in the Disciplina Clericalis, however, nowhere is the nutritive metaphor more fully elaborated than in one of the most popular passages of the whole work: that is, the account of proper table manners. This passage was avidly adapted and even amplified in medieval redactions of the Disciplina; one fifteenth-century Latin version even inserts detailed information on how to eat an egg politely.24

The passage begins with practical information: you must wash first, and be careful to touch nothing but the food. You must wash after the meal, not just "because it is hygienic and well-mannered," but for reasons

of health: "many people's eyes become infected because they wipe them without having washed their hands after eating." Here, courteous behavior and healthful behavior are perfectly aligned, and the observation of orderly progress at the table results in orderly progress both on the level of social interaction and individual self-regulation. The passage continues with an exposition of proper etiquette regarding invitations: just as there is a proper order in the manual taking up of the morsel of food, so there is a proper order in the acceptance of invitations. The careful exposition of the proper order of procedure, however, soon gives way to parody:

The young man asked the old man, "What should I do when I am invited to eat? Should I eat very much or very little?"

The old man said to him, "Eat very much. For if a friend invites you, he will rejoice in it, and if an enemy, he will be sad."

The boy laughed when he heard this: and the old man asked, "Why are you laughing?"

The boy: "I am reminded of the answer of Maimundus, the Negro slave: an old man asked him how much he could eat. He answered, 'Whose food, mine or some one else's?' The old man: 'Your own.' Maimundus: 'As little as possible.' The old man: 'Some one else's?' Maimundus: 'As much as possible.'"

The old man said to the boy, "You only remember the words of the glutinous, lazy, stupid, talkative, and trifling man, and whatever is said about a person of this type is found to an even greater extent in Maimundus."

The boy said, "I like to hear about him because everything about him is funny, and if you remember anything about him, tell me, and I will consider it a great favor." (DC 22; ed. 334–40, trans. 98–100)25

What follows is the extremely comic "Anecdotes of Maimundus the Slave." In terms of the alimentary narrative traced in this essay, the most striking detail of the "Anecdotes of Maimundus" is the way that each tiny fragment of narrative is thrown, like a tasty morsel, into the waiting orifice of the pupil. After a few bits, the pupil says, "I have heard of his laziness; now I would like to hear of his talkativeness."26 The give and take, the to and fro, of these anecdotes mimics the shallow appetite being satisfied by the short bursts of narrative. In short, hearing the "Anecdotes of Maimundus" is like eating a bag of potato chips: you are not satisfied by just one.

The pull of appetite, expressed in the insatiable desire to hear more, is countered in the Disciplina Clericalis by the discipline imposed in the social practices of eating. It is important to recall that the detailed exposition of table manners is the necessary precursor to the tasty anecdotes of
Maimundus. In the recounting of these anecdotes, the nested narrative of the pupil parodically reproduces the verbal exchange of the frame narrative within the exchange of Maimundus and his interlocutor. In this parodic repetition, the pupil plays the role of Maimundus, and his teacher—“the old man” or “senex”—is, precisely, “the old man.” This momentary inversion of the authoritative role of the teacher, however, is soon restored: following the rapid-fire anecdotes of Maimundus, the narrator returns to its production of shimmering pearls of wisdom: “The philosopher says, ‘All the good things of this world are mixed; you do not eat honey with poison.’ Another: ‘Everything in this world is changeable....’ Another: ‘The glory of the world ends in the twinkling of an eye.’” 27 In the Disciplina Clericallis, then, delicious morsels of narrative come in different forms: some are flavorful, nourishing foodstuffs; others are tasty but insubstantial, offering a fleeting burst of pleasure. Their value lies in their ability to prolong the attention of the pupil, to facilitate the transmission of knowledge not just to the individual, but to the larger cycle of learning, as the eager pupil stores up “tasty morsels” that he will be able to pass on to hungry learners of a future day. To put it another way, in the Disciplina Clericallis, auditory appetite is in the service of intellectual digestion.

At this point, it is fruitful to turn to the Fables of Marie de France, which make a strikingly useful foil to a reading of the nested narrative form of the Disciplina Clericallis. Composed sometime during the second half of the twelfth century, the Fables respond to the same readership that avidly took up the earliest vernacular translations of the Disciplina, that is, the Castoiment du pere a son fils discussed in the opening pages of this chapter. Marie’s patronage by Henry II, to whom she dedicated her Lois, marks her as a thread in the tangled web of imitation that links several twelfth-century writers, philosophers, and scientists to the Anglo-Norman court of the Angervins. Marie’s Fable 27 is, on the one hand, a quaint narrative of the vernacular texts related to the Latin Romulus Nilantii. It also expresses, on the other hand, the relatively sophisticated metaphor of the body politic articulated in detail in the late twelfth century by John of Salisbury in his Polycratius. While John does not adduce a source for the metaphor, a version of it appears in the commentary on Macrobius composed by John of Salisbury’s venerated teacher, William of Conches (who was also the teacher of the young Henry II). It is therefore possible that the metaphor of the body politic had a more local didactic currency before its popularization in the Polycratius. In “De l’homme, de son ventre, e de ses membres” [Of Man, His Belly, and His Limbs], Marie recounts the story “of a man.” This story is not only a fable but also an “exemple” worthy of remembering, for this single man is a microcosm of the social order. The hands and feet, believing themselves poorly served by the stomach, who simply “wastes” all that they have “gained,” rebel. They refuse to procure nourishment for the belly and, as a result, the whole body is destroyed. Even though the members repent and “offer food and drink to the belly,” the whole body becomes feeble and dies. The exemplo is this:

Par ceste exemple peot hum veer
E chescun franc humme le deit saver;
Nul ne peot aver honur
Ki hunte fet a sun seignur;
Ne li sire tute ensement,
Pur qu’il voille hunir sa gent.
Si j’u a l’autre est failliz,
Ambur en erent maubailliz.

[By this example one may see,
And every wise man should know it,
That no one can have honor
Who does shame to his lord;
Nor the lord, just the same,
If he wishes to humiliate his people.
If the one fails the other,
Both of them will suffer for it.] 28

In the extended metaphor of the body, as in several of Marie’s Fables, appetites of the individual get in the way of the smooth interweaving of the social fabric. Mutual trust and social interrelations disintegrate when the needs of the one take precedence over the needs of the community.

This dynamic can be seen, for example, in Marie’s tale “Del lu e del chien” [Of the Wolf and the Dog]. A wolf and a dog meet. Seeing that the dog is well fed and healthy while he suffers, the wolf asks the dog how he has managed to become so prosperous. The dog generously offers to let the wolf in on his action: he says, “I eat well, and I have enough...Every day I sit at the feet of my master and gnaw on the bones, which is why I’m so fat and big.” 29 Once the wolf discovers the price of this social contract, however—namely, the chain with which the dog is tied up—he beats a hasty retreat: “I’ll never choose chain! I’d rather be a wolf, entirely free, than to live richly on a chain.” The moral of the story is the parting of the ways: the wolf says, “‘You go to the town, I’ll go to the woods.’ Thus by the chain is divided both their friendship and their companionship.” 30 As in the earlier fable “De l’humme, de son ventre, e de ses membres,” the tale of the wolf and the dog concerns mutual trust and social interrelation. The delicious bones that have made the dog so fat are the catalyst for the story, but they are not in themselves enough to bring about the metamorphosis of the feral wolf into the domestic canine. In Marie’s Fables, unlike the Disciplina Clericallis,
food and appetite are not the medium of the social interaction, but rather
the catalyst that precipitates the crisis.

A somewhat more intricate depiction of the way appetites serve as the
catalyst for social change appears in Marie’s fable “Del reclus e del vilein”
[Of the Hermit and the Peasant]. In this story, the hermit is pestered by
a peasant who demands to know “why Adam ate the fruit, which caused
the people to be damned, and, when he ate the apple, why God did not
forgive him.”31 The hermit comes up with a solution: he hides a mouse
underneath a bowl and goes out, asking the peasant absolutely to stay away
from the bowl. Unsurprisingly, the peasant, overcome by curiosity, lifts the
bowl, and the mouse escapes. When the hermit returns, he exounds the
moral: “You must not blame Adam anymore if he ate the fruit of the tree
that had been forbidden to him by our Lord... He who thinks he can blame
someone else should much better reproach himself.”32 Again, as so often in
Marie’s Fables, appetites are dangerous not so much insofar as they affect
the life of the individual, but as they affect the life of the community. Adam
should not have eaten the fruit, because humankind as a whole suffered for
it; the peasant should not reprove Adam—or anyone at fault—without first
correcting himself.

Marie de France’s Fables are a useful foil to the Disciplina Clericalis because
their comparatively narrow focus serves to highlight some of the features
that make the work of Petrus Alfonsi so extraordinary. On a narrative level
in Marie’s Fables, we find the vestiges of an interlocutory structure reminis-
cient of the Disciplina; in the Fables, however, the voice of the teacher is
ubiquitous, with the voice of the pupil largely silent. Insofar as the voice of
the pupil remains, it is in the implicit addresses to whom the narrator of the
Fables addresses admonitions. The pupil is almost completely assimilated
to the passive reader, who accepts the edifying tales of the Fables as they are
spoon-fed to him in easily digested morsels. Marie’s Fables resemble not so
much Alfonsi’s own version of the Disciplina Clericalis as the later redactions
of the text made for preaching purposes, such as the work of Jacques de
Vitre, in which the tantalizing fables of the Disciplina are retooled to make
them serve more readily as sermon exempla.33

To find a responsive student who acts as an interlocutor as in the Disciplina
Clericalis, it is necessary to turn to the scientific and philosophical dialogues
of Alfonsi’s contemporaries Adelard of Bath and William of Conches. Here,
it is only possible to provide one brief example from William’s Disclogram to
illustrate this point. The Disclogram is a dialogue of a philosopher and a
duke, that is, of a teacher—William of Conches—and his pupil—the young
Henry of Anjou, soon to be Henry II, ruler of Norman England. Even
in this most formal respect, the similarity to the dialogue format of the
Disciplina Clericalis is evident, and the give-and-take of the interaction of
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describes how, elsewhere, he “took care to write a preface on the truth of [astronomy] and on its most pleasant truth.” In the present work, Alfonso goes on to say, “part of this we transmit for your enjoyment, so that you may both see and know how desirable and how beautiful this art is.” Once again, the pleasure of receiving knowledge—and of imparting it—is the communicative glue that unites teacher and student into a perennial cycle of assimilating and redistributing knowledge.

**Mediterranean Flow**

We might think of this very cycle of the assimilation and redistribution of knowledge in contemplating the nature of medieval Norman culture, and the ways that it at once interacted with local cultures and produced a transnational culture stretching across Europe and the Mediterranean. On the one hand, each expression of medieval Norman culture must be understood as specific to the individual location, formed by the interaction of Norman elements with local features. On the other hand, Norman culture must be understood as a common, shared phenomenon precisely in terms of that process of assimilation: it is the methodology of interacting with local elements that produces the layer of culture that we can identify as “Norman.” In thinking through this shared phenomenon, it might be helpful to study manifestations of Norman culture drawing upon the methodologies of Peregrine Horden and Nicholas Purcell, outlined in their very useful study of comparative Mediterranean history, *The Corrupting Sea.* Horden and Purcell argue that cultures are best studied not as individual units that interact to a greater or lesser extent with surrounding units, but rather as participants in larger cultural flows that rest upon major geographical structures, such as the Mediterranean Sea. These cultural flows produced geographically and culturally contiguous societies that interacted to a variable degree, with periods of intensification alternating with periods of abatement. The twelfth century was certainly one such period of intensification, in which persons—and texts—circulated dynamically not just throughout the Mediterranean, but from the Iberian peninsula into Norman France and Norman England. Connections to Norman Sicily even further enriched the dynamic flow of ideas, the give-and-take that characterized this extraordinarily vibrant period in literary and cultural history. The dialogic structure of the *Disciplina Clericalis,* with the mutual relationship of teacher and pupil and its pervasive metaphorical linking of knowledge and delicious food, emblematizes precisely this dialectical relationship produced by the interaction of, on the one hand, the local hybrid culture of each Norman society and, on the other hand, the transnational

“Normannitas” that stretched seamlessly across borders. In the *Disciplina Clericalis,* assimilation of food mirrors assimilation of knowledge, and both of these mirror the assimilation of culture.

The approach to the *Disciplina Clericalis* that I have proposed here might serve as a helpful way of reading literary texts that are too often understood as privileged mediators of some kind of essential identity, whether that identity be defined in terms of ethnicity, national origin, or gender. Petrus Alfonso has, in the past, been interpreted as just such a representative of “Oriental wisdom” or “Arabic literary tradition” or even, more recently, of Sephardic identity; Jacqueline-Lise Genot-Bismuth’s recent edition of the *Disciplina Clericalis* makes a valiant effort to reconstruct the contours of “the postulated Hebrew of the original text,” and repeatedly identifies its author not as “Petrus Alfonsi,” but “Moses the Sefarad.” While some readers, such as Steven Kruger, have taken pains to understand the complex negotiations of a divided identity that underlies the *Disciplina Clericalis* and, even more prominently, the *Dialogi contra Iudeos,* others seem too ready to locate some essential quality in the work, if not in the man himself. In her brief yet perceptive discussion of Petrus Alfonso, Maria Rosa Menocal describes him not in terms of “Oriental,” Jewish, or Muslim identity, but in terms of Andalusian identity, as a representative of that heterogeneous, polynomic culture that was the crucible of a range of communities that interacted among and against one another. Even Menocal, however, characterizes the frame-tale form of the *Disciplina Clericalis* as an exotic import into European culture, a linguistic and cultural “translation” that imports the oral, vernacular modes of expression found in al-Andalus into the written, Latinate clerical culture of Europe. In her account, Alfonso’s work is “a translation from an oral to a written form, as much as from one language to another: from the vernacular...to a written Latin form with the veneer of learning.”

What I have tried to offer here is a perspective on the *Disciplina Clericalis* in particular (and, I hope, on medieval literature in general) that makes room for a reading of literary form as the product of cultural interaction rather than simply its object. As an interpretive matrix, Norman diaspora allows a reading that is founded on the ebb and flow of cultural identity, rather than the fixed stability of national, ethnic, or geographical origin.

This chapter began with a little fable concerning the late eighteenth-century edition of the *Castorien du pere a son fils,* in which Étienne Barbazan presents the French translation of the *Disciplina Clericalis* as the product of an “Auteur anonyme” who embodies the paternal authority of the French nation. For Barbazan, the paternal voice of chastisement is the voice of the past, ventriloquized by means of the philologist’s task of etymological excavation. In responding to Barbazan’s nationalist philology, we can do no better than to think of another late twelfth-century text
produced in the rich literary and linguistic ferment of Norman culture, the Hebrew translation of Marie’s Fables produced by Rabbi Berechiah ben Natronai ha-Nakhdán, who lived both in Normandy and in Norman England. In addition to his well known Mishlei Shu’alim (or Fox Fables), based largely on Marie’s collection, ha-Nakhdán may have composed a Hebrew adaptation of one of Marie’s Lais, “Guigemar,” under the title “The Story of King Solomon’s Daughter.”41 The frame–tale narrative, winding its way from the Disciplina Clericalis to the Castoimento to Marie’s Fables to ha-Nakhdán’s Mishlei Shu’alim, might thus be read not as an Oriental commodity but as the lingering trace of cultural flow, marking the movement of both literary form and narrative content across the rippling waves of nation, religion, language, and gender.42

Notes


2. Preface (vii–xii): “Il seroit a souhaiter que l’on put donner les ouvrages de tous nos anciens Auteurs, rien ne nous instruirait mieux des usages et des moeurs de nos peres, rien aussi ne nous eclaircircroit davantage sur l’origine, et sur les variations de notre Langue” (vii).

3. The term corresponding to “jactithus” in the Latin text is “jacinthus” (jacinth or hyacinth; DC ed. 314). Quotations from the Disciplina Clericalis are taken from the Latin edition (with French translation) of Jacqueline–Lise Genot–Bismuth, La Discipline de clergé/Disciplina clericales (St. Petersburg: Dom/Paris: Editions de Paris, 2001); English translations are taken from Joseph Ramon Jones and John Esten Keller, The Scholar’s Guide: A Translation of the Twelfth-Century Disciplina Clericalis of Petro Afnosio (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1969). Both are subsequently cited by page number, with the abbreviation “DC.”

4. “Aumacor. Je n’ai vu ce moit qu’ici. Et je n’en trouve point l’origine dans le Latin. M. de Guignes l’un des Auteurs du Journal des Scavans, que j’ai consulté, m’a dit qu’en Arabe Omara–Khor signifie principes Stabuli. Aumacor peut fort bien répondre à notre mot connestable” (154n2, to line “Roi et Contor et Aumacor”). Note that in the Latin text, the line reads “Vbi sunt rege, vbi principes, vbi diuuique thesaurus congregauerunt et inde superbi fuerunt” (DC ed. 364). In his discussion of the French versions of the Castoimento, Tolán (following the observations found in the edition of Hilka and Söderholm) states that: “the translator removes Arab and Muslim elements from Alfonso’s text”; John Tolán, Petrus Alfonsi and his Medieval Readers (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993), 135. This is apparently not the case, as the text edited by Barbazan preserves all of those same features that Tolán notes as omitted in both the A and B versions of the Castoimento.


6. For Hermes, the Disciplina Clericalis “occupies a very important position on the caravan route of the transference of oriental tales to the west” (8); Eberhard Hermes, ed. and trans., The Disciplina Clericalis of Petrus Alfonsi (1970. Trans. P.R. Quarrie. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977). In his extremely perceptive and foundational study of Petrus Alfonsi, Tolán identifies the Disciplina Clericalis as an example of “Oriental Wisdom literature” (Petrus Alfonsi, 82, 91). For Amer, the Disciplina Clericalis is not only a source of “fables arabe” (5) but a representative of a “tradition arabe” (20); cf. “la littérature didactique arabe” [129], “la tradition littéraire arabe” [169] that participates in the transmission of “une thèorie orientale de l’interprétation” typical of “fables arabe” (21); Sahar Amer, Esopo au féminin: Marie de France et la politique de l’interculturalité (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1999).


8. It is important to note that there is a distinction to be made between the self-identification of African American slave communities with Jews living in captivity in Egypt before the Exodus and the state of diaspora. The former is in a state of anticipation, looking forward to the Promised Land and, ultimately, the Incarnation; the latter is (from the Christian perspective) in a state of despair, resulting from the Jewish rejection of the divinity of Jesus. For a thoughtful exploration of the distinction between these two states of being, see Brian Stock, “Exodus and Exile in Late Antiquity,” in La Estela de los Viajes: De la historia a la literatura, ed. Francisco Jarauta [forthcoming].


20. “sed si aliquid philosophorum huiusmodi reposuisti in cordis armariolo, largire michi discipulo, et ego fideli memorie commendabo, ut quandoque condiscipulus lacte philosophico educatis delicatissimum largiri possim alimentum” (DC 15; ed. 276, trans. 70).


22. “Bene me instruxisti, et quod de illarum artibus retulisti siticuloso et desideranti animo commendavi” (DC 9; ed. 246, trans. 57).


24. On the egg passage of the fifteenth-century Latin manuscript W2 (inserted just before the Epilogue), see the edition of the *Disciplina Clericalis* edited by Alfons Hilka and Werner Söderhjelm (Helsinki, 1911): the text containing the passage appears in Anhang II, 77, and the manuscript is described at pp. vi–vii, xxv. Noted in Tolan, *Petrus Alfonsi* 155 and 259n99.


27. "Philosophus ait: Huius seculi bona sunt commixta; non enim comedes mel sine ueneno. Alius: Quecumque in seculo sunt commutabilia sunt...Alius: Quasi in occultu finitur gloria mundi" (DC 27; ed. 346, trans. 103; cf. DC 28, ed. 350, trans. 105-6).


29. "Je manguz bien, si asez...Diant les piez man seigneur / Puis chesuen jur runer les os. / Dunt jeo me faz grao e groo" (Fable 26; ed. 94).

30. "Ja chaune ne choiserais! / Meuez voil estru a delivere / Que en eheine richement vivre...Va a la vile, jeo vois al bois! / Par la chaune est departie / Lur amur e lir cumpainie" (Fable 26; ed. 96).

31. "Par quei Adam mange le fruit, / Par quei le people aie destruite— / Et quant il la pume manga, / Par quei Deu ne li pardume" (Fable 53; ed. 156).

32. "Ne veuille mes Adam blamer, / Si le fruit de l’arbre manga, / Que nostre sire le devea...Tel quide blamer le fet d’autrui, / Que meuz deveeret reprendre lui" (Fable 53; ed. and trans. 158).

33. On Jacques de Vitry and sermon exempla, see Tolan, Petrus Alfonsi 140-46.

34. William of Conches, Dragnetum 6.2.22; trans. Italo Ronca 164-54.