'GOLIARDIC' POETRY AND THE PROBLEM OF HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE: MEDIEVAL ADAPTATIONS OF WALTER OF CHÂTILLON'S QUOTATION POEMS

> Historicisms, new and old, remain literary criticism's most productive procedures for anchoring a text so that it does not float entirely clear into absolute subjectivity or theoretical 'contextlessness'.[1]

When considering 'Goliardic' poetry it is often frustratingly impossible to 'anchor' a text in this way. The erotic, satirical, parodic, and generally scurrilous contents of famous 'Goliardic' collections such as the *Carmina Burana* are often distinctly lacking in historical references, leaving the reader interested in studying them as productions of their historical-literary contexts without clear starting points. This is not a new observation: over thirty years ago, A. G. Rigg remarked that his research into the authorship of 'Goliardic' poetry had led him into a similarly opaque situation that he described as 'the realm of ghosts'.[2] He went on to say that this spectral state of affairs was not confined to questions of authorship and attribution, clear points at which texts intersect with their historical contexts, but extended to the broader issue of generic classification:

> There is no common denominator for all the poems, except for wit, linguistic dexterity, and a fluency in rhyme and rhythm (none of which are features confined to Goliardic poetry).[3]

Rigg's discovery that not just historical questions such as authorship but even a broad generic understanding were problematic for this elusive poetry makes the contextualization of 'Goliardic' texts a significant problem. Yet it is one that must be addressed if critical understanding of this poetry is to develop beyond descriptive and thematic readings that often do not extend readers' understanding in historically significant ways.[4]

Despite Rigg's attempt to highlight the ethereal nature of the evidence, the terms 'Goliard' and 'Goliardic' still have generic currency.[5] The terms are most often applied to twelfth- and thirteenth-century secular Latin poetry such as that represented in the *Carmina Burana* collection, not simply by modern scholars but by medieval scribes and poets, as Rigg's study has shown.[6] Gerald of Wales, for example, uses the legendary figure of 'Golias' to designate poetry that he sees as anticlerical and impudent.[7] The designation of 'Golias' as the author of certain kinds of Latin poetry therefore seems to be an unusual instance of generic classification in the medieval period, despite the vague nature of the term.

However, this medieval use has left critics with several problems. The medieval pedigree of the term (and its derivatives) justifies its modern use historically, but the lack of what Rigg calls a 'common denominator' across the vast number of poems it classifies means that it is imprecise, making the word inadequate as a useful generic indicator. Rigg's study of 'Golias' also shows that most of the poems attributed in this way by medieval scribes are satirical, yet modern critics have often chosen to select erotic and seasonal verse as more representative of 'Goliardic' poetry, perhaps influenced by the attractive image of the poets as 'wandering scholars'.[8] This means that as well as the generic imprecision of the term, its application is often different in modern and medieval contexts, further complicating its frame of reference. In addition, the fact that much of this poetry is anonymous, undatable, and exists in inadequate editions or has yet to be edited makes it clear why the term 'Goliardic' poetry is still current several decades after Rigg's study: the lack of knowledge about available contexts (whether historical, literary, or manuscript) makes such poetry unclassifiable and hence almost uninterpretable. Trying to engage with the phenomenon of 'Goliardic' poetry from a historicist perspective, which in turn would 'anchor' the text and secure it from 'absolute subjectivity or theoretical "contextlessness"',[9] leads the reader into an arena better described as purgatorial than spectral: few names, fewer dates, unreliable biographical information, and often unhelpful medieval and modern assumptions.[10]

How then are we to read 'Goliardic' poetry with some awareness of historical and cultural (as broadly distinct from thematic) context? This critical purgatory can potentially be addressed by focusing on the manuscript contexts in which the poems are found, a method used with helpful results in studies of vernacular lyrics.[11] In order to begin to answer this question, however, there needs to be distinctive information available about the witnesses, but here too the 'realm of ghosts' image can often be extended to the manuscript situation. Although 'Goliardic' poetry is sometimes found collected *en masse* in famous manuscripts like the Codex Buranus, the diversity of themes, metrics, and even language can be such that a specific ideal behind the desire to collect the poetry is often indecipherable.[12] Beyond such famous witnesses, our knowledge of the manuscript situation of 'Goliardic' poetry is still very hazy, despite critical work such as Rigg's invaluable studies of the best-known Latin poetic anthologies.[13] Both these factors hamper critical understanding of the manuscripts' possible *compilatio* and thus occlude possible answers to the question of how to read such poetry with a historical focus.

In the absence of wide-ranging manuscript studies, the question of how to interpret 'Goliardic' poetry from this perspective seems not to have an available answer. However, Rigg's study of Golias attributions contains an observation that may help. He makes the point that 'considerable textual variation – at times, wholesale rewriting – is a characteristic of a great number of poems in the Goliardic corpus'.[14] Textual comparison of different versions of poems, where extant, may enable scholars to track changes made during the medieval era that will highlight the ways the works were read, interpreted, and adapted.

This would begin to identify a hermeneutic history for 'Goliardic' poetry independent of surmise, bypassing the romanticized images of the supposed 'wandering scholars' that are often still extant and focusing on the impact of the literature throughout its history, not just at the (often unidentified) moment of composition. It would also enable scholars to reappraise the meaning of the term 'Goliardic' in specific contexts by seeing whether poems defined in this way (either by explicit attribution or by juxtaposition in manuscripts to works defined as such) are subject to different interpretations over time.

A promising starting point for such a study is the later twelfth-century poet Walter of Châtillon, best known for his Latin epic the *Alexandreis*.[15] His works that have most frequently survived in different versions are 'satirical' poems, works that engage with ecclesiastical corruption, which represent a type of writing that as discussed above Rigg finds to be the most common in 'Goliardic' literature.[16] Many of Walter's poems are also attributed to Golias or his pseudonyms by medieval scribes.[17] Walter is therefore defined as a 'Goliardic' poet both by attribution and by the type of composition he created. Of his 'satirical' poems, there are four works that are particularly subject to significant adaptation in medieval manuscripts; these are the poems written in an unusual metre known as the *Vagantenstrophe cum auctoritate*, or 'Goliardic metre with authority'.[18] In this form, the thirteen-syllable line so common in twelfth-century Latin poetry is completed at the end of each verse by a classical Latin hexameter, usually a direct quotation from one of the poetic *auctores*.[19] These *auctoritas* poems (as they are usually called) occur together in many manuscripts, suggesting that they were read and copied as collections; thus they form a significant sub-group in Walter's *œuvre*. This study will compare the earliest versions extant with a slightly later witness in which they have been significantly adapted, in order to see whether there is a discernible hermeneutic approach that may illuminate the historical context in which they were read and copied.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 603

The earliest witness to Walter's *auctoritas* poems is Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 603, which dates from the late twelfth or very early thirteenth century.[20] It is a miscellany of Latin poetry copied by a single scribe and contains ten of Walter's satirical poems. As Walter's date of death is usually assumed to be around 1200, there is no need to posit a direct link between its contents and the author, and in support of this Rigg claims that its poems are derived from an earlier Walter of Châtillon collection.[21] There is thus a chronological gap of some thirty to forty years between the poems' probable composition by Walter in the 1160s and 1170s and the date of the versions found in Bodley 603. Although there is no way of definitively identifying authorial versions of the poems, the texts found in Bodley 603 are the closest surviving versions chronologically to Walter's authorial compositions, and as the earliest known witnesses are valuable in analysing how the poems were received in the initial stages of their history. It is also notable that the texts of the *auctoritas* poems as found in Bodley 603 are

transmitted identically in three other later witnesses, suggesting that the Bodley versions were part of a medieval tradition of transmission and reception that remained important.[22] The Bodley 603 versions are hence crucial because of their early date and their continuing longevity, even though they are unlikely to be authorial texts.

The first *auctoritas* poem in Bodley 603 is very close to the printed text of Walter's 'poem 4' as found in the most recent edition published by Karl Strecker in 1929.[23] Each verse is formed of three thirteen-syllable lines with end rhyme, and a fourth hexameter line taken from a classical text, mainly Juvenal's satirical works but also from the poems of Ovid, Virgil, Horace, and Lucan.[24]

> Missus sum in vineam circa horam nonam,
> suam quisque agere vendere personam;
> ergo quia cursitant omnes ad coronam,
> semper ego auditor tantum, nunquamne reponam? (Juvenal, *Satires*, 1.1)

> (I was sent into the vineyard about the ninth hour, and [I saw] everyone pressing forward to promote his person; since all keep running towards the crown, shall not I therefore, always a witness of such things, make a reply?)

This verse sets the scene for an ecclesiastically directed poem: the workers in Christ's vineyard are toiling for their own promotion, which Walter decries using the first line of Juvenal's first satire, an easily recognizable clue as to the sort of work that might follow. The next verse further establishes Walter's claim to be a poetic voice crying in the wilderness against corruption by appropriating a line from Virgil's second *Eclogue* that describes the poet's tools, a clear sign of his literary aspiration.[25] He goes on to declare that he is not interested in advancement, rather that the criticism of vice is his only concern ('derogare vitiis omnibus est animus', '[my] intention is to put down all vices'), using another Juvenalian hexameter to make the point.[26] The poem continues to criticize mercenary priests, abbots, and senior clerics before bewailing the greedy nature of the entire world, the decay of academic pursuits, and the evils of women and homosexuality.[27]

Table 1.

Verse	Structure
1–4	Introduction
5–15	Criticism of avaricious priests and religious
16–18	General greed
19–22	Decline of academic pursuits for their own sake
23–7	Evils of women and homosexual behaviour

This brief overview of the poem as found in Bodley 603 suggests that there is a unity of theme present, one that moves through a hierarchy of criminals from the lesser (priests) to the greater (senior clerics) and in turn to the whole world (academe and then to women). Walter's situating of decayed academe ('Florebant antiquitus artium rectores, / nunc acquirunt redditus auri possessores': 'in

ancient times the rulers of the arts flourished, now the owners of gold gain a return', verse 19.1–2) towards the end of his hierarchy of sin is a hyperbolic statement of his own interests as a clerk reliant on his intellectual abilities and thus forms a natural conclusion to his theme of decay, with the criticism of women and homosexual behaviour a final flourish.

The *auctoritas* lines of the verses are crucial in seeking to analyse the poem's textuality at a closer level. For example, in the final five verses that concern women and homosexuals, three of the five *auctoritates* explicitly refer to the same subjects, suggesting that here it is the content of the *auctoritas* lines that defines the character of each verse.[28] Paul Gerhard Schmidt has stated that these lines are the 'constitutive principle' by which the whole verse is composed, giving them a structural as well as a thematic role.[29] The *auctoritas* lines create the rest of the verse, both through end-rhyme and through content; here antifeminist lines taken from antifeminist classical texts define a similarly antifeminist set of verses. However, both Schmidt and Strecker observed that Walter's *auctoritas* poems experience sudden narrative twists and turns.[30] Given the strong emphasis on form that the use of the *auctoritas* line necessitates, this may suggest that the connection between that line, the vital 'constitutive principle' of the whole verse form, and its preceding lines is potentially more complicated than a simple, mutual reinforcing of thematic subject by the quotation. It is necessary therefore to look more closely at the interaction between *auctoritas* lines and their medieval counterparts.

An indication of this interaction is found in the assimilation of the hexameter line into the medieval poem. It is evident that Walter's use of his *auctoritates* differs from the majority of *auctoritas* poems in this regard, according to Schmidt. His claim regarding the quotations that 'in the process [of composition] alterations to their original form were frequently unavoidable'[31] is not tenable in Walter's case; there is little such alteration, little accommodation between medieval metrics and classical hexameter. This is evident in the very first verse of Strecker's 'poem 4' quoted above, 'Missus sum in vineam'.

Reading this aloud immediately highlights the lack of assimilation between the first three lines and the last, which interrupts the jangling, bouncy rhythm established in the first part of the verse as it moves from rhymed metre (based on stressed and unstressed syllables) to quantitative metre (based on syllable length). It appears as if the poet has used the *auctoritas* line, the 'constitutive principle' of the rest of the verse,[32] in an unadapted fashion that creates deliberate rhythmical discordance. Although this instance is particularly noticeable, the idea of deliberate contrast between *auctoritas* quotation and the rest of the verse at the metrical level is tenable in every verse that demonstrates the form, because of the incompatibility of the rhythmical and quantitative patterns.[33]

This idea of discordance between *auctoritas* line and verse extends beyond a lack of metrical assimilation, however. It is also a factor in the disjunction of individual verses' themes. This is shown in the following verse from poem 4:

> In quo mundi climate, sub quo celi signo
> est abbas vel pontifex pectore benigno,

> dignus Christi nuptiis, dignus vite ligno?
> Rara avis in terris nigroque simillima cigno![34]

(In what climate of the world, under what sign from heaven, is there an abbot or a pope with a kind heart, worthy of the nuptials of Christ, worthy of the tree/staff of life? A rare bird on the earth, very similar to a black swan!)

The *auctoritas* line is separate both grammatically and in terms of subject from its preceding verse, necessitating an unexpected intellectual leap between the literal and figurative levels of description. Other examples of such separation abound, some necessitating an explicit introduction for clarification, as in verse 13:

> A prelatis defluunt vitiorum rivi,
> et tamen pauperibus irascuntur divi;
> impletur versiculus illius lascivi:
> quicquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi.[35]

(Rivers of sins flow from the priests, and still the gods are angry with poor people; the little verse of that joker is fulfilled: 'whatever the kings drivel about, the Greeks are punished.')

Here the 'gap' between verse and the Horatian *auctoritas* is such that a line is needed to link the two together explicitly. Yet this sort of explanatory link is unusual in Walter's verse;[36] the poet appears to relish the interruption, both metrically and in terms of subject, that the quotations can provide on a greater or lesser scale.

It seems that Walter's deployment of this metrical form deliberately highlights the differences between *auctoritas* lines and the rest of the text, emphasizing the metrical eclecticism of his work. This emphasis on form is reinforced by Schmidt's plausible suggestion that Walter's *auctoritas* poems were composed for the Feast of Fools and were recited to an educated audience, who would recognize and even guess in advance the *auctoritas* quotations at the end of each verse.[37] Interestingly, some of the early evidence for the Feast comes from Châlons-en-Champagne, where Walter is meant to have taught and from where he derived his surname, suggesting a potential geographical link between his poetry and the festival.[38] This places the poems in a ludic and festive context, in which the quotations themselves were valued as much as their surrounding material. This performative context is an important factor in the poems' interpretation, as, if the audience's attention was focused on recognizing the forthcoming quotation in each verse, then it is possible that the perception of the verses as connected by a consistent linear narrative was of secondary importance; in other words, individual lines and verses, not their overall relationship within the context of a larger poem, were of primary interest. In this situation, discordance between quotation and poem can be seen as necessary for the hermeneutic context of the Feast of Fools in which authority was temporarily inverted: the poem's textuality embodies the theme of the festival.

For poem 4 in Bodley 603, the question of how to read this 'Goliardic' poem in its initial context has been provisionally answered by an awareness of the textual culture of the Feast of Fools and by a close analysis of the

poem's own hermeneutics. This analysis has highlighted the fact that the poem is composed using a metrical form that plays with the idea of textual *auctoritas* so as to undermine it, which demonstrates the importance of metrical form in understanding the poem's content and context. The other two *auctoritas* poems found in Bodley 603 must also be analysed to see if the same emphasis on form as a hermeneutic principle is found there also.

The poem immediately following this one in Bodley 603, beginning 'Multiformis hominum fraus et iniustitia', also bewails corruption in the Church.[39] Like its predecessor, it starts with four introductory verses describing the state of the world, ending this section with a verse about the need to write arising from anger:

> Cum mundum intuear sordis fluxu mersum,
> et nature penitus ordinem perversum
> et hinc a principibus in vulgus dispersum:
> si natura negat, facit indignatio versum.

(When I see the world engulfed by a flood of filth, and the order of nature wholly distorted, and from here spread out from the leaders into the throng, if nature denies [me ability], anger will create verse.)

The final line is quoted from Juvenal's first satire, again setting the thematic scene.[40] The next three verses specifically criticize bishops for avarice and greed before a series of four verses that direct this criticism more precisely at Rome, a city characterized by greed, illegal wheeling and dealing, and corrupt elections.[41] There follow four verses bemoaning the evil behaviour of religious before two verses sum up: the cleric, who ought to be chosen by God, is covered in filth and is the answer to a series of vicious rhetorical questions ('Qui sunt, qui ecclesiam vendunt et mercantur? … Clerici – ne longe exempla petantur'[42]). The poet then complains that the Ten Commandments have been defeated by Ovid's line that the gods establish as legal whatever gratifies them, before closing with three verses about the tendency of humanity in general to become greedy and corrupt.

Table 2.

Verse	Structure
1–4	Introduction
5–7	Criticism of bishops
8–11	Criticism of Rome
12–15	Criticism of religious
16–17	Criticism of all clerics
18	Defeat of the Decalogue
19–21	Avarice of humanity in general

This poem is similar in theme and content to its predecessor. It addresses the crimes of three different kinds of churchmen (bishops, the Roman clergy, and religious) before discussing them all simultaneously as 'clerici', and then drawing

a wider parallel between corruption in the Church and sins of mankind in general. The point made above with regard to the lack of assimilation in poem 4 between hexameters and 'Goliardic' lines, both metrically and thematically, also applies in poem 5, as is shown in the following example.

> Quis nunc imitator est illius Johannis,
> cuius erat tegimen cameli pro pannis,
> epulum silvestre mel, potus purus amnis?
> Laudamus veteres, set nostris utimur annis.[43]

(Who is now an imitator of that John whose covering in place of clothes was camel hair, whose food was wild honey, whose drink pure water? We praise the ancients, but we live in our own times.)

Here once again a grammatical and thematic leap must be made between verse and *auctoritas*, demonstrating that in poem 5 the situation regarding poetic form is the same as in poem 4.

The third and final poem, edited by Strecker as 'poem 7', to be considered from Bodley 603 is not found juxtaposed to the other two discussed here, but later in the series of Walter's poems.[44] It is a poem regretting the papal schism of 1159–77, which gives it some historical background.

Table 3.

Verse	Structure
1–3	Introduction
4	Golden age
5–6	Papal schism
7–17	Speech of Church complaining of schism

Like the other two poems, it begins with introductory verses before the poet describes the papal schism and the problem of which candidate to trust, and then introduces the idea of the Church as Christ's bride. The bride's speech forms the rest of the poem's eleven verses: she laments the violence done to her and the Church's failure (verses 8–9) and claims the emperor has no jurisdiction over her (verse 10) before eventually ending her complaint on a note of hope, claiming that her bridegroom is finally visible (verse 17). Despite the different focus of this poem, the same metre is used, although the *auctoritas* quotations are drawn more often from non-satirical classical poems.[45] This work has a sense of narrative, unlike the other two, perhaps because of the personification and speech of the Church, which may be the reason why although Walter's basic poetics remains the same, the frequency of disjunction between *auctoritas* and verse is less. The following example of disjunction, in which the quotation is separate grammatically and to some extent in terms of subject, is therefore less common than in the other two poems:

> Illi, per quos hereses scismataque vici
> quondam, michi facti sunt nuper inimici;

> que cecidi, stabilis non debebam dici:
> quid me felicem totiens iactastis, amici?[46]

(Those through whom I formerly defeated heresies and schisms have recently become my enemies; I who have fallen ought not to be called 'stable'; why, friends, do you bandy it about so often that I am happy?)

Despite this difference in degree, however, Walter's poetics in this third poem is broadly the same as in its predecessors.

These three poems, sharing subject matter and metrics, thus seem to display some thematic continuity despite their playful textuality. However, this continuity is only applicable in terms of a broad overview of the texts' structure; it should not be equated with thematic development or expansion. It is evident that all three of these poems' verses are repetitions of the same essential points. A juxtaposition of verses 6 and 16 from poem 5 demonstrates this clearly:

> Heu quam nugatorii presules moderni!
> dici debent potius presides Averni
> vel spretores melius iudicis eterni,
> potatores bibuli media de nocte Falerni.
>
> Clerus, qui sors Domini vocari deberet,
> hic est, cui precipue sordis fex adheret;
> vox ergo prophetica locum non haberet:
> omne caput languidum et omne cor meret.[47]

(Alas, how frivolous [are] modern bishops! They ought rather to be called guardians of hell or, better, despisers of the eternal judge, drinkers who thirst for Falernian wine in the middle of the night.
The cleric, who ought to be called the chosen [lit. lot] of the Lord, [instead] is the one to whom chiefly the dregs of filth stick; therefore the prophetic voice would not have a place: the whole head [is] drooping and the entire heart grieves.)

There is little difference between these verses in terms of subject: both complain about priests and their alleged corruption. The same phenomenon occurs in poem 7, although as mentioned above there is more of a sense of narrative in that work because of the personification of the Church, as the juxtaposition of verses 7 and 9 shows:

> Suam Christus vineam amodo non fodit,
> illam vocat heritus, illam scisma rodit;
> sponsa Christi coniugis iussa non custodit;
> sepe etenim mulier, quem coniunx diligit, odit.
>
> Si verum subtilius libet intueri,
> iam defecit dignitas et libertas cleri;
> Roma prorsus cecidit in eclipsim veri
> et, si non cecidit, potuit cecidisse videri.[48]

(Christ does not dig his vineyard now, the heir demands it, schism gnaws it; the bride of Christ does not protect the orders of [her] husband; for often the wife, whom [her] husband loves, hates [him].

If truly it is allowed to consider more subtly, now the dignity and freedom of the cleric has failed, Rome has fallen headlong into an eclipse of truth, and, if she has not fallen, may seem to have fallen.)

Despite the broad theme of the poems, at the level of individual verses the impression is one of repetition based around separate demonstrations of poetic *variatio* rather than of a coherent and developed intellectual argument created through a succession of interdependent points. This analysis of the structure suggests therefore that poems do not operate primarily as carefully constructed vehicles for didactic satirical criticism, although their satirical subject is still important as part of their amusement value. Reading them as 'biting satires', with the desire for moral criticism and correction this implies, necessitates placing a dominant emphasis on their subject matter rather than on their witty and subversive form. It is their form, not their subject matter, which has been shown to be vital both metrically and contextually.[49]

This observation about the seeming primacy of intellectual amusement rather than satirical criticism has ramifications for subsequent interpretation of Walter's 'Goliardic' poetry. Was it valued as a condemnatory narrative rather than for its virtuosic skill, once the Feast of Fools context was in the forgotten past? This question may be illuminated by an analysis of the texts found in London, British Library, Harley MS 978. The texts here have been adapted in ways that highlight how Walter's *auctoritas* poems were read and interpreted half a century after their Bodley 603 incarnations.

London, British Library, Harley MS 978

Harley MS 978 is a manuscript that has received much critical attention. It contains works composed in Latin, Middle English, and Anglo-Norman and is particularly famous for preserving the text and music of the early Middle English canon 'Sumer is icumen in'.[50] Written probably during the 1260s as a single book, it is a miscellany containing medical treatises as well as verse.[51] It is known to have spent time at Reading Abbey in the thirteenth century, and may have been copied in Oxford.[52] The manuscript contains several pieces of Latin 'Goliardic' verse among which appear versions of Walter of Châtillon's *auctoritas* poems on fols 92ʳ–94ʳ, as well as a separate text of his non-*auctoritas* poem 'Tanto viro locuturi' (Strecker's poem 1) at fols 80ᵛ–82ʳ. Intriguingly, the verses of two of the *auctoritas* poems copied as separate items in Bodley 603, plus the poem in the same metre absent from that witness,[53] appear in Harley 978 as components of two 'new' texts comprising seventy-one strophes between them. It is important to note here that Strecker's account of these 'new' texts is confusing. He first states that they form a single poem containing seventy-one individual verses, but later sees them as two separate items.[54] The manuscript has a line gap between verses 52 and 53, consistent with the space left elsewhere in the manuscript between the end of one poem and the start of the next.[55] This blank line also falls between a verse that is found elsewhere at the end of Strecker's poem 6 and the verse that in several other versions begins poem 7.[56] This suggests that

the scribe perceived the seventy-one verses as falling into two groups, using the same mode of distinguishing between the two as found in individual poems he had already copied. For the moment, it will be assumed that these two verse groups equate to two separate poems, based on this manuscript evidence.

The first *auctoritas* poem formed from Walter of Châtillon's verses is found in Harley on fols 92^r–93^v and contains fifty-two verses found elsewhere as poems 4, 5, and 6, with a single one from poem 7 and another singleton found in poems 9 and 13.[57] The poem is not an eclectic result of random juxtaposition, however, as an overview of its structure indicates.

Table 4.

Verse	Structure
1–7	Introduction
8–9	Transition to main subject, clerical crimes
10–13	Episcopal crimes
14–19	Simony
20–1	Rarity of clerical virtue
22	Clerics as *exempla*
23–5	The blameworthiness of priests
26–9	Criticism of the Roman curia
30–3	Examples of biblical virtue in contrast with contemporary vice
34–9	Avarice and monastic corruption
40–52	The pointlessness of the scholarly life

The verses found in Bodley 603 as separate poems have created a text with a series of mini-themes, suggesting that a compiler has selected relevant verses and placed them next to each other to achieve this. This prioritizing of theme is particularly clear at moments when the juxtaposing of verses from poems distinct in Bodley 603 is most eclectic.

> 20. In quo mundi climate, sub quo mundi signo
> est abbas vel pontifex pectore benigno,
> dignus Christi nuptiis, dignus vite ligno?
> Rara avis in terris nigroque simillima signo [cigno]! (4:10)

> 21. Ut Judeis odio sunt carnes suille,
> sic in his extincte sunt virtutum scintille;
> hic vacat libidini, gule servit ille.
> Credite me folium vobis recitare Sibille. (4:11)

> 22. Cur sequi vestigia magnatum refutem,
> impleri divitiis et curare cutem,
> adipisci talibus corporis salutem?
> Quod decuit magnos, cur michi turpe putem? (6:4)

> 23. Set neque presbiteros decet excusari,
> quos cum suis ovibus constat inquinari,

unde quosdam contigit vel ementulari
vel perimi, quotiens voluit fortuna iocari. (4:16)

24. Si vero subtilius velis intueri,
iam defecit dignitas et libertas cleri;
et iam Roma cecidit in eclipsim veri
et, si non cecidit, potuit cecidisse videri. (7:10)

25. Dic papa, dic pontifex, nobilis sponse dos,
cur mores redarguis et sermones fedos,
cum sis peior pessimis, hedus inter hedos,
inter Socraticos notissima fossa cynedos! (5:7)

(In what climate of the world, under what worldly sign, is there an abbot or a pope with a kind heart, worthy of the nuptials of Christ, worthy of the tree/staff of life? A rare bird on the earth, very similar to a black swan!

As the meat of pigs is loathsome to the Jews, so the spark of virtue is extinct in these; this one wastes time in lust, that one is enslaved by greed. Believe me, I recite the leaf of the Sibyl to you.

Why should I refuse to follow the tracks of great men, why refuse to obtain safety of the frail body by means of such things, to be filled with riches and to care of [my own] skin? What is suitable for great men, why should I think shameful for myself?

But it is not fitting that priests, of whom it is agreed that they have befouled [themselves] and their flocks, be excused, from which it follows that [they should be] castrated or totally destroyed, as often as Fortune wants to joke.

If truly you should wish to consider more subtly, now the dignity and freedom of the cleric has failed, and now Rome has fallen headlong into an eclipse of truth, and, if she has not fallen, may seem to have fallen.

Speak, pope, speak, bishop, dowry of the noble bride – why do you denounce vile customs and speeches, when you are worse than the worst, a goat among goats, the most famous ditch [i.e. rectum] amongst the Socratic sodomites!)

As may be seen from the numbers in brackets, indicating the 'original' poems from which the verse have been selected, these six verses occur elsewhere as part of four individual *auctoritas* poems.[58] Here they have been combined to form a stinging critique of greedy priests, leading to a condemnation of Rome and the Pope himself. What is particularly interesting is that verses taken from other works are used here to elaborate upon points made by the first verses quoted, consecutive strophes from poem 4 as found in Bodley 603. The verse defending the narrator's right to imitate the self-concern of 'great men' explicitly makes the connection between these and the 'abbot or pope' of the first verse of this sequence, and builds on the less clear 'these people' ('his') of the interim verse. A similar hermeneutic strategy is observable in the juxtaposing of a verse from poem 7 in Bodley 603 to one from poem 4 (here verses 23 and 24); the second verse expands upon the corruption of priests who have 'fouled' their flocks by generalizing about the 'eclipse' of the clergy. Both these instances are moments of thematic *amplificatio* based on verses taken from poem 4 as found in Bodley

603. The phenomenon of *amplificatio* is hardly an unusual one in thirteenth-century textual culture, but there may be another factor at work here. The verses from poem 4 expanded on in this work are ones in which the *auctoritas* line does not aid the narrative flow of the text. Both lines – 'rara avis in terris nigroque simillima cigno!' ('a rare bird on the earth, very similar to a black swan!') and 'Credite me folium vobis recitare Sibille' ('Believe me, I recite the leaf of the Sibyl to you') – are grammatically independent of the rest of the verses in which they appear, and are not connected to these lines in terms of subject matter. The first acts as a metaphorical description of the rarity of honest clerics in an abrupt transition from narrative questioning to figurative description, as noted earlier, and the second simply confirms the accuracy of the narrator without reference to the rest of the verse. The fact that these particular verses are subject to compilatory exegesis in the form of 'glossing' via extra explanatory verses may indicate that they were interpreted as thematically obscure, despite the added 'value' of prestigious quotations.[59] This in turn suggests that the concern for thematic unity demonstrated in the overall structure of the text is also present at the level of individual lines and verses, indicating that the desired hermeneutic strategy at the point when the verses were rearranged was an ethical one, concerned with an exhaustive treatment of clerical corruption.

The ideal of ethical *amplificatio* is hardly a surprising one for medieval readers to exhibit, given the common idea that classical material in particular should be read for ethical edification.[60] Rigg notes, with regard to the canon of poems ascribed to 'Golias', that 'when the myth began, the poems were witty, epigrammatic, and personal; by the fifteenth century the canon embraced more socially directed poems'.[61] Yet it is interesting to find evidence of an ethical focus that can be construed as 'socially directed' this early in the texts' history, at much the same time that 'Goliardic' poems are being collected potentially simply for enjoyment in witnesses like the Codex Buranus. However, the *compilatio* of the Harley manuscript contrasts with that shown by this text. The contents of Harley are catholic, ranging from Walter's verse to medical treatises and music, Marie de France's *lais*, and herbal texts. It is defined by Andrew Taylor as a miscellany containing a 'staggering variety of material', making a single agenda behind its copying difficult to discern, unless it is simply variety itself.[62] If so, then the ethical focus indicated in the reordering of Walter's verses is not shared consistently by the Harley manuscript. This may indicate that the reordering was not undertaken as part of Harley's copying, but earlier in the text's transmission and closer to the time of composition. This would in turn suggest that Walter's verses were rewritten at a relatively early point in the manuscript tradition to prioritize their ethical content over their performative wit.

It is necessary to see whether the same sense of ethical refashioning is found in the second group of verses in Harley. The group consists of nineteen stanzas, of which the first eight come from poem 7 and the rest mainly from poem 4, with one respectively from poem 5 and poem 6.

Table 5.

Verse	Structure
1–2	Introduction
3–4	General clerical corruption
5–8	Complaint of Christ's bride, the Church
9–19	Miscellaneous verses, bewailing greed, avarice, decline of learning, the evils of women

This table shows that, in contrast to the first group of verses found in Harley 978, this collection does not exhibit a series of mini-themes. In addition, it is evidence of a different editorial process from the thematic *amplificatio* of the first group. The first eight verses of this group are all from poem 7, 'Eliconis rivulo', also found in Bodley 603 in the same order; however, in the Harley version verses that explicitly refer to the papal schism are not present.[63] These omissions transform this part of the work from a specific criticism of the schism and its results to a general mourning for the state of the Church as 'illam vorat ambitus, illam scisma rodit' ('doubt devours it, schism gnaws it', 56.2). In this section, the editorial process appears to be one of omission, not amplification, in order to remove references to a historical context no longer relevant.

The poem then moves abruptly to a miscellaneous collection of verses mainly from poem 4, but also including a couple of strophes from poems 5 and 6.

> 9. Quando cibus deficit pecudibus brutis,
> mugiendo postulant velut spe salutis;
> et michi resonat vocibus argutis
> fistula disparibus septem compacta cicutis. (4:2)

> 10. Set quia non metuunt anime discrimen,
> principes in habitum verterunt hoc crimen,
> virum viro turpiter iungit novus hymen,
> exagitata procul non intrat femina limen. (4:28)

> 11. Clamabat decalogus, ne quis peieraret,
> ne quis adulterium furtumve patraret,
> set dictum prevaluit, a quo dictum claret:
> Jupiter esse pium statuit, quodcumque iuvaret. (5:18)

> 12. Sit pauper de nobili genere gigantum,
> sciat quantum Phebus scit et Saturnus quantum,
> [per se solus habeat totum fame cantum:][64]
> Cesar Aristotiles quid erit si gloria tantum? (6:19)

> 13. Omnes avaricia mentibus imbutis
> in nummo constituunt spem sue salutis;
> volunt dici prodigi rebus dissolutis:
> fallit enim vitium specie virtutis. (4:12)

> 14. Nummo mundus deditus sequitur hunc morem,
> ut tanto quis iudicet quemque meliorem;

illum quanto noverit esse ditiorem:
O nummi, nummi, vobis inpendit hunc prestat honorem.
(4:17)

15. Nescit mundus compati, nescit condolere
medicanti Palladi, que solet vigere,
nam si nummo careas, foras expellere,
ipse licet venias musis comitatus, Homere. (4:21)

(When brute animals have no food, bellowing, they call out as if hoping for
salvation; and my pipe resounds with a clear message, constructed of seven
different reeds.

But since they do not fear the risk for [their] souls, the princes have turned this
sin into a habit, and a new kind of wedding joins man shamefully to man, and
woman, driven off to a distance, may not enter the threshold.

The Ten Commandments proclaimed that no one should swear falsely, nor commit
adultery nor robbery, but this saying has got the upper hand, as is clarified in this
phrase: Jupiter establishes as holy/lawful whatever would be pleasing.

Though the poor man be of the noble race of giants, though he knows as much as
Apollo and Saturn, [how though he alone may have all the celebration of renown],
what will it be, Caesar and Aristotle, if it is glory alone?

All, with minds steeped in avarice, establish hope of their salvation in coins; they
want to be called prodigal by wasting their possessions: for sin deceives in the
appearance of virtue.

The world, dedicated to money, follows this custom; the richer a man is known
to be, the better he is judged. Oh money, money, the world offers and lays out
this honour to you.

The world does not know how to pity or condole Pallas when she ails, who is
normally thriving, for if you lack money, [you will] be thrown outside, even if,
Homer, you arrive in the company of the Muses.)

The majority of these verses (excluding the monetary focus of verses 13 to 15)
do not seem to have a narrative or thematic connection between them, other
than the very broad concept of reproving vice, in stark contrast to the attempt
to create thematic unity observed in the first group of Walter's verses in the
Harley MS. Following these, four ill-assorted verses (in terms of subject) form a
conclusion to the group. We have here an uneasy grouping of verses only vaguely
connected thematically. One reason for this might be that this miscellaneous
inclusion is a different kind of editing, on the principle of including verses left
over in the exemplar; very few verses elsewhere copied as part of these poems
are in fact omitted in Harley's versions.

This second group of Walter's verses seems therefore to exhibit two editorial
principles: omission and inclusion. Although they are different, even opposed,
they are in fact allied by their results: the removal of specific references to the
papal schism of 1159–77 and the inclusion of verses addressing various sins both
have the effect of creating a collection of verses focusing on ethical concerns.
This editing of the second group, although its methods are different, is thus
allied to the interest in thematic focus displayed by the first group, as both aim
to create texts focusing on the supposed moral injunctions of Walter's writing.

This focus on ethics, hardly unusual in the thirteenth century, is nevertheless intriguing, given that Walter's poems as found in Bodley 603, the earliest witness, are already strongly focused on ethical concerns such as greed, avarice, and ecclesiastical corruption in terms of their subject matter. This raises the question as to why the texts were felt to need such thorough reworking soon after their probable composition. The creation of two substantial collections of verses in Harley that display editorial concern for ethics over and above that of the earliest versions suggests that the poems were not read as ethically focused enough, despite their content. In what sense, therefore, were they felt to have an insufficient ethical focus? A clue is provided by the fact that it is only these *auctoritas* poems, with their unusual quotation form, that are subject to this editing, implying that the quotations are part of this deficiency.[65] If this is the case, then the question of form and metrics, fundamental in defining verse content as discussed above, is a key factor in these poems' thirteenth-century ethical reworking.

'Auctoritas' poetry: authoritative challenge?

The evidence of Harley 978 has shown that Walter's *auctoritas* verses were, by the mid-thirteenth century at latest, seen as being in need of editorial attention before they could be transmitted. Despite their content matter, this editorial adaptation suggests that the texts were at some level transgressive, failing to meet expected standards or norms. This idea of transgression needs to be interrogated, as it raises the question of why such verses were thought worthy of preservation in the first place: it would have been easier simply to omit them from manuscripts if they were seen as fundamentally inappropriate.

The first thing to note is that this possible 'transgression' is unlikely to be due to their content, given the interest in this highlighted by Harley 978. In addition, in the verses' 'original' performative context of the Feast of Fools, as suggested by Schmidt, the criticism of ecclesiastical sins was surely part of the joke: it could hardly have been interpreted as 'straight' condemnation of influential clerical patrons such as William of Champagne, who could well have been present.[66] This demonstrates the flexibility of the anti-ecclesiastical content: it can be read for amusement, or, as in Harley 978, as genuine condemnation, the interpretation being defined by the circumstances. Although such flexibility may contribute to the concern for interpretation shown in Harley 978, the consistent interest displayed in such content suggests that any perceived problems lay elsewhere.

This directs the focus once again towards the verse form itself, which in Walter's poetics has been shown to be deliberately causing disjunction between *auctoritas* and the rest of the text. This playful disjunction between statement and supposedly supportive authority is a poetic embodiment of the theme of the Feast of Fools, and in that context can be seen as part of a licensed temporary inversion of the ecclesiastical and textual hierarchy. However, in terms of textual culture more generally, the use of citation of high-status texts implicitly to undermine not just particular points but the whole principle of *auctoritas* itself is subversive. The very existence of this form, in Walter's deployment of

it, calls into question a fundamental tenet of medieval textuality, namely that propositions should be supported by a cited authority.[67] When these poems are detached from their Feast of Fools context and cease to be obviously playful treatments of the *auctoritas* ideal, they lose their interpretative framework. Verses that were once vehicles for witty quotations become 'about' their ecclesiastical content, so that *auctoritas* lines originally included more for their recognition factor than for their thematic appropriateness, such as the Ovidian line about the black swan, are now defined solely by their relationship to their predecessors' subject matter. Where this relationship is unclear or obscure, any satirical punch is lost; in the case of the black swan, the lack of connection to its signified, the corrupt abbot, means that the illustration becomes somewhat limp. This means that the disjunctions observable on many occasions at the level of individual lines cease to be illustrations of the feast's theme and instead become interpretative cruxes, the 'abrupt changes of direction' commented on by Schmidt.[68] Yet despite this the poems were still valued, perhaps because of their seemingly authoritative citations, and thus they continued to be copied.[69] This phenomenon explains the editing displayed in the thirteenth-century Harley texts: the compiler, reading the poems primarily for their content rather than for their form, sought both to preserve their prestigious quotation form and also to minimize the disruption he observed by means of *amplificatio*, either in terms of theme or simply via cumulative effect. The fact that it is the *auctoritas* poems, rather than Walter's other works, that experience this sort of editorial attention lends weight to the hypothesis that it was their form, not their content, that caused interpretative problems. The medieval need to edit Walter's verses seen in Harley is hence an implicit recognition of their problematic format at an early point in their history, and shows that they were not always seen as straightforward ecclesiastical satires without requiring significant adaptation.

This recognition has implications for the poems' status as 'Goliardic' productions. Rigg noted in his study of 'Golias' attributions that poems ascribed to the pseudonym 'Galterus' or 'Gauterus' in manuscripts were generally satirical works, as the name had become 'an appropriate pseudonym for a particular kind of poetry and satire', perhaps because of Walter's fame as a writer of such poems.[70] If 'Gauterus' was a label assigned to satirical works, this implies that Walter's texts from which the label ultimately derived were read as satires, as criticisms of ecclesiastical abuses rather than as playful quotation games (although of course the two are not mutually exclusive), in line with the evidence provided by Harley. However, if Walter's poems were implicitly recognized via adaptation as not fitting easily into a clear satirical format, then the definition implied by 'Gauterus' can be seen as stemming from a desire to classify and delimit potentially 'difficult' poetry. This interest in classification is a parallel to the ethical *compilatio* found in the Harley texts: both are a means of providing the poems with a context, a way in which to interpret them as belonging to a particular sort of writing. Designating a poem as by 'Gauterus' or 'Golias' gives it a recognizable habitation and a generic name, a particularly acute necessity if the poem is difficult to interpret on account (for example) of its form.

The medieval desire to identify and secure Walter's *auctoritas* poetry as 'Goliardic', both by explicit ascription to 'Galterus/Gauterus' and through the collective weight of juxtaposed poems, is thus paradoxically a sign of anxiety about how it should be read. Given the complex textuality of these works when detached from their performative context, such a definition potentially has the power to make Walter's texts 'safe', or at least less controversial. This is surely because defining texts as 'Goliardic' enabled them to be categorized as 'other', written by people who were perceived as 'educated, discontented, unbeneficed, possibly amorous (and probably drunken)'.[71] This may partly explain the continued medieval ascription of poems to the Archpoet, Hugh Primas, Golias, and others that Rigg observed, despite the lack of historical evidence for their authorship: as well as a generic classification, such an authorial definition placed texts firmly in a 'safe' category for reprobates or subversives, well away from 'serious' medieval writings. This in turn may illuminate why 'Goliardic' verse often occurs in collections, the most extreme being the vast *Carmina Burana*, but also in less compendious witnesses;[71] it is viewed as 'different', and therefore is transmitted, if not separately, then often in generic company to make it clear what kind of poetry it is by sheer cumulative effect. The vagueness of the term 'Goliardic' that has troubled modern critics such as Rigg in this analysis would be a medieval virtue, as it covers a multitude of sins. It identifies difference, otherness, potential danger.

Yet it could be argued that this 'otherness' is simply the underside of orthodox textuality. Walter's ludic citation of texts in his *auctoritas* poems demonstrates the difficulty of defining a clear difference between this and less orthodox (if not positively heterodox) textual strategies; it is the context of the Feast of Fools that enables his poems' textuality to be seen as part of a licensed inversion of authority, rather than as a confused attempt at authoritative satirical writing.[72] The dependence of 'Goliardic' poetry more generally on mainstream texts and traditions makes a boundary between its texts and those imbued with authoritative status that it parodies or transforms extremely difficult to construct.[73] More importantly for Walter's poems, the parody common in 'Goliardic' compositions is often formal, using metres from liturgical contexts or the structure of biblical texts.[74] It is because these controversial texts are so close to their authoritative counterparts that medieval scribes needed to define them so strongly as separate, either by ascribing them to colourful pseudonyms or by collecting them in anthologies. In Walter's case, this need results in the wholesale reconstitution of his *auctoritas* poems in the early days of their medieval transmission.

To return to the question of how to read 'Goliardic' poetry from a historicist perspective posed at the beginning of this essay: in the case of Walter of Châtillon, it has been demonstrated that reading his *auctoritas* poems as if they are self-evidently didactic and satirical works, timeless and ahistorical, does not allow a full understanding of the factors behind their medieval transmission.[75] In this instance, analysing the nature and relevance of the metrical form has led to a better comprehension of the reasons for the adaptation of the poems and hence

of their probable context. This will of course not always be straightforward; it is fortunate (and unusual) that we have Walter's name and some biographical information to provide a starting point. Yet focusing more closely on form, which can be innovative, rather than on thematic content that is often derived ultimately from classical models not contemporary medieval practice, may enable scholars to identify modes of adaptation and parody that can in turn be localized more effectively. Comparative study of this kind, examining the 'wit, linguistic dexterity, and ... fluency in rhyme and rhythm'[76] characteristic of 'Goliardic' poetry alongside textual *variatio*, would enable critics to probe a little deeper into the important question of how such varied poetry was read and interpreted, and why it was preserved so extensively beyond the period in which it was composed.

Oxford   VENETIA BRIDGES

NOTES

[1] Richard Newhauser, 'Historicity and complaint in *Song of the Husbandman*', in *Studies in the Harley Manuscript: The Scribes, Contents, and Social Contexts of British Library MS Harley 2253*, ed. Susanna Greer Fein (Kalamazoo, Mich., 2000), pp. 203–39, at p. 203.

[2] A. G. Rigg, 'Golias and other pseudonyms', *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser. 18/1 (1977), 65–109, at p. 65.

[3] Ibid., p. 109.

[4] Albrecht Classen's recent article 'The *Carmina Burana*: a mirror of Latin and vernacular literary traditions from a cultural-historical perspective: transgression is the name of the game', *Neophilologus*, 94/3 (2010), 477–97, takes a non-specific approach to context despite its title emphasis on historical and cultural perspective, engaging mainly with broad cultural ideas such as 'courtly love'.

[5] For example, the term 'Goliard' is used without discussion to define an Anglo-Norman poem found in London, British Library, Harley MS 2253 by Carter Revard, '*A Goliard's Feast* and the metanarrative of Harley 2253', *Revue belgique de philologie et d'histoire*, 83/3 (2005), 841–67. This is despite the useful summary of critical discussion of 'Goliardic' poems provided by Jill Mann's study 'Satiric object and satiric subject in Goliardic literature', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*, 15 (1980), 63–86, at pp. 63–5.

[6] A useful discussion of Goliardic poetry and its practitioners is found in *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises: Le Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1964; repr. 1992), pp. 551–3.

[7] The relevant passage from the *Speculum ecclesiae* is cited in Mann, 'Satiric object', p. 64. For the etymology of the word 'Golias', see Edward G. Fichtner, 'The etymology of *Goliard*', *Neophilologus*, 51 (1967), 230–7.

[8] Anthologies like those compiled by George F. Whicher, *The Goliard Poets: Medieval Latin Songs and Satires* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949) and Edwin H. Zeydel, *Vagabond Verse: Secular Latin Poems of the Middle Ages* (Detroit, Mich., 1966) include more love poems than satirical works. The romantic image of 'Goliardic' poets as mendicant beggars was popularized in modern times by works such as Helen Waddell's much reprinted book *The Wandering Scholars* (London, 1927).

[9] Newhauser, 'Historicity and complaint in *Song of the Husbandman*', p. 203.

[10] The biographical information about the poet Hugh Primas is a case in point; colourful

and scurrilous, it is impossible to verify, and much of it could have been derived from his poems themselves. See Peter Dronke, 'Hugh Primas and the Archpoet: some historical (and unhistorical) testimonies', in *Hugh Primas and the Archpoet*, ed. and trans. Fleur Adcock (Cambridge, 1994), pp. xvii–xxii, at pp. xviif.

[11] See for example the useful volume *Studies in the Harley Manuscript*, ed. Fein.

[12] Classen, 'The *Carmina Burana*', p. 493, seems to assume that there is such an ideal behind the *Carmina Burana* collection, as he talks of the 'overall design', the 'interconnectedness of individual songs to all others', and the 'organizing collector', but does not go into any more detail.

[13] See his series of five articles on medieval Latin poetic anthologies published in *Mediaeval Studies*, 39–41, 43, 49 (1977–9, 1981, 1987), pp. 281–330, 387–407, 468–505, 472–97, and 352–90.

[14] Rigg, 'Golias and other pseudonyms', p. 72.

[15] It was probably published in 1180, although this is debated; see A. C. Dionisotti, 'Walter of Châtillon and the Greeks', in *Latin Poetry and the Classical Tradition*, ed. Peter Godman and Oswyn Murray (Oxford, 1990), pp. 73–96, and the different view of Neil Adkin, most recently expressed in 'The date of Walter of Châtillon's *Alexandreis* once again', *Classica et mediaevalia*, 59 (2008), 201–11. Walter's datable short poems were written during the 1160s and 1170s, a point made in my Ph.D. thesis 'Writing the past: a comparative study of "the classical tradition" in the works of Walter of Châtillon and contemporary literature, 1160–1200' (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 30f.

[16] They have been most recently edited by Karl Strecker as *Moralisch-satirische Gedichte Walters von Chatillon* (Heidelberg, 1929), henceforth cited as *MSG*.

[17] See Rigg, 'Golias and other pseudonyms', p. 87.

[18] See the definition in Paul Gerhardt Schmidt's important essay 'The quotation in Goliardic poetry: the Feast of Fools and the Goliardic strophe *cum auctoritate*', in *Latin Poetry and the Classical Tradition*, ed. Godman and Murray, pp. 39–55, at pp. 41f. The essay is an extended version of his article 'Das Zitat in der Vagantendichtung: Bakelfest und Vagantenstrophe *cum auctoritate*', *Antike und Abendland*, 20 (1974), 74–87.

[19] Variants of this form are found in vernacular literature also: see John Scattergood's description of one of the Harley 2253 English poems as 'a five-line variant of the goliardic stanza *cum auctoritas*', in his 'Authority and resistance: the political verse', in *Studies in the Harley Manuscript*, ed. Fein, pp. 163–201, at p. 163.

[20] A. G. Rigg dates the manuscript to the late twelfth century in 'Medieval Latin poetic anthologies (III)', *Mediaeval Studies*, 41 (1979), 468–505, at p. 468; Strecker claims that it was written in the thirteenth century but not long after 1200 (*MSG*, p. v).

[21] Rigg, 'Medieval Latin poetic anthologies (III)', p. 489.

[22] The three witnesses are Paris, BnF, MS latin 3245, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 166, and a printed edition by Johannes Lydius, *Nicolai de Clemangiis … opera omnia* (Leiden, 1613); see Strecker, *MSG*, pp. vf.

[23] The differences are that the first verse, 'Missus sum in vineam', is printed by Strecker as poem 6 verse 1, and that Strecker's verses 16, 'Set neque presbiteros decet excusari', and 29f., 'Unum est pre ceteris, quod cuncti mirantur' and 'Esto fur vel proditor, Verres sive Graccus', are absent from the Bodley version.

[24] For the full list of attributions, see Strecker, *MSG*, pp. 71f.

[25] The line is 'fistula disparibus septem compacta cicutis', 'a pipe made of seven different reeds', *Eclogues*, 2.36.

[26] Juvenal, *Satires*, 1.15.

[27] I have used Strecker's numbering of the verses here as given in the table of verses in *MSG*, p. 59.

[28] These three lines are taken from Juvenal's satires against women (no. 1) and against effeminacy (no. 2) (verse 23.4 is *Satires* 6.460; verse 25.4 is 2.170; verse 27.4 is 2.88).

[29] Schmidt, 'Quotation in Goliardic poetry', p. 41.

[30] Ibid., p. 43, and Strecker, *MSG*, pp. 61, 72.

[31] Schmidt, 'Quotation in Goliardic poetry', p. 40.

[32] Ibid., p. 41.

[33] Particularly noticeable examples occur in poems 4, 9.4; 5, 8.4; 6, 13.4 (*MSG*, pp. 65, 75, 85).

[34] Verse 10, *MSG*, p. 65.

[35] Poem 4.13 in Strecker, *MSG*, p. 66. The *auctoritas* line is Horace, *Epistles*, 1.2.14.

[36] Schmidt, 'Quotation in Goliardic poetry', p. 43.

[37] Ibid., esp. p. 45.

[38] See Max Harris, *Sacred Folly: A New History of the Feast of Fools* (Ithaca, NY, 2011), pp. 68–73.

[39] It is edited by Strecker as poem 5 in *MSG*, pp. 73–80.

[40] Juvenal, *Satires*, 1.79.

[41] The first lines of verses 8–10 are: 'Roma datis opibus in tumorem crescit', 'Roma solvit nuptias contra nutum dei', and 'Roma metit omnia quadam falce manuum', which translate as 'Rome grows into a tumour with donated wealth', 'Rome looses nuptial vows against the will of God', and 'Rome reaps everything with the scythe of [her] hands'.

[42] Verse 17.1 and 4, *MSG*, p. 77.

[43] Poem 5.15, Strecker, *MSG*, p. 77. The quotation is Ovid, *Fasti*, 1.225.

[44] See Strecker, *MSG*, p. v.

[45] Ibid., pp. 95f.

[46] Poem 7.12, Strecker, *MSG*, p. 93. The quotation line is Boethius, *Consolation of Philosophy* I.21.

[47] Strecker, *MSG*, pp. 74f. and p. 77.

[48] Ibid., pp. 92 and 93.

[49] This is the reading of Ronald E. Pepin in his chapter on Walter in *Literature of Satire in the Twelfth Century: A Neglected Mediaeval Genre* (Lampeter, 1988), pp. 89–115, who interprets the poems as straightforward 'biting satires … sparked by Juvenalian indignation over vices' (pp. 89 and 90) with no comment on any of the different versions and no analysis of the poems' structures.

[50] Fol. 11ᵛ.

[51] For the dating, see A. Taylor and A. E. Coates, 'The dates of the Reading Calendar and the Summer Canon', *Notes and Queries*, 45/1 (1998), 22–4. See also the useful summary description of the MS on the British Library Manuscripts Catalogue website, www.bl.uk/catalogues/manuscripts. Strecker dates it to 1260 (*MSG*, p. vi).

[52] Taylor thinks the MS may have been commissioned from Oxford booksellers by William of Wycombe, a Benedictine monk, or William of Winchester: see his *Textual Situations: Three Medieval Manuscripts and their Readers* (Philadelphia, Pa, 2002), pp. 93, 94, 110–26, 132–6.

[53] This is Strecker's poem 6, 'Missus sum in vineam', *MSG*, pp. 80–9.

[54] Strecker implies that Harley 978 contains a single composite version of poems 4–7 at p. vi, but at p. 60 he correctly describes the verses as two separate texts.

[55] This occurs on fol. 93ᵛ, col. 1. The folios that follow contain verse in the same metre, with a line space between poems.

[56] The verses are edited by Strecker as poem 6.20, 'Audi, qui de Socrate disputas et scribis' and poem 7.1, 'Eliconis rivulo modice respersus', *MSG*, p. 87 and pp. 90f. respectively.

[57] The presence of the verse found also in poems 9 and 13 is intriguing, as these works

are not present in Harley. It could have been interpolated either into Harley's exemplar or at a still earlier stage in its transmission.

[58] Poem 6 does not appear in Bodley 603.

[59] It is notable that the scribe of Harley 978 has altered (potentially through eye-skip?) the word 'cigno' ('swan') found in the Ovidian *auctoritas* line, to 'signo' ('sign'). This error may indicate that the scribe failed to recognize the famous quotation, which troubles the idea that the poem was read and copied solely for its *auctoritates* at a textual level.

[60] For a valuable overview of the practice of ethical interpretation, see Judson Boyce Allen, *The Ethical Poetic of the Later Middle Ages: A Decorum of Convenient Distinction* (Toronto, 1982).

[61] Rigg, 'Golias and other pseudonyms', p. 108.

[62] Taylor, *Textual Situations*, p. 84. The copying of the manuscript, however, is interpreted by him as suggesting that 'Harley 978 is not just a casual hodgepodge ... but does indeed reflect the reading habits of a single thirteenth-century individual', p. 89.

[63] The eight verses are nos. 4–6, 9, 11f., 16f. as edited by Strecker, *MSG*, pp. 91–5.

[64] Harley omits the third line of this verse as found in other witnesses; see Strecker, *MSG*, p. 86.

[65] The poems Strecker edits as nos. 1 and 2, 'Tanto viro locuturi' and 'Propter Sion non tacebo', are also found in several different versions in the witnesses. However, the scribal involvement their texts display is different from that of the *auctoritas* poems, as it mainly consists of the presence of additional verses, not wholesale reordering. See *MSG*, pp. 1–33, especially pp. 8f., 13–15, 22, 23.

[66] William of Champagne, Archbishop of Reims between 1176 and 1202, is the dedicatee of Walter's epic the *Alexandreis* and was very probably his patron: see John R. Williams, 'William of the White Hands and men of letters', in *Anniversary Essays in Medieval History by Students of Charles Homer Haskins*, ed. C. H. Taylor (Boston, Mass., 1929), pp. 365–87.

[67] The importance of authority as a principle is evident even in works that implicitly bring the idea into question, such as Peter Abelard's *Sic et non*, which seeks to reconcile divergent statements from the Church Fathers on particular topics.

[68] Schmidt, 'Quotation in Goliardic poetry', p. 43.

[69] The interest of scribes in quotation generally (not merely the *auctoritas* lines) is shown by the highlighting in red of important words in the versions of poems 4 and 5 found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 4; in a Hanover manuscript the *auctoritas* authors are occasionally noted in the margin (Strecker, *MSG*, pp. 68, 70).

[70] Rigg, 'Golias and other pseudonyms', pp. 85f.

[71] Ibid., p. 68.

[72] This is true of Walter's 'satires' and also of 'Goliardic' poetry more generally: see Strecker, *MSG*, pp. v–viii for a list of the poems in manuscripts, and the witnesses analysed by Rigg in his series of studies entitled 'Medieval Latin poetic anthologies'.

[73] This is Strecker's view in *MSG* as cited by Schmidt, 'Quotation in Goliardic poetry', p. 43.

[74] The compositions of poets such as the earlier twelfth-century authors Hugh Primas and the Archpoet transform 'standard' authoritative texts and material to turn Ulysses into a selfish mendicant, or Jonah into a bibulous poet: see Hugh's poem 10 'Post rabiem rixe' and the Archpoet's poem 2 'Fama tuba dante sonum', both in *Hugh Primas and the Archpoet*, ed. Adcock, pp. 20–7 and pp. 80–5.

[75] See for example the text edited as 'The students' money-gospel' in Martha Bayless, *Parody in the Middle Ages: The Latin Tradition* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1996), pp. 332–7.

[76] As does Pepin, *Literature of Satire*, pp. 89–115.

[77] Rigg, 'Golias and other pseudonyms', p. 65.