

T. E. FRANKLINOS

ut eius uirginea reserassem uincula: unlocking the relationship between the Latin and German stanzas of *Carmen Buranum* 180.

Abstract: This article revisits *Carmen Buranum* 180, transmitted only in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 4660, the so-called Codex Buranus. It is argued that the nine stanzas (seven in Latin and two in German) and the two refrains should be read as one coherent poem, rather than as examples of compilation or contrafacture. Moreover, it is suggested that the Latin of the seventh stanza has been misinterpreted and, further, that – as an example of the sophisticated experimentation with literary form found in this manuscript that often challenges readerly expectations – all of the stanzas and refrains belong to one male lyric persona, rather than switching between male and female voices.

Key words: *Carmina Burana*, contrafacture, compilation, gender, medieval Latin lyric, Minnesang.

The Codex Buranus (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 4660) contains an extraordinary and unique array and combination of texts including sixty-four that contain some Middle High German, for the most part in combination with Latin. Of the lyric poems, a handful are macaronic texts that syntactically integrate the two languages, while most of them – forty-seven in total – follow Latin stanzas with one or (rarely) two German ones. The relationship between these stanzas has been a vexed issue in scholarship on the texts of the Codex Buranus for over a century, and historically the debate has centred around whether these multilingual texts arose through compilation or contrafacture.¹ In sum, the former supposes that the inclusion of »German strophes [was] inspired by either a thematic or a metrical resemblance to the preceding Latin text« and that these strophes, drawn from existing collections, were juxtaposed with the Latin stanzas without a view to necessarily creating a

* I am grateful to the Mittellateinisches Forschungskolloquium at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich for comments on an earlier version of this paper, in particular to Marc-Aeilko Aris, Marie Zöckler, and Anna Ritzel; my thanks too to Mary Boyle and Cosima Clara Gillhammer.

¹ The fundamental works here are: Otto Schumann, Die deutschen Strophen der Carmina Burana, in: Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift 14 (1926), 418–437; William T. H. Jackson, The German Poems in the Carmina Burana, in: German Life and Letters 7 (1953) 36–43; Bruce A. Beatie, Macaronic Poetry in the Carmina Burana, in: Vivarium 5 (1967) 16–24; Ulrich Müller, Mehrsprachigkeit und Sprachmischung als poetische Technik: Barbarolexis in den *Carmina Burana*, in: Europäische Mehrsprachigkeit: Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Mario Wandruszka, ed. Wolfgang Pöckl, Tübingen 1981, 87–104; Burghart Wachinger, Deutsche und lateinische Liebeslieder: zu den deutschen Strophen der Carmina Burana, in: From Symbol to Mimesis: The Generation of Walther von der Vogelweide, ed. Franz H. Bäuml, Göttingen 1984, 1–34; Olive Sayce, Plurilingualism in the Carmina Burana: A Study of the Linguistic and Literary Influences on the Codex, Göttingen 1992; Cyril Edwards, The German texts in the *Codex Buranus*, in: The *Carmina Burana*: Four Essays, ed. Martin H. Jones, London 2000, 41–70; Udo Kühne, Deutsch und Latein als Sprachen der Lyrik in den »Carmina Burana«, in: Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur 122 (2000) 57–73. The arguments and conclusions of each, as well as the development of the debate, have been lucidly and helpfully summarised in Henry Hope, Compilation, Contrafacture, Composition: Revisiting the German Texts of the Codex Buranus, in: Revisiting the Codex Buranus: Contents, Contexts, Composition, eds. Tristan E. Franklino and Henry Hope, Woodbridge 2020, 351–392, at 351–367.

meaningful whole.² Contrafacture, on the other hand, has the stanzas in one language serve as a model for the creation of new verses in the other; these are then transmitted alongside one another »in order to reflect the genesis of the new song and to provide new layers of meaning« for the original text.³ In his insightful re-evaluation of the approaches taken to the texts that contain German in the Codex Buranus, Henry Hope explores a third possibility, only fleetingly entertained by others, that some of the multilingual texts without concordances elsewhere may be the result of composition *per se*, rather than of compilation or of contrafacture. He concludes that one should »tak[e] seriously the German stanzas *as transmitted in the Codex Buranus*«, that is as forming an integral and coherent whole with the Latin stanzas that precede them, and that one should consider the possibility that they result from »the same acts of composition that [...] generated the macaronic songs alongside which they are transmitted«.⁴ It is bearing in mind Hope's invitation to readers of the multilingual songs of the Codex Buranus that I turn to consider CB 180 (*O mi dilectissima*).

The text of CB 180 is transmitted on fol. 71r. of clm 4660, beginning at the top of the folium and accompanied by the rubric *Item al.* (= *Item aliud*) as is common in this manuscript; it takes up almost the whole of the page, with the opening verses of CB 181 occupying the last six lines. The poem consists of seven Latin stanzas followed by two in Middle High German and begins with one of the famous red initials of the Codex Buranus that depicts a bearded face. After the first Latin stanza a brief German refrain is introduced by a rubricated *Refl.* (= *Reflecte*). This refrain is not written out again after subsequent verses, nor is *Refl.*, nor has a suitable space been left by the scribe for the inclusion of either or both; such omission is not unusual in the Codex Buranus.⁵ Each of the stanzas after the first begins with a middle-sized rubricated initial except that of stanza 7; strophic clarification in the light of this slip is achieved by the addition of a paragraphus before the start of the seventh stanza by a later hand. A second refrain follows the first of the German stanzas: it is a variation on the first refrain and is introduced by a red initial, but not with a rubricated *Refl.*; there is no mention that this refrain should be repeated after the second German stanza, but one may assume – as is the case with the first refrain – that its repetition was envisaged. The first stanza of the Latin and the first refrain that immediately follows it have unheighted (adiastematic) neumes written above; such notation means that the melody is not able to be discerned by those not already familiar with it.⁶ The provision of neumes for only the first stanza and refrain on the assumption that the melody will be repeated for the following strophes is common in the Codex Buranus. Formally speaking, all of the stanzas are four verses in length and each verse is a trochaic heptasyllabic line; the third and fourth verses occasionally have an anacrusis and, as this phenomenon occurs

² Edwards (note 1) 52.

³ Hope (note 1) 353.

⁴ Hope (note 1) 392; his emphasis.

⁵ The scribe is known as *h*² and was responsible for almost all of the texts in the Codex Buranus containing elements of German (excluding the *Fragmenta Burana*); see the table in Hope (note 1) 355–359. On the hands in clm 4660, see Otto Schumann, Einleitung (Die Handschrift der Carmina Burana), in: *Carmina Burana* II.i, ed. Alfons Hilka and Otto Schumann, Heidelberg 1961, 1*–96*, at 13*–31*.

⁶ Four neumators worked on the Codex Buranus; it was *n*³ who was responsible for the notation in CB 180. For an overview of the work of the neumators, see Heike Sigrid Lammers-Harlander, Revisiting the Music of the Codex Buranus, in: *Revisiting the Codex Buranus: Contents, Contexts, Composition*, eds. Tristan E. Franklins and Henry Hope, Woodbridge 2020, 251–281, at 251–274; for more detail, see Heike Sigrid Lammers, *Carmina Burana: Musik und Aufzeichnung*, diss. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich 1997.

in both of these verses in the first stanza, notation is provided in the form of a ›punctum‹ for use in the third and fourth verses of stanzas where anacrusis occurs. All of the Latin and German strophes are rhymed in couplets except for the first Latin stanza which has a monorhyme.

In her 1967 study on CB 180, Olive Sayce surprisingly claims that »the palaeographical evidence« suggests that »the German material was regarded as subordinate by the compiler« of the manuscript, since the »Latin texts begin at the beginning of a new line with a large decorated initial, whereas the German strophes attached to them begin with a medium-sized capital immediately after the end of the Latin«. She supposes a process of contrafacture in CB 180 and similar texts in the Codex Buranus, noting that it seems likely that most of the German stanzas – apart from those with concordances and one or two others – were produced »specially in order to imitate Latin metrical structures in the vernacular«. ⁷ The palaeographical evidence need suggest nothing of the sort. A far more straightforward reading of the text of CB 180 as transmitted on fol. 71r. is to understand it – following Henry Hope’s invitation – as one integral composition in which the use of middle-sized rubricated initials for the start of the two German stanzas is the same as that used for the preceding Latin stanzas: there is no subordination of vernacular strophes implied by palaeographical details or the *mise-en-page*.

There are a number of possible reasons why compilation or contrafacture have presumably seemed attractive as plausible means of attempting to understand CB 180. Two are of particular significance here. First, scholars have posited a change in speaker between the Latin and the German stanzas. The account of the text given by Cyril Edwards is representative of the *communis opinio*: the seven Latin stanzas constitute a love song in a male voice; the first of the German stanzas seems to be in a woman’s voice (»[dieser] Vierzeiler klingt wie eine Frauenstrophe«); and the final stanza could be understood as belonging to a male or a female voice. Edwards further notes that the first refrain, which he characterises as »rätselhaft«, is in a female voice and relates more closely to the German stanzas of the poem and their similar refrain. ⁸ The second, related reason why scholars have favoured contrafacture or compilation is that they have understood the text to have rather a sudden break in sense after the seventh stanza. In the Latin part of the text, the speaker describes his beloved reading his letter (stanza 1), before giving an account of its content in which he speaks of her beauty and the effect that this has on him physically and mentally (stanzas 2–6); the seventh stanza has been understood as a wish that the gods grant the lyric persona his desire that he may come to possess his girl. The first German stanza has then been read as switching to the perspective of a girl – perhaps the beloved – who wishes to stop being doleful and to head out to the meadows with her companions. This abrupt change is further complicated by a possible move from a female voice in the first German stanza to a male one in the final stanza, which may consist of »a man asking

⁷ Olive Sayce, *Carmina Burana* 180 and the *mandaliet* refrain, in: Oxford German Studies 2 (1967) 1–12, at 2–3.

⁸ Cyril Edwards, Die Stimme der Frau in den *Carmina Burana*, in: Frauenlieder – *Cantigas de amigo*, eds. Thomas Cramer, John Greenfield, Ingrid Kasten, and Erwin Koller, Stuttgart 2000, 267–280, at 272–273. This view of the gendering of stanzas and refrains is shared by Sayce (note 7) and Michael Stolz, Plurilingualism in the Codex Buranus: An Intercultural Reconsideration, in: Revisiting the Codex Buranus: Contents, Contexts, Composition, eds. Tristan E. Franklins and Henry Hope, Woodbridge 2020, 317–350, at 335–41. Conversely, Theodor Frings, Stolz, *Carmina Burana* 180a (141), in: Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur 91 (1971) 539–547 alters the text of the two German stanzas and believes that they both belong to the female voice: »[d]ie zweite Strophe ist keine Mannesstrophe, sondern eine zweite Reigenstrophe der Mädchen« (540).

the girl to make him a garland as a sign of love, or a girl asking personified ›Minne‹ to help her make such a garland«. ⁹ The change from the first refrain to the second at the same time as the seemingly sudden narrative shift from the Latin to the German stanzas has no doubt encouraged this sense of a distinct break between the two parts of the text.

It seems, however, that the move between the Latin and German strophes is far less abrupt than previous readings have implied. In the seventh stanza, the lyric persona asks that the gods grant what he has purposed in his heart (*Vellet deus, uellent di, | quod mente proposui*). The next two verses – *ut eius uirginea | reserassem uincula* – elaborate on what the speaker intended and have, I would suggest, been misconstrued. First, *ut* is typically understood as introducing a substantival final clause or indirect command dependent on *proposui*; second, *reserassem*, a pluperfect subjunctive, is read as an imperfect subjunctive and understood as connoting an intention for the present. ¹⁰ David Traill renders these verses »May God – may the gods – grant the goal that I have set myself: to unlock the chains of her virginity«, ¹¹ meanwhile, Benedikt Vollmann writes »Möge Gott, mögen die Götter gnädig geben, was ich mir vorgenommen habe – ihren jungfräulichen Kerker aufzuschließen«, ¹² while Günter Bernt translates them »Wollte Gott, wollten die Götter, was ich im Sinne gedachte: Dass ich ihr jungfräuliches Band aufschließen möchte«. ¹³ Though it is true that the pluperfect subjunctive had come increasingly to replace the imperfect subjunctive in Medieval Latin and so it is not unusual to find pluperfect forms where one might have expected the imperfect in Classical Latin, ¹⁴ this seems unlikely to be the case in this instance, since there are true imperfects in the first line of the stanza and the imperfect form *reserarem* is metrically available but not used; moreover, the meaning provided by a final clause with imperfect sense is not satisfactory given what follows and the resultant reading is rather awkward. The next stanza – which, I propose, maintains the same first-person male voice as the preceding Latin strophes (see below) – begins with the speaker deciding not to be doleful anymore; this seems strange after a forceful

⁹ Stolz (note 8) 339; he concludes that it seems more »probable« that a female voice speaks. Edwards (note 8) 272–273 has also wondered whether the final stanza represents a male voice asking for a garland from maidens or whether a maiden, lacking in skill when it comes to making garlands, asks for help from her companions.

¹⁰ That *proponere* can introduce an indirect command beginning with *ut* is clear (TLL 10.2.2065.24–2066.60; DMLBS s.v. *proponere* 11d; Lexicon Latinitatis Nederlandicae Medii Aevi s.v. *proponere* 2.b.3), but the construction will not tolerate a pluperfect subjunctive here; see below on the unlikelihood of the pluperfect being used to stand for the imperfect here.

¹¹ Carmina Burana, ed. David A. Traill, Cambridge MA 2018, 2.239.

¹² Carmina Burana, ed. Benedikt K. Vollmann, Berlin 2016², 581. At 1197, Vollmann vigorously objects to the idea that *uincula reserare* could refer to a sexual act and concludes »[m]öglich ist nur, die ›Fesseln‹ bzw. den ›Kerker‹ der Jungferschaft als das Bewachtwerden durch das Elternhaus (die Gesellschaft) oder als das ›Gefängnis‹ der keuschen Zurückhaltung, der ›Sprödigkeit‹ zu verstehen, in welchem das Mädchen eingesperrt ist. Aus diesem Kerker möchte der Mann sie ›befreien‹«. I share the concern voiced by Stolz (note 8) 337 n. 34: the idea that the girl's parents or society more generally are meant to be thought of as protecting her here »does not seem very convincing«. While neither *uinculum* nor *reserare* are not attested in lexica as used in a sexual context – no references in the DMLBS or OLD s.vv., nor in James N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London 1982 – the metaphorical idea of a man seeking to undo a lover's bonds or restraints as representing an attempt at the sexual act is not uncommon; compare the account of a rape in CB 72, noting the use of *reserare* (2b.4–6 *dum [puella] dubitat | soluere uirguncula | repagula pudoris*; 3a.4–5 *sese plicat et intricat genua, | nec ianua pudoris reseratur*).

¹³ Carmina Burana, ed. Günter Bernt, Stuttgart 1992, 245; he omits the two German stanzas and the second refrain altogether.

¹⁴ See Peter Stotz, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters: Vierter Band – Formenlehre, Syntax und Stilistik*, Munich 1998, 333–4 (§69).

assertion of the male speaker's hope in the seventh stanza that he be able to have his way with his beloved. It seems worth at least considering whether the pluperfect subjunctive should be understood with its full force. Were one to understand *ut* (for *utinam*) as introducing an optative with a pluperfect subjunctive rather than a final clause,¹⁵ the seventh stanza would contain a note of regret about an unfulfilled past event: »would that I had her maiden bonds undone«. ¹⁶ The lyric persona could be understood as suggesting that he missed a previous opportunity to have his way with his beloved and now – alone – has to satisfy himself with the idea that she reads about his lovestruck state in her letter.

Such a reading of the final Latin stanza allows for a much smoother transition into the German stanzas. After voicing regret, in the seventh strophe, at the lack of sexual consummation with his beloved, the lyric persona announces that he no longer wishes to be doleful (*Ich wil truren varen lan*), before suggesting to his companions that they venture to the meadow so that they can search for other amorous opportunities there. The *gespilen* of this strophe have universally been understood to be female companions, but the word is attested of male playmates or friends too.¹⁷ Admittedly, this is a radical suggestion, but one that seems in keeping with the at times provocative and experimental approach of the sophisticated poets and scribes of the Codex Buranus, who were evidently steeped in the traditions of Latin lyric and well-versed in the norms of Minnesang, and who seem sometimes to have sought to challenge their audiences' expectations of what these sorts of poems could contain. Poetic treatments of amorous scenes in rural settings from antiquity onwards often involve maidens taking themselves to meadows in order to pick flowers; there they are encountered by men who have come with the express intention of finding a sexual partner. It is usually the case that it is the women who are described as going to the meadow to pluck flowers, only themselves to be plucked thereafter: one may compare the second stanza of the macaronic CB 185 (*Ia wolde ih an die wisen gan, | flores adunare, | do wolde mich ein ungetan | ibi deflorare*).¹⁸ In stanza 8 of CB 180, however, the lyric persona does not wish to pick flowers, but to look at them (*da seh wir der blumen schin*); presumably he takes these ornaments of the meadow to represent the women whose attentions he seeks. The association of maidens in such scenes with flowers is well known, and may receive further support in this context from the use of the noun *schin*, ›brightness‹ or ›radiance‹, to refer to the flowers' brilliancy.¹⁹ This is a word elsewhere collocated with the eyes of the beloved, as in Gottfried von Neifen's ›Saelic saelic sî diu wunne‹, which closes with the line *fröide machen kan dîn spilnder ougen schîn*.²⁰ One may also felicitously compare the figurative use of *florere* in the first stanza of CB 185 (*Ich was ein chint so wolgetan, | uirgo dum florebam*). The poet of CB 180 thus appears to play with the audience's expectations of who one expects to go to the meadow: one usually hears of the

¹⁵ For *ut* as *utinam*, see DMLBS s.v. *ut* 18; cf. OLD s.v. *ut* 42.

¹⁶ It is also possible that *ut* could introduce a consecutive clause here which would likewise have a plangent tone: »with the result that I had her maiden bonds undone«; this seems a little more strained to me after the preceding verses.

¹⁷ See Georg F. Benecke, Wilhelm Müller and Friedrich Zarncke, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, Hildesheim 1963, s.v. *gespil* and <http://www.mhdwb-online.de> s.v. *gespil*.

¹⁸ CB 185 was written by the same scribe as CB 180.

¹⁹ For the »general« influence of Neidhart, »affecting the choice of lexical items, syntactical features, motifs, and rhymes« in many of the German stanzas of the Codex Buranus concerned with descriptions of nature, see Sayce (note 1) 129–134.

²⁰ In ›Saelic sî diu heide‹, Gottfried also has the line-end *bluomen schîn*.

women heading out to look for flowers with no mention of the men until they appear to rape them; here, in an innovative turn, we hear of a man's motivations for going to the meadow. In the final stanza of the poem, the voyeuristic ambitions of the male lyric persona in the first German strophe can then be seen as fulfilled as he asks his (new?) beloved for a garland that befits a proud man who can see to his lady's needs.²¹

Consideration of the two refrains may lend support to such a reading. These have also been taken as belonging to the female voice,²² and as having their origin in dancing songs. It has been suggested that the first refrain – transmitted in an independent source – was added to the Latin strophes by the scribe who was »prompted to add a refrain, because the isometric four-line stanza [is] frequently associated with a couplet refrain«. This explains, for Olive Sayce, why it seems to have »no link at all« to the stanzas that surround it.²³ She supposes that the second refrain, with its shared structure and lexis, was composed by the scribe in response to the first refrain that had been found elsewhere.²⁴ While this is not impossible, it is also conceivable that these two similar refrains were both composed along with the rest of the poem by a single author. One may, moreover, suppose that both refrains do, in fact, reflect and respond to the contents of the Latin and German stanzas. Setting to one side the controversial *mandaliet*,²⁵ the words of the first refrain (*min geselle chōmet niet*) could be taken, in the voice of the male lyric persona, to be an assertion that, though his beloved reads his fulsome praise of her in his letter and learns of the effect that she has had on him, she does not come to him. Hence, in stanza 7, as I have suggested, he voices his regret about not having taken advantage of his previous opportunity to achieve sexual consummation with her. The second refrain can then be understood as marking a change in circumstance for the male lover as he finds himself with his companions looking for a beloved on the meadow: he is more successful here, it seems, and is able to assert that his beloved now comes to him (*min geselle chumit mir*).²⁶ Close repetition of structure and language between the two refrains implies that they are meant to complement one another and also to reflect a movement through the poem. The variation in morphology between *chōmet* and *chumit* may lend support to the idea that the first refrain had an original source elsewhere and that the second refrain was written in response to it along with the Latin and German stanzas,²⁷ but need not necessarily do so; in any case, it is clear that both refrains can be understood as meaningfully cohering with the stanzas that surround them, even

²¹ A less radical, weaker version of the proposed reading would be to suggest that the poet encodes an ambiguity of gender in the first German stanza. If one reads it as a female lyric voice (following the newly construed Latin stanzas), the male speaker of the Latin could have concluded by voicing his regrets before an unexpected narrative leap turns to the beloved, with whom the male has not succeeded, heading to the meadows to assuage her own (amatory?) disappointment with a (new?) love.

²² See, e.g., Stolz (note 8) 335–336.

²³ Sayce (note 1) 137.

²⁴ Sayce (note 7) 5.

²⁵ Sayce (note 7) argues that *mandaliet* is a nonce-word of the sort often found in refrains; she has been followed by Edwards (note 8) 273, who argues that *mandaliet* is constituted of two words ›man‹ and ›liet‹ with a nonce infix ›-da-‹ added. A full summary of different approaches to understanding the word can be found at Stolz (note 8) 336; see also Vollmann (note 12) 1198–1199.

²⁶ On the text here, see Sayce (note 1) 35, esp. n. 11, who observes that the scribe originally wrote *chumit* over the line-break and that a later hand, misunderstanding that the word continued over the line after the first three letters added an ›m‹ to produce *chum mit*, an imperative rather than a finite verb, which has been printed in all editions.

²⁷ Sayce (note 1) 138 n. 21.

if one of them was drawn from an existing tradition. The notion that refrains change in the course of a poem to reflect the developing circumstances of the rest of the text can be attested from antiquity onwards.²⁸ We can compare the shift from Latin to German refrains in CB 181 and 182, and the changing ›color‹ of the refrain in CB 185 (*Hoy et oe! | maledicantur thylie | iuxta uiam posite!*), where, though the words remain the same, their force seems to transform as the maiden's account of her rape unfolds.

A few further remarks on the coherence of the Latin section of the poem are worth venturing at this juncture. The first stanza is distinct from the remainder of those in the poem in that it has a monorhyme in ›-a‹ as opposed to rhymed couplets. This difference has caused some to suspect that the first stanza originally belonged to another text: »it has thematically little connexion with the rest of the poem«; it may even be that its inclusion at this juncture in the manuscript »was suggested by the similarity of its opening theme to that of the preceding German [stanza]« that closes CB 179 (*Einen brief ich sande | einer vrowen güt*).²⁹ A different way of approaching this distinct stanza might be to suggest that the change in rhyme scheme marks off what follows as belonging to the contents of the letter; this is further signalled by the presence of *dixi* in the second line of stanza 2. The second and the fourth stanzas each begin with the same line (*Que est hec puellula*) serving to structure the letter into two parts: strophes 2 and 3 respectively treat the beloved's physical beauty and its outward reflection of her inward *nobilitas*;³⁰ strophes 4 and 5 turn chiasmically to treat the effect of the girl's inner qualities on the lover before touching on the power of her outer *pulchritudo*. The sixth stanza then picks out the girl's eyes as a particularly noteworthy feature and their brightness is compared to the rays of the sun (*sol*) and the *splendor fulguris* that brings light in the darkness. There seems to be a possible suggestion of an elevated and divine aspect to her comeliness here: one might think of the words of the Magnificat antiphon for the 21st December: *O Oriens, splendor lucis aeternae, et sol iustitiae: ueni et illumina sedentes in tenebris et umbra mortis*.³¹ The seventh stanza, which seems not to form part of the letter,³² then makes clear the present state of the

²⁸ Cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 8.68 *ducite ab urbe domum, mea carmina, ducite Daphnin* and 109 *parcite, ab urbe uenit, iam parcite carmina, Daphnis*; Theocrit. *Idylls* 1.64, 94, 127 and 2.17 and 69. Note also, for example, the Latin refrains of CB 56.

²⁹ Sayce (note 7) 3; cf. Vollmann (note 12) 1195–1196, who notes that the German stanza that concludes CB 179 »gehört weit eher zum folgenden Gedicht«. A more fruitful way of reading this juxtaposition of two amatory poems concerning love letters may be to consider this nexus as an example of »parodistische Nachbarschaft« of the sort described in the Codex Buranus by Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, who helpfully draws out the significance of the evidently intentional arrangement of poems within the manuscript by the compiler(s); see Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, *Parodie in der Sammlung: eine parodistische Nachbarschaft in den ›Carmina Burana‹*, in: *Parodie und Verkehrung: Formen und Funktionen spielerischer Verfremdung und spöttischer Verzerrung in Texten des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit*, eds. Seraina Plotke and Stefan Seeber, Göttingen 2016, 45–71, and Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, *Parody in the Codex Buranus*, in: *Revisiting the Codex Buranus: Contents, Contexts, Composition*, eds. Tristan E. Franklins and Henry Hope, Woodbridge 2020, 39–66, at 61–65.

³⁰ The reflection of the beloved's beauty in her inner being is brought out in the combination of the colours red and white that draw stanzas 2 and 3 together. In stanza 2, her fair skin (*candor*) has a blushing rosy countenance (*rubedo*); this combination is answered by the mention of white milk and red blood (*lac miscet cum sanguine*) in the third stanza, which uses mention of these two liquids figuratively to refer to mildness and passion (cf. Juv. 11.68 [*haedulus*] *qui plus lactis habet quam sanguinis*).

³¹ This antiphon itself alludes to Zechariah's prophecy at Luke 1.79 *illuminare his qui in tenebris et in umbra mortis sedent* and Malachi 4.2 (= 3.20) *et orietur uobis timentibus nomen meum sol iustitiae*. My thanks to Cosima Clara Gillhammer for drawing the lexical similarities with the antiphon to my attention.

³² In their editions, Vollmann (note 12) and Traill (note 11) conclude the letter at the end of the sixth stanza. The magisterial edition of Hilka–Schumann–Bischoff marks off the stanzas that speak of the beloved in the third

male persona, who regrets that he has not succeeded in previous attempts on his beloved; the request for goodwill from the gods with which this strophe begins seems to demarcate it from the preceding letter. We have already seen how the German stanzas follow on from here, providing a coda of sorts for the Latin ones.

To conclude, then, it seems that by attending to the presentation of the text of CB 180 in the manuscript and by reading the German stanzas as thoroughly integrated with the Latin strophes that precede them, rather than supposing some process of compilation or contrafacture, one finds a coherent and engaging song that experiments with the generic norms and expectations of contemporary Latin lyric and Minnesang in an exciting and creative way that is typical of the collection as a whole.³³ We may compare Peter Godman's remarks on the macaronic CB 185: he refers to the poem and the manuscript in which it is found as happily and innovatively combining the traditions of »German and Latin verse as complementary and continuous« and as betraying a »sophistication, conceptual and formal, [that] appeals to an aesthetic which, in a central periphery of medieval Europe, was highly developed«. ³⁴ There is good reason to suppose that CB 180, along with many of the other uniquely attested texts in clm 4660, was composed by one of the scribes of the manuscript or someone in their immediate milieu,³⁵ in an environment that was well versed in the developing traditions of Latin and German lyric in the early to mid-thirteenth century, and where playful literary and artistic interactions resulted in the creation of extraordinary new works, many of which, happily, are transmitted together in the nonpareil Codex Buranus.³⁶

Below an edition of the text is given along with a translation based on my understanding of stanza 7; I have intentionally rendered the refrains and the German stanzas genderless.

person as addressed to the poet's public (2, 4, 7), while the remainder, which speak of the beloved in the second person, are taken as instances of direct address to her. There is no suggestion that we are shown the content of the letter being read. The loss of at least one stanza between the first and second strophes is posited in which the circumstances of the lover's and beloved's meeting are explained: the lover is then imagined as recounting his thoughts during his encounter with the girl to his public in the stanzas in the third person (2, 4, 7); see *Carmina Burana* I.ii, ed. Alfons Hilka and Otto Schumann, Heidelberg 1941, 302.

³³ One might consider the possibility of a metapoetic gesture in the garland that the male lyric persona would like for himself in the final stanza (a suggestion I owe to Anna Ritzel): could it represent a text whose poet picks and chooses, drawing on varied literary traditions in an innovative way? The Latin poetic tradition is explored, while novel perspectives on the pastourelle (stanza 8) are wittily juxtaposed with aspects of »hohe Minne« in stanza 9 (n.b. *der wol wiben dienen chan*).

³⁴ Peter Godman, Rethinking the *Carmina Burana* III: The Poetry of Peasants, in: *Revisiting the Codex Buranus: Contents, Contexts, Composition*, eds. Tristan E. Franklins and Henry Hope, Woodbridge 2020, 171–203, at 202–203.

³⁵ Cf. the discussion of *h!* as a learned and sophisticated organising force behind the Codex Buranus in Peter Godman, Rethinking the *Carmina Burana* (I): The Medieval Context and Modern Reception of the Codex Buranus, in *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 45 (2015) 245–286, at 246–259. Note also the important musicological discussion of Gundela Bobeth, Wine, women, and song? Reconsidering the *Carmina Burana*, in: *Manuscripts and Medieval Song: Inscription, Performance, Context*, eds. Helen Deeming and Elizabeth Eva Leach, Cambridge 2015, 79–115, esp. at 79–84, where she draws attention to the intellectual breadth and depth of the contents of the manuscript.

³⁶ For a summary of the scholarly debate on the likely origin of the Codex Buranus with full bibliography, see Tristan E. Franklins and Henry Hope, Introduction: The Codex Buranus – A Unique Challenge, in: *Revisiting the Codex Buranus: Contents, Contexts, Composition*, eds. Tristan E. Franklins and Henry Hope, Woodbridge 2020, 1–12, at 1 and 9–10.

<p>1. O mi dilectissima, uultu serenissima et mente legis sedula, ut mea refert littera.</p> <p><i>Refl.</i> 1 Mandaliet, mandaliet, min geselle chōmet niet.</p> <p>2. »Que est hec puellula«, dixi, »tam precandida, in cuius nitet facie candor cum rubedine? <<i>Refl.</i> 1 ></p> <p>3. Vultus tuus indicat, quanta sit nobilitas, que in tuo pectore lac miscet cum sanguine. <<i>Refl.</i> 1 ></p> <p>4. Que est hec puellula dulcis et suauissima? eius amore caleo, quod uiuere uix ualeo. <<i>Refl.</i> 1 ></p> <p>5. Circa mea pectora multa sunt suspiria de tua pulchritudine que me ledunt misere. <<i>Refl.</i> 1 ></p> <p>6. Tui lucent oculi sicut solis radii, sicut splendor fulguris, qui lucem donat tenebris.« <<i>Refl.</i> 1 ></p> <p>7. Vellet deus, uellent di, quod mente proposui: ut eius uirginea reserassem uincula! <<i>Refl.</i> 1 ></p> <p>8. Ich wil truren varen lan; vf die heide sul wir gan, vil liebe gespilen min: da seh wir der blumen schin.</p>	<p>My most beloved lady, most serene in countenance are you and with attentive mind do you read what my letter conveys.</p> <p><i>Mandaliet, mandaliet,</i> my companion comes not.</p> <p>»Who is this maiden«, I wrote, »so exceedingly radiant, in whose face shines fairness with a rosy hue.</p> <p>Your countenance betrays the extent of your superiority which, in your breast, combines mildness with passion.</p> <p>Who is this maiden delightful and most sweet? With love for her I burn that I scarce have strength to live.</p> <p>About my breast do I heave many sighs concerning your beauty, sighs that grieve me greatly.</p> <p>Your eyes shine as the rays of the sun, as the flash of lightning that brings light to the darkness.«</p> <p>May god grant, may the gods grant what I purposed in my heart: would that I had her maiden bonds undone!</p> <p>I want to cease from being doleful; let us go to the meadow, friends of mine most dear: there we see the radiance of the flowers.</p>
--	---

<p><Refl. 2> Ich sage dir, ih sage dir, min geselle chumit mir!</p> <p>9. Sūziv minne, raine min, mache mir ein chrenzelin! daz sol tragen ein stolzer man, der wol wiben dienen chan!</p> <p><Refl. 2></p>	<p>I tell you, I tell you, my companion comes to me!</p> <p>Sweet love, pure love, make for me a garland! That is what a proud man ought to wear, one skilled at serving ladies.</p>
---	--

Oriel & Wolfson Colleges, Oxford
tristan.franklinos@classics.ox.ac.uk

[Dr T. E. Franklinos,
Oriel College,
Oxford,
OX1 4EW,
United Kingdom/Vereinigtes Königreich]