DAVID A. TRAILL

The Codex Buranus: Where was it written? Who commissioned it, and why?*

ABSTRACT

Recent proposals to reject Steer's finding that the Codex Buranus was written in South Tyrol in favor of a scriptorium in Aquileia, Friesach, or Seckau are discussed and found to be unconvincing. The narrower window for the compilation and writing of the manuscript (1218–1230) recently put forward suggests Berthold von Neuffen, bishop of Brixen 1216–24, *protonotarius* of Frederick II, crusader in Egypt, and uncle of Minnesänger, Gottfried von Neifen, as the likeliest candidate to have commissioned it, probably for personal rather than pedagogical reasons.

Keywords: Neustift, Brixen, Aquileia, Seckau, Steer, Bischoff, Bertelsmeier-Kierst, Drumbl, Klemm, Walworth, Sayce. Frederick II, Berthold von Neuffen, Heinrich von Taufers, Fifth Crusade, John of Brienne, Otto von Botenlauben, Beatrix de Courtenay

More than two hundred years after the discovery of the Carmina Burana manuscript (now Clm 4660 in Munich) in the abbey of Benediktbeuern, south of Munich, there is still no agreement on three basic questions: where was the manuscript written? who commissioned it, and why? Progress has been made on the dating. In 1930 Schumann dated it towards the end of the thirteenth century.[1] In 1970 Bernhard Bischoff corrected this to no later than 1250.[2] However, study of the manuscript by the leading expert on gothic script, Albert Derolez, has led him to suggest a date no later than 1230.[3] Since we know that Neidhart's *Sommerlied* 11, from which

* An earlier version of this paper was given at the *Media Latinitas* conference in Vienna in September 2017.

[1] Carmina Burana, ed. A. Hilka and O. Schumann, 1 pt. 1, Heidelberg 1930, ix.

[2] Carmina Burana, ed. A. Hilka, O. Schumann, B. Bischoff, 1 pt. 3, Heidelberg 1970, x–xi. Bischoff cites the dating of the manuscript illustrations by art historians Albert Boeckler and Otto Pächt to the first third of the thirteenth century; see Peter Dronke, A Critical Note on Schumann's Dating of the Codex Buranus, in: Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur 84 (1962) 173–83, at 181.

[3] I am grateful to Professor Albert Derolez for informing me of his opinion in a personal communication dated 29 July 2017. He identified the script as pregothic rather than early gothic, pointing out «The letter forms are generally still close to the Carolingian ones» and after describing a number of them, concluded: «All in all there are features pointing

© Anton Hiersemann, Verlag · Stuttgart

the German stanza 168a has been excerpted, was written 1217–1219, we now have a much narrower window for the manuscript's creation (1218–1230) than Bischoff's 1218–1250.[4]

Where the manuscript was written has proved much more controversial. Originally, it was assumed to have been written in Benediktbeuern itself. But Paul Lehmann argued that the occasional use by scribe h² of what looks rather like a ç for a z, a practice foreign to German manuscripts, indicated Italian influence, and suggested a scriptorium in South Tyrol, now in Italy but still largely German-speaking.[5] Bischoff agreed with Lehmann about the Italian influence but thought it more likely that the manuscript was written further east, suggesting somewhere in Carinthia or Styria.[6] In 1983 Georg Steer pointed out that the German dialectical forms in the Carmina Burana overwhelmingly reflect the practice of scribes in South Tyrol rather than that of scribes in Carinthia or Styria. He suggested the monastery of Neustift, about three kilometers north of Brixen/Bressanone, as the most likely scriptorium.[7] This view has gained widespread acceptance by philologists.[8]

Christa Bertelsmeier-Kierst, however, has argued against both Neustift and Brixen as the location for the scriptorium that produced the Codex Buranus.[9] She does so because she could find no instance of the use of the tell-tale ç-shape for z in «relevant manuscripts» in the archives there, though she did find this usage in manuscripts in archives in Bozen/Bolzano and other locations south of Brixen.[10] She is to be thanked for warning us against too ready an acceptance of Steer's suggestion on this point.

---

to a rather early date in the thirteenth century. The writing above the top line is generally an indication that a manuscript is not written after c. 1230». I am also grateful to Daniel Pachurka for bringing to my attention that Karin Schneider, Gotische Schriften in deutscher Sprache, 4 vols., Göttingen 1987–2009, 1 (Textband) 130–31, appears to reach a rather similar conclusion: «die konservative Schrift eines um 1230 wohl schon älteren Schreibers».

4 For the dating of Neidhart's poem and Bischoff's dating of the Carmina Burana, see Carmina Burana (note 2) 1 pt. 3, xi.

5 Paul Lehmann, Einzelheiten und Eigenheiten des Schrift- und Buchwesens, in: Lehmann, Erforschung des Mittelalters, vol. 4, Stuttgart 1961, 1–21, at 5.

6 For Carinthia see Carmina Burana (facsimile edition), ed. B. Bischoff, New York 1967, 28–29 and for Styria (specifically, Seckau) see Carmina Burana (note 2) 1 pt. 3, xi–xii.

7 Georg Steer, Carmina Burana in Südtirol, in: Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur 112 (1983) 1–37, esp. 34–35.

8 Olive Sayce, Plurilingualism in the Carmina Burana, Göppingen 1992, 37, writes that Steer shows «conclusively that Lehmann's tentative supposition was correct, and that the Southern Tirol is the only location which makes it possible to explain all the linguistic evidence satisfactorily». See also Cyril Edwards, The German Texts in the Codex Buranus in: Carmina Burana: Four Essays, ed. Martin H. Jones, London 2000, 41–70, at 53.

9 Christa Bertelsmeier-Kierst, *Muget ir schouwen, waz dem meien ...*, Zur frühen Rezeption von Walthers Liedern in: Blütezeit, Festschrift für L. Peter Johnson zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. by Mark Chinca, Joachim Heinzle and Christopher Young, Tübingen 2000, 88–99, at 97.

10 The population of today's Bozen/Bolzano is 73 % Italian-speaking but in the thirteenth century the majority would have spoken German but would have been 43 kilometers closer than the people of Brixen to parts where the majority spoke Italian; so one would naturally expect Italian influence to be stronger there than in Brixen.

However, she seems to have misinterpreted Bischoff's note regarding the use of the ç form for z in the Codex Buranus, for Bischoff points to two instances of scribe h²'s use of ç for z in the Latin text (actually, in both instances, ç for c, not z), adding that it is found more often in the German text.[11] Since Latin uses z only in Latinized Greek words and in foreign names, whereas German (especially Middle High German) uses z quite frequently, this is not surprising. However, if a given phenomenon occurs only rarely in one place but is said to occur «more often» somewhere else, this does not necessarily imply that it occurs there «often», as Bertelsmeier-Kierst appears to assume when she writes: «So verwendet der Hauptschreiber der deutschen Strophen für z *häufig* das nur im italienischen Schriftwesen gebräuchliche c-cédille, das in deutschen Handschriften sehr selten – und nur unmittelbar unter italienischen Einfluss – zu finden ist».[12] It is regrettable that on such an important issue she did not offer basic details about the «relevant manuscripts» she examined regarding their dating, the language in which they were written, and the sample sizes. In attempting to assess the validity of her conclusions, however, it is important to bear in mind the following: of the two scribes, h¹ and h², responsible for 98 percent of the original collection of the Carmina Burana (CB 1–228), h¹ did not use the ç form at all (although he shows other signs of Italian influence), while h² used the ç form only six times in the Latin text of CB 1–228 (in all instances to represent an initial c, not z, as Bischoff implies) and in the German text only 22 times for z as against 157 instances of the regular forms of z.[13] If we examine the practice of the scribes of CB 1*–26*, where Schumann identifies contributions by a further 29 scribes, we find no instance of the ç form for z at all and 80 additional occurrences of regular z forms. Accordingly, if all the manuscripts that Bertelsmeier-Kierst examined in Brixen and Neustift were in Latin, then her finding that there were no instances of the ç form to represent z precisely matches the practice of all the Codex Buranus scribes. If, on the other hand, she examined only German manuscripts, then her finding that there were no instances of ç for z in the Neustift or Brixen manuscripts conforms, as far as we can tell, with the practice of 30 out of 31 scribes of the Codex Buranus. After dismissing Brixen and Neustift as likely scriptoria for the Codex Buranus on what appear to be very dubious grounds, Bertelsmeier-Kierst suggests the court of Berthold of the noble family of Andechs in Bavaria, patriarch of Aquileia 1218–1250, as a possible can-

---

[11] See Bischoff (note 6) 36 n. 18 (or 33 n. 18 in German): «E. g. foll. 31v *zelatum*, 54v and more often in German texts». At 31v I follow Carmina Burana, ed. B. K. Vollmann, Frankfurt am Main 1987, 264 in reading *celatum* not *zelatum* (CB 77 3.4) and at 54v all editors read *Cerberus*, not *Zerberus* (CB 131a.2.2).

[12] Bertelsmeier-Kierst (note 9), 97 (my emphasis on *häufig*).

[13] Besides the two instances of ç for c cited in note 11 the only other instances of ç I found in the Latin (or mainly Latin) texts were all four occurrences of *çinke* (for *cinq*) at CB 215.7. Accordingly, in the Latin (or mainly Latin) texts there are six instances of ç for c and no instances of ç for z. Of the 22 occurrences of ç for z in the German and macaronic texts, nine are for *Herz*, which is written *herçe(n)* every time in CB 1–228, whereas in 1*–26* all three instances are written herze(n).

didate for the scriptorium but offers no specific argument in support of this theory beyond pointing to the plurilingualism of his court.[14]

More recently Johann Drumbl has suggested that the Codex Buranus may have been commissioned at the end of July 1237, when the archbishop of Salzburg consecrated the restored Brixen cathedral after the fire of 1234 and Henry I, bishop of Seckau, was also in attendance.[15] Drumbl sees this occasion as an ideal conjuncture, when the two locations (Brixen and Seckau) most prominent in the debate over the likely «Heimat des Buranus» came together, as it were.[16] The strongest argument for suggesting Seckau as the scriptorium is provided by CB 6*, in which the Marner sings the praises of the provost of Maria Saal and urges the audience (the Seckau chapter?) to support his bid to become the next bishop of Seckau.[17] The campaign was successful and Henry of Zwettl became Henry I, bishop of Seckau in 1231. However, since all the poems numbered 1* to 26*, were added after completion of the original collection, CB 1–228, it was clearly not part of the commissioned work. Besides, as noted above, leading paleographers hold that the commissioned work seems to have been completed at least seven years before 1237.[18]

In 1998 the art historian Elisabeth Klemm took issue with the Brixen/Neustift thesis. She pointed out that illustrated manuscripts comparable to the Carmina Burana do not exist in Neustift and maintained that the tradition of wall paintings in and around Brixen argued against a South Tyrol origin for the Codex Buranus illustrations.[19] Although aware of the gist of Steer's article, she does not address his arguments. She suggests instead Friesach in Carinthia, then a significant trading and ecclesiastical center, as a more likely location for the scriptorium, though no manuscripts comparable to the Codex Buranus exist there (or, apparently, from there) either. Also, she does not attempt to explain why the two scribes in the Friesach scriptorium designated to work on the manuscript spoke the dialect of South Tyrol, not Carinthia. In support of Friesach she points to the resemblance between features of the dress of the lovers on CB folio 72v and that of the basket-bearers in the painting (1125–50) of the Feeding of the Five Thousand on the north wall of the Deutschordenskirche in Friesach and the virtually identical but somewhat later painting

---

[14] Instead she goes on to suggest (p. 98) that the Carmina Burana could perhaps be seen as reflecting performances by clerics and *Minnesänger* at some ecclesiastical court, such as that of the patriarch of Aquileia. Presumably, the clerics produced all the Latin pieces but she does not attempt to explain why we usually have only a single stanza from the poems of the *Minnesänger* or why the court scribes seem to have spoken the dialect of South Tyrol.

[15] Johann Drumbl, Studien zum Codex Buranus in: Aevum 2 (2003) 323–56, here 353.

[16] Ibid.

[17] See Carmina Burana (note 2) 1 pt. 3, xii.

[18] Moreover, had Henry, bishop of Seckau, commissioned the work, he would certainly have been outraged to find the poem praising him (CB 6*) had been ignominiously placed in the space left between the end of CB 227 and the beginning of 228 at the top of folio 105r, where, however, there was insufficient room so that its concluding lines had to be added at the bottom of fols. 104v and 105r.

[19] Elisabeth Klemm, Katalog der illuminierten Handschriften der bayerischen Staatsbibliothek in München, 4 vols. in 8 parts (Wiesbaden 1980–98), vol. 4 (Textband) 123–24.

in the Johanneskapelle in Pürgg (Styria).[20] Ultimately, however, the relevant features of the dress of the basket-bearers and the Codex Buranus lovers were inspired by the same features in the dress of figures in the St. Clement chapel of San Marco in Venice.[21] Presumably, access to the same model book that was used to guide the painters for the composition of the Friesach and Pürgg murals, or a copy of it, could account for the similar features in the dress of the lovers in the Codex Buranus.

Another art historian, Julia Walworth, has pointed out that «the presence of illustrations is evidence of the value placed on this collection of texts by the patron», since «collections of Medieval Latin lyric generally have little in the way of decoration».[22] Clearly, the questions «Who commissioned the Codex Buranus, and why»? are bound up with one another. A bishop of Brixen seems a likely candidate, for they were *Fürstbischöfe* (prince-bishops), that is to say, both the spiritual and secular rulers of their diocese. The bishops of Brixen had long had close ties with Neustift not only because of the proximity of the Augustinian monastery to Brixen, but also because it was Hartmann, bishop of Brixen 1140–64, who had founded Neustift in 1142. Given the recent narrowing of the window for the writing of the Codex Buranus to 1218–1230 there are two bishops who qualify as potential candidates: Berthold von Neuffen (or Neifen), bishop of Brixen from 1216–1224, and Heinrich IV von Taufers, bishop of Brixen 1224–1239.[23]

Berthold came from a noble family of Swabia that staunchly supported the Staufer dynasty. He seems to have been the third son and so probably destined for a career in the church. He wrote excellent Latin, as we can see from the charters he wrote from 1212 till mid-1216, when he served as the *protonotarius* of the young king, Freder-

---

[20] Klemm (note 19) vol. 4 (Textband) 124. She could have added that the decorative band on the upper arms also appears near the end of the forearm on all the figures too. For an illustration of the Deutschordenskirche wall-painting, see Otto Demus, Romanesque Mural Painting, New York 1970, pl. 289; for Pürgg, see Evelyn Weiss, Der Freskenzyklus der Johanneskapelle in Pürgg, in: Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte 22 (1969) 7–42, pls. 14 and 15. Weiss argues (p. 42) that the two paintings, though iconographically very similar, are stylistically quite different, attributing the Pürgg painting not to the Salzburg tradition (as in the case of the Friesach mural) but to what she calls the «italienisch-tirolischen Kunstkreise». Demus had earlier noted (p. 139) the difference in style between the two works, attributing the similarity in iconography to the use of a model book «probably originating from Salzburg». What Weiss sees as the Italian-Tyrolean school seems to amount to much the same as what Demus (p. 140) sees as the southern branch of Salzburg's influence: «Salzburg's influence penetrated as far as the South Tyrol, fostered by the close ecclesiastical relationships and the busy traffic through the Puster valley». The Puster flows into the Etsch/Adige at Brixen.

[21] For the St. Clement chapel figures see Weiss (note 20), pl. 17 or (for a larger image) Otto Demus, The Mosaics of San Marco in Venice, vol. 1 (plates), Chicago 1984, pl. (black & white) 64.

[22] Julia Walworth, Earthly Delights: The Pictorial Images of the Carmina Burana manuscript, in: The Carmina Burana: Four Essays, ed. Martin H. Jones, London 2000, 71–109, at 71.

[23] For more on the lives of these two bishops, see Anselm Sparber, Die Brixner Fürstbischöfe im Mittelalter, Bozen 1966, 77–81, to which my own summary accounts are much indebted.

ick II.[24] When Rodank, bishop of Brixen, died in 1216, Frederick, then 22, promptly had the cathedral chapter choose Berthold as their bishop-elect. This was probably for strategic reasons as much as for ecclesiastical considerations, for Brixen, being the only town of any size near the summit of the Brenner pass on the Italian side, guarded the German emperor's natural route to his possessions in Italy. Accordingly, the bishop of Brixen had to be someone on whom the emperor could rely. In two documents dated 29 December 1217 Frederick made significant gifts to the Brixen diocese clearly intended to strengthen its bishop. In the first he awarded Berthold and subsequent bishops all the silver and salt mines in the diocese with all the rights appertaining; in the second he gave them all the children of one of his *ministeriales*[25] and half of the children of another. Both salt and silver of course were extremely valuable commodities in the Middle Ages. In late 1218, presumably with Frederick's approval, Berthold left Brixen in the hands of a substitute while he went off to participate in the Fifth Crusade. He returned in 1220 and in November of that year accompanied Frederick to Rome for his coronation as emperor by the pope. Berthold died in Brixen in 1224. Berthold's brothers, Heinrich II of Neuffen, who knew Latin and French, and Albert, were both often to be found in Frederick's court and Heinrich's son Gottfried von Neifen, later became a significant poet of German *Minnesang*.[26] Since Gottfried appears to have grown up in the castle of Hohenneuffen, where Berthold and his siblings had been raised, this suggests that the family had literary leanings and probably a good library in the castle, possibly with manuscripts of German Minnesang.

The father of Heinrich von Taufers, Hugo III von Taufers, married Euphemia von Villalta (near Udine in Italy), a marriage that brought him rich possessions in the neighborhood of Aquileia; accordingly, the couple settled there. Heinrich became a cleric and eventually archdeacon of Aquileia. No doubt Heinrich's superior, Berthold, patriarch of Aquileia 1218–51, was influential in winning him the bishopric of Brixen in 1224, for he belonged to the powerful noble family of Andechs, whose castle in Ambras, just outside of Innsbruck, lay within the Brixen diocese. Soon after Heinrich's consecration as bishop in 1228 his cousin, Hugo IV of Taufers, bequeathed most of his possessions, including the Taufers castle, to the Brixen dio-

---

24 See J. L. A. Huillard-Bréholles and H. de Albertis de Luynes, Historia Diplomatica Friderici Secundi, 6 vols., Paris 1852, vol. 1, pt. 1, 232–34. 256–68; pt. 2, 449–60, 462–66, 478–79. I have assumed that only those documents where Berthold's name appears in the closing formula «Data per manum Bertholdi ...» were actually composed by him, though of course he could have dictated others.

25 MGH *Diplomata Regum et Imperatorum Germaniae*, 14, pt. 2 (Hannover, 2007), 496–99, nos. 425 and 426. On *minsteriales* see Karl Bosl, «Noble Unfreedom»: The rise of the *ministeriales* in Germany, in: The Medieval Nobility, ed. Timothy Reuter, Amsterdam 1979, 291–311; for more detail, see Benjamin Arnold, German Knighthood 1050–1300, Oxford 1985; the entire book is essentially a study of *ministeriales*.

26 Volker Mertens, Gottfried von Neifen, in: ²VL, vol. 3 (1981) 147–51, here 147–48; see also Hugo Kuhn, Gottfried von Neif(f)en, in: Neue deutsche Biographie, vol. 6, Berlin 1963, 671–76, here 671.

cese and became a *ministerialis*[27] (legally an unfree servant, but, in Heinrich's case, no doubt enjoying a privileged lifestyle) of the diocese. This was clearly a move to protect Hugo and his possessions from the depredations of the ambitious and aggressive Albert III/IV, count of Tyrol, who had become the *vogt* (bailiff) of Brixen. Heinrich fell foul of Frederick II in 1236 when the emperor heard complaints about Heinrich's maladministration of the courts. As punishment he stripped him of his secular control of the diocese.

Of these two bishops Berthold seems the more likely candidate. His personal closeness to the emperor together with that of his brothers and nephews suggests a cultural sophistication in the family that Frederick found congenial, a sophistication that probably included an appreciation for not only Latin literature and German *Minnesang*.[28] Nothing in what we know about Heinrich von Taufers or his family, which, admittedly, is even less than we know about Berthold and his family, suggests that he might have commissioned the Codex Buranus.

The poems of the original collection fall into the following four groups: moral-satirical poems, love poems, poems on tavern life (drinking, gaming, and gambling), and religious plays. Some poems do not seem to fit in their section. For instance, among the love poems we find poem 133, which gives the Latin names of about 75 birds in 22 ingenious hexameters and poem 134 with the names of 38 wild animals in twelve equally ingenious hexameters; the German names for the birds and animals have been added above the Latin names. These two remarkable poems are usually found together and are attested today in at least 84 manuscripts.[29] This is highly unusual, for more than half of the Carmina Burana poems are found nowhere else. Clearly, these two poems were intended for teaching purposes. They are more suggestive of the schoolroom than any other poems in the collection and must have played a major role in persuading Olive Sayce to conclude that the Codex Buranus had «a pedagogic purpose of some kind».[30] However, it seems most unlikely that such a luxurious manuscript with ten elaborate illustrations and widespread rubrication would ever have been intended for educational purposes. Creating the manuscript was a huge task. It naturally involved the careful writing of an extensive text replete with rubrication. But before that could even start, many manuscripts from which the new anthology could be compiled had to be assembled. These would have to be borrowed from other monasteries and would doubtless include similar but much smaller anthologies, some single-author collections, and a number of manuscripts reflective of the large Notre Dame repertory.[31] Then there would be the plan-

---

27 On *ministeriales* see note 25.

28 While David Abulafia, Frederick II: A Medieval Emperor, London 1988, 251–89, is probably right in suggesting that the cultural élan of Frederick's court has been exaggerated, it seems clear that Frederick did enjoy the company of the culturally aware and that his friendship with the von Neuffens, together with Gottfried's later achievements, suggests that Berthold and his brothers met this requirement.

29 Vollmann (note 11) 1123.

30 Sayce (note 8) 203.

31 For a more detailed discussion of this, see Bischoff (note 6) 25–27.

ning of the different sections and the process of selecting and ordering appropriate poems from the range of available manuscripts.

After the completion of what is generally agreed to be the original collection (CB 1–228), another 26 poems, prose segments, and plays were added (CB 1*–26*), of which Bernhard Bischoff judges 16*–26* to be early additions.[32] The dates for the addition of the poems numbered 1*–15* range from ca. 1230 to the second half of the 14th century, the latest being 1*.[33] We do not know when, how, or why the manuscript reached Benediktbeuern. The earliest indication of its presence there is provided by its binding, which dates to the seventeenth century.[34] The fact that the manuscript appears to have remained in its scriptorium after completion of the planned work (CB 1–228) and to have been periodically added to, rather than becoming a prized possession in the hands of whoever commissioned it, is surprising and has not been adequately addressed. It is not hard to imagine Berthold on his return in 1220 from his two years engaged in a disillusioning crusade in Egypt, deciding to commission a work such as the Carmina Burana that would cater to his love of Latin, reflect a family interest in *Minnesang*, and culminate in two religious plays that celebrated the birth of Christ and – most unusually, but no doubt significantly for a participant in the Fifth Crusade – the triumph of Christianity over the pagan gods of Egypt.[35] The entire work would certainly have taken several years. Berthold died in 1224, a comparatively young man, given that his father (also named Berthold) had died, aged 61, only three years earlier.[36] If Berthold was seriously ill or already dead when the planned work was nearing completion, this would explain why it never left the scriptorium and why, eventually, monks felt free to make additions to the original collection.

The grouping of poems by genre – love poems, moral-satirical poems, and so on – was standard practice at this time. For instance, the Arundel collection comprises 16 love poems, followed by seven Christmas hymns and then four moral-satirical poems, while the Saint-Omer collection of Walter of Châtillon's lyrics comprises two main groups: Christmas hymns and love poems. What is most unusual about the Carmina Burana is its inclusion of a fair amount of German. Typically, this takes the form of a final added stanza in German that is rhythmically identical, or very similar, to the preceding Latin stanzas. There are 47 such poems, all but one of them among the love poems. The other rather unusual feature of the anthology is the inclusion of a group of crusader poems CB 46–52 in the moral-satirical section. This can be seen as reflecting an interest of Berthold's, given his experience as a crusader. There is only one place where these two unusual features converge and that is in the crusading poem 48 with 48a:

---

[32] Bischoff (note 6) 20–21 and 40.
[33] Carmina Burana (note 2) 1 pt. 3, 111.
[34] Bischoff (note 6) 30 and Carmina Burana (note 1) vol. 2 pt. 1, 5*.
[35] The subject matter of the play is highly unusual: it makes substantial borrowings for plot development from the *Ludus de Antichristo*.
[36] Wikipedia website: *Herren von Neuffen*.

1. *Quod spiritu David praecinuit,*
nunc exposuit
nobis Deus, et sic innotuit.
Sarracenus sepulchrum polluit,
5 *quo recubuit*
qui pro nobis crucifixus fuit.
Quantum nobis in hoc condoluit,
quantum nobis propitius fuit,
dum sic voluit
10 *mortem pati cruce, nec meruit!*
Ref. *Exurgat Deus!*

2. *Et dissipet hostes, quos habuit,*
postquam praebuit
Sarracenis locum, quo iacuit.
<three lines missing>
7 *Duo ligna diu non habuit,*
Sarreptina, quibus ut caruit,
semper doluit
10 *et dolebit, dum rehabuerit.*
Ref. *Exurgat Deus!*

3. *Sunamitis clamat pro filio,*
qui occubuit,
nec Giezi sanare potuit:
«Helisaeus nisi met venerit
5 *non surrexerit,*
et os ori recte coniunxerit.»
Helisaeus nisi nunc venerit,
ni peccata compassus tulerit,
non habuerit
10 *ecclesia crucem, qua caruit.*
Ref. *Exurgat Deus!*

4. *Et adiuvet in hoc exercitu,*
quos signaverit
signo crucis, qua nos redemerit.
Iam veniae tempus advenerit,
5 *quo potuerit*
se salvare, qui crucem ceperit.
Nunc videat quisque, quid fecerit,
quibus et quot Deum offenderit.
quod si viderit,
10 *et se signet, his solutus erit.*
Ref. *Exurgat Deus!*

5. *Exsurrexit! Et nos assurgere*
ei propere
iam tenemur atque succurrere.
Ierusalem voluit perdere,
5 *ut hoc opere*
sic possemus culpas diluere;
nam si vellet hostes destruere
absque nobis et terram solvere
posset propere,
10 *cum sibi nil possit resistere.*
Ref. *Exurgat Deus!*[37]

[37] Text and translation as given in Carmina Burana, ed. and translated by David A. Traill, Cambridge, Massachusetts / London 2018, 166–171. 1. What David foretold mystically, God has now revealed to us and so it has become known: the Saracen has profaned the tomb where he reposed who was crucified for us. How much compassion he felt for us in doing this! How great was his benevolence towards us when he so chose to suffer undeserved death on the cross! *Ref.* May God rise up! 2. Let him scatter the enemies he acquired when he granted the Saracens the place where he lay, <three lines missing> The widow of Zarephath did not have her two sticks for long and when she lost them, she constantly grieved for them and will grieve for them until she has them again. *Ref.* May God rise up! 3. The Shunamite woman called out for her son when he died and Gehazi could not heal him: «If Elisha does not come himself and duly apply mouth to mouth, he will not rise again.» If an Elisha does not come today, and with compassion take our sins from us, the church will not regain the cross it has lost. *Ref.* May God rise up! 4. May he come to assist those in this army whom he has marked with the sign of the cross with which he redeemed us. The time for forgiveness will soon be here when salvation can be won by everyone who takes up the cross. Now let each reflect on what he has done, with what acts – and how many – he has offended God. If he reflects on this and takes the cross, he will be freed from these sins. *Ref.* May God rise up! 5. He has risen up! We too are now bound to rise up for him in haste and hurry to his assistance. He chose to destroy Jerusalem so that by undertaking this task, we could wash away our sins; for if he so wished, he could quickly destroy the enemy without our help and set the land free, for nothing can stand up to him. *Ref.* May God rise up!

48a

«Hœrstu, friunt, den wahter, an der zinne,
wes sîn sanc verjach?
wir müezen uns scheiden nû, lieber man.
alsô schiet dîn lîp nû jungest hinnen,
5 *dô der tac ûf brach*
unde uns diu naht sô flühteclîchen tran.
naht gît senfte, wê tuot tac.
owê, herze liep, in mac
dîn nû verbergen niht.
10 *uns nimet diu freude gar daz grâwe lieht.*
stant ûf, riter!»[38]

The poem is also unique in that it is the only instance outside of the love poems where a German stanza rounds off the Latin stanzas. It is taken from an alba or *Tagelied* (dawn song) by Otto von Botenlauben, in which the woman urges her lover to leave, for the dawn is breaking. One might have expected it to be added to a love poem but it is correctly placed here, for it has the same highly unusual rhythmic pattern as the Latin poem and a similarly worded (and dramatically short) refrain. One poem must be a *contrafactum* of the other. Usually in such cases, the Latin is judged to be the original, but in this case, experts consider the German to be the original and the Latin the *contrafactum.*[39] The recurring theme of the rather strange second and third stanzas, whose allegorical language makes them rather cryptic, is the loss of the

[38] Traill, Carmina (note 37) 170–173. 48a «Do you hear, my friend, the watchman on the battlement? Do you hear what his song proclaimed? We must part now, dear man. Just so, not long ago, you left this place when day broke and the night slipped away from us like a fugitive. The night brings comfort, the day brings sorrow. Ah! my heart's true love, I can no longer hide you. The gray light robs us of all our joy. Rise up, my knight»!
I am indebted to James A. Schultz, Professor emeritus of the University of California, Los Angeles, for the editing and translation of the Middle High German.

[39] This view, first put forward by Bruce A. Beatie, *Carmina Burana* 48–48a: A Case of «Irregular Contrafacture», in: Modern Language Notes 80 (1965) 470–78, seems to have gained wide acceptance; see Vollmann (note 27) 988. One difficulty for this view is that the opening lines of CB 48 have suggested to many, including myself, a date shortly after the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin in 1187 and it seems unlikely that Otto's poem could have been written before then, as Burghart Wachinger, Deutsche Lyrik des späten Mittelalters, Frankfurt am Main 2006, 634 rightly observes. However, CB 48, as Wachinger points out, could have been written in 1197 or even later. Most scholars consider the influence of Wolfram von Eschenbach on Otto unmistakable, for Wolfram is credited with introducing the subgenre of the alba to German *Minnesang*. The period of Wolfram's literary activity is usually dated ca. 1200–1220; so Ingrid Kasten, ed., Deutsche Lyrik des frühen und hohen Mittelalter, Frankfurt am Main 2005, 1051. The fact that the opening lines of CB 48 seem inspired by the opening of CB 47 suggests that they may have been written about the time of the compilation of the *Carmina Burana*, possibly by one of the scribes, though, if so, the mutilated state of the Latin text is rather surprising.

true cross, which the crusaders incurred at the battle of the Horns of Hattin in July, 1187.[40] In Otto's life crusading and love were inextricably linked.

Born into the noble family of Henneberg, Otto joined the German Crusade of 1197, probably aged around twenty.[41] Like Berthold he was a younger son who could not expect to inherit as much as his two elder brothers and so he would be expected to look for a rich heiress to marry. In Acre he wooed Beatrix de Courtenay, the daughter of Joscelin III (1159 till after 1190), titular count of Edessa, whose family had been driven out of Edessa by Turkish Muslims. Joscelin had considerable land-holdings north of Acre and was the seneschal (treasurer) for the Kingdom of Jerusalem.[42] Since Joscelin had arranged that Beatrix should marry into the royal family (the Lusignans), Otto could not marry her until after Joscelin's death (ca. 1197). The year of their marriage is unknown but it must have been before 1206.[43] In 1220 Otto sold the estates his wife had inherited from her father and returned with her to Germany, where he reconstructed the Henneberg castle of Botenlauben, near Bad Kissingen.[44]

We know next to nothing about Berthold's participation in the Fifth Crusade apart from the dates of his setting out (1218) and his return (1220). However, given the recently discovered letter of John of Brienne, king of Jerusalem and leader of the ill-fated crusade, to Frederick II, which reads like the report of a commanding officer to his superior, it seems more than likely that Berthold would have aligned himself with John and returned with him to Acre in early 1220 in the wake of the leadership quarrels after the capture of Damietta.[45] If Berthold had never met Otto before, he would almost certainly have met him in 1220 in Acre since both were leading members of the German nobility in a city-state run by French nobility. Moreover, Otto's mother, Sophie, was a daughter of the noble family of Andechs, whose castle at Ambras, as indicated above, lay within the Brixen diocese, just outside of Innsbruck. Since we know that both Otto (with his wife Beatrix) and Berthold returned home in 1220, it seems quite likely that they would have done so together. The Brenner Pass provided the easiest route to the Henneberg possessions further north. Otto and Beatrix would probably have stopped at both Brixen and Ambras on their way to Henneberg castle

[40] The third stanza probably also alludes allegorically to the loss of Jerusalem in October 1187.

[41] Peter Weidisch, Otto von Botenlauben: Minnesänger, Kreuzfahrer, Klostergründer, eine biographische Analyse in: Otto von Botenlauben: Minnesänger, Kreuzfahrer, Klostergründer, ed. Peter Weidisch, Würzburg 1994, 17–51, here 24.

[42] Acre was the de facto capital of the Kingdom of Jerusalem after the fall of Jerusalem itself in 1187.

[43] Weidisch (note 41) 27.

[44] Weidisch (note 41) 30. For a detailed account of the reconstruction see J. Wabra, Zur Baugeschichte der Burg Botenlaube, in: Weidisch (note 41) 309–49.

[45] The letter survives in two manuscripts in Paris and Innsbruck. For the Paris text and translation, see Guy Perry, John of Brienne, Cambridge 2013, 198–200. For a critical edition, see Josef Riedmann, Die Innsbrucker Briefsammlung, MGH, Briefe des späteren Mittelalters, vol. 3, Wiesbaden 2017, 55–56.

(near Meiningen, Thuringia) and ultimately to Botenlauben (near Bad Kissingen). It is conceivable then that, as a compliment to Otto, Berthold had someone compose a crusading poem in the same rhythm and sung to the same melody as Otto's Tagelied, the second stanza of which becomes the final added stanza in German.

To conclude, I believe it very likely that it was Berthold who commissioned the Codex Buranus, most probably for his own personal use. His early death in 1224 accounts for the failure of the manuscript to go to its intended owner and allowed for the addition of CB 1*–26*. The culminating item of the project, the rather bizarre play about the power of Christianity over the pagan gods of Egypt, celebrates a victory that the Fifth Crusade, in which he participated, signally failed to achieve. The inclusion of poems 133 and 134 listing the names of birds and wild animals is best explained perhaps as intended to evoke pleasant memories of childhood. The anomaly of CB 48 as the only poem outside of the love poems with an added German stanza suggests 48/48a had special significance for Berthold, perhaps evoking happier memories of the crusade related to friendships he made in Acre by commemorating, in Minnesang terms, the relationship between Otto and Beatrix before their marriage. While much of this can rightly be called mere speculation, I doubt that unless some hard evidence unexpectedly emerges, we are likely to fix on a more probable scriptorium for the Codex Buranus than Neustift or a more probable candidate for commissioning than Berthold von Neuffen.