UC Berkeley

Title

Between Languages: Interlingual Retextualization Between Latin and the Medieval German Vernaculars

Permalink

Author

Kirk, Louisa Helen

Publication Date

2023

Between Languages:
Interlingual Retextualization Between Latin and the Medieval German Vernaculars

By

Louisa H. Kirk

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Comparative Literature

&

Medieval Studies

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Niklaus Largier, Chair
Professor Jonas Wellendorf
Professor Winfried Kudszus

Summer 2023

Abstract

Between Languages:
Interlingual Retextualization Between Latin and the Medieval German Vernaculars

By

Louisa H. Kirk

Doctor of Philosophy in Comparative Literature & Medieval Studies

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Niklaus Largier, Chair

Scholarship in the field of Medieval Studies on the topic of translation between Latin and the vernacular languages has, in general, been plagued by certain overarching narratives and biases. More specifically, at a macro level, translation in the Middle Ages has often been viewed in terms of a cultural struggle between Latin and vernacular literary cultures and thus reifies existing assumptions about the nature of the relationship between Latin and the vernacular languages as one that is fundamentally antagonistic and competitive. The overreliance on such narratives, in turn, has lead to an overemphasis on the role of rhetoric in structuring specific translations (to the exclusion of other areas of Medieval academic thought) and further fails to adequately account for medieval texts that present themselves as translations of a particular source text but that nevertheless do not pursue faithfulness to the same degree as modern translations.

Rather than offering an overarching theory about the nature of translation in the Middle Ages, the present study seeks to reexamine and ultimately deconstruct the existing scholarly narratives on the topic of medieval translation and ultimately does so via the expansion of the discussion from simply "translation" to the somewhat broader semantic field of "retextualization," which allows for the incorporation of works that are difficult to encompass within the traditional paradigm. By exploring three specific moments of medieval retextualization—Notker's 10th-11th century Old High German translation of traditional Latin school texts (including of the Latin translation of Boethius and Aristotle), the macaronic Latin-Middle High German compositions within the 13th century *Carmina Burana*, and finally, the 13th century Latin and 14th century Middle High German translations of Mechthild's originally Low German *Fliessendes Licht der Gottheit*—the current study applies a discourse-analytic approach that examines the specific texts both in close dialogue with each other as well as in terms of the larger cultural and literary discourses with which each retextualization engages.

Table of Contents

Contents

1. Introduction: Unfaithful Translations in the Middle Ages

From the perspective of translators for much of the modern era, the desire for faithfulness in a translation has largely been a given.[1] This emphasis on the need for fidelity—as well as the fundamental impossibility of achieving perfect equivalence in translation—is evident in the various quips one often hears about the function and limitations of the translator: from the Italian saying *traddutore, traditore* (translator, traitor) to the old adage that translated texts, like women, can either be beautiful or faithful but never both. Much, of course, has been made of what exactly "faithfulness" and "fidelity" might actually refer to in a translation and how translators might best pursue these ideals in practice. Traditionally, the problem of faithfulness in translation has been phrased as a question of whether a good translator ought to stay closer to the literal wording of the original text or the general sense behind it. Other scholars of translation, following the lead of Eugene Nida's work on Biblical translation, have instead relied on a number of not entirely distinct formulations of the same question. Here, the traditional categories of "word-for-word" and "sense-for-sense" translations are superficially done away with and translations are instead categorized by their "formal" or "dynamic equivalence," which seek to describe translations in terms of their prioritization of either structural principles or emotional effects. Even Venuti's polarizing *Translator's Invisibility* does not so much do away with the desire for faithful translations as it renegotiates what it means to be faithful, rejecting the pursuit of fluent, easily readable translations, which he claims have come to dominate the American publishing world, in favor of translations that faithfully acknowledge the source text as the product of a foreign culture. Regardless of what particular terms are used to describe the different theoretical frames, behind the vast majority of these schemata stands an assumption that the translator is seeking to produce a translation that is, in some framework at least, faithful to the original work.

Not so, it would seem, in the Middle Ages, despite the fact that the idea of fidelity in translation was not a completely unfamiliar notion. The concepts of "word-for-word" and "sense-for-sense" translations, having their origins already in the Classical period, were admittedly familiar to scholars and writers in the Middle Ages, but this is only to say that a concept of "faithfulness" existed and had some relevance to medieval translators, not that fidelity—at least, not the modern understanding of it—was the primary valuation system by which translations were judged. Certain Classical remarks on the merits of sense-for-sense over word-for-word translations—Cicero's claim in *De optimo genere oratorum*, for example, that he translates not word-for-word ("non verbum pro verbo*")* but preserves instead the general force of the source text (5.14-15) or Horace's warning against the faithful interpreter (*fidus interpres*) who, in translating too literally, fails to mark out any space for his or her own creative productions (*Ars Poetica* 133-134)—were well-enough known to be referenced fairly frequently

---

[1] The characterization here is not meant to negate or ignore the more recent work done in the field of Translation Studies to move away from the reliance on notions of fidelity in discussions of translation but rather is intended to emphasizes the extent of the difference between traditional translation theory and medieval practices of translation. To be sure, beginning with the work of Walter Benjamin—who argues in the "Translator's Task" that "no translation would be possible if, in accord with its ultimate essence, it were to strive for similarity to the original" (77) and thus largely strives to divorce translation from fidelity altogether—various scholars have indeed pushed back against the overwhelming focus on fidelity in translation and sought other models for conceptualizing the field. Such non-fidelity focused models (particularly those that focus on the cultural and discursive aspects of translation) are indeed crucial to my own work here in the present study.

in medieval discussions of translation as touchstones for certain goals and strategies of translation.[2] There were, moreover, special cases of medieval translation—notably the translation of sacred texts such as the Scriptures—in which the demand for a more recognizable conception of faithfulness in translation was much stronger and less creative license was allowed to translators.

In practice, however, as the manuscript evidence clearly attests, medieval translators often took great liberties in their re-creations of the source texts they were working with (e.g. mixing the source text and secondary commentaries, altering crucial sentences, rearranging, splicing together, or fully omitting passages, or even adding in new material altogether). In Notker the German's late-10th century translations of various Latin school texts, for example, the text alternates between lines of the original Latin texts and Notker's Old High German paraphrases, with additional and otherwise undistinguished commentary and clarifications. Alongside these sometimes lengthy excurses, numerous words and phrases in the vernacular commentary are not given a vernacular equivalent but are simply left untranslated in the original Latin. Notker's translation is hardly an outlier among medieval translations in terms of the liberties it takes with the original text. Sometimes, medieval translators—here we might take the Latin translation of Mechthild's *Fliessende Licht* as an example—are content to rearrange the source text, intersplice it with new material or material from other sources, or to omit passages entirely. Ultimately, it seems that the notion of fidelity—or at least the modern understanding of it—is hardly the only mechanic at play in medieval conceptualizations and practices of translation.

Indeed, modern scholars of medieval literature often have even called into question the legitimacy of applying the term "translation" both with respect to particular texts and to medieval literature more generally, demonstrating the extent to which medieval translators transformed their source texts via translation. Siegfried Ringler, for example, in his study of the Middle High German version of Gertrud the Great's *Legatus Memorialis Abundantiae Divinae Pietatis*, writes that, despite the literal exactness of the translation at the sentence level, the text should nevertheless be considered a "Bearbeitung" (edition or adaptation) rather than a translation in a strict sense ("Übersetzung") due to the significant changes in order and content made by the translator ("Die Rezeption Gertruds von Helfta" 144). Joachim Bumke has—in contrast, yet to similar effect—critiqued the relevance of such categorical distinctions more generally, at least in the realm of courtly epics, arguing that it is "kaum sinnvoll, zwischen Übersetzung und Bearbeitung zu unterscheiden" (13). Finally, Franz Josef Worstbrock asserts that a conception of systematic translation ("methodische Übersetzung" [130]) did not develop until the Early Modern period and suggests *Wiedererzählen* (retelling) as a more accurate way to discuss the practices of textual adaptation in the medieval period. Regardless of which term one ultimately settles on to refer to medieval practices of interlingual retextualization, this critical uncertainty in scholarship about the usefulness and validity of employing the term *translation* within a medieval context clearly evidences the extent to which medieval translations diverge from a modern sense of the term. Moreover, the scholarly discourse on Medieval translation, particular between Latin and the Medieval vernaculars, further demonstrates the field's failure to catch up with more recent models of translation emerging in the field of translation theory—namely, the

---

[2] Jerome, for instance, had repeated Cicero's distinction between sense-for-sense and word-for-word translations of the bible (Letter 57 "Ad Pammachium" in Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 22.568-579), while John Scotus Eriugena, writing in the ninth century in his prologue to his translation of the Pseudo-Dionysius' *De caelesti hierarchia*, apologetically likens himself to Homer's "faithful translator" (Migne, *PL* 122.1032).

more recent cultural and discursive models of translation—and to fully divorce the idea of translation from traditional concepts of faithfulness.

These unfaithful translations of the Middle Ages, then, stand as both an opportunity as well as a challenge for scholars of the medieval period. On the one hand, retextualization—that is, the recomposition of an existing text (pre-text) in a new form or context (re-text)[3]—was, perhaps, the dominant form of literary production during the Medieval period. From the production of commentaries (and commentaries on commentaries) to influential Classical and Christian texts down to a university student's own individual re-copying of the major school texts, the vast majority of literary activity in the Middle Ages can legitimately be described as some sort of process of rewriting or retextualization. [4] Translation proper—in a very wide sense of interlingual rextextualizations, encompassing everything from very literal interlinear translations to looser adaptations or even entirely new works based on or inspired by existing literary material in another language—is, admittedly, only a small segment of this larger category of retextualization but still a major type of literary production during the time period. On the other hand, however, in practice, scholarship on medieval translation—particularly with respect to translations between Latin and the European vernacular languages—has often, for reasons discussed in the following section, lagged behind the field of translation studies more generally. More specifically, although, in more recent years, modern translation theory has increasingly moved away from such fidelity-based models of translation and towards a greater interest in the cultural and discursive aspects of translation,[5] such change has been slower to take hold in the realm of medieval studies, particularly in the study of translation between Latin and the vernacular languages.

This discrepancy is likely due, at least in part, to the current institutional structure in which medieval literature is often studied—that is, one in which the study of Latin is disconnected from the study of both medieval vernaculars as well as modern languages and literatures—conditions which also likely gave rise to certain persistent stereotypes about the nature of the Latin-vernacular relationship in the Middle Ages. As a result of these conditions, rather than attempting to integrate modern translation theory with the study of medieval translations, many studies of translation in the Middle Ages instead continue to assess medieval translations either in anachronistic terms of faithfulness to the source text—which end up

---

[3] For more on the term *retextualization* and its application to the field of Medieval literature, see Joakim Bumke and Ursula Peters (eds.), "Retextualisierung in der mittelalterlichen Literatur", particularly the essays by Bumke (6-46) and Holznagel (47-81).

[4] These processes, admittedly, would all likely have been categorized under different terms by the medieval individuals who composed and read such texts, as Joakim Bumke points out in his introduction to the subject of medieval retextualizations (1). Nevertheless, however, he recommends *retextualization*—which he describes as a "generelle und neutral Begriff…, der die versiedensten Ebenen und Aspekte vormoderner ‚Arbeit am Text' als eine Interaktion von Prä- und Re-Text faßt"—as a useful starting-point for studies that engage with "mittelalterlichen LIteratur als einer kontinuierlichen Umschreibpraxis" (2).

[5] For more on these approaches, see the essays collected within Susan Bassnett's and André Lefevere's (editors) *Translation, History, and Culture*. In such studies, as the editors describe it in their introduction to the collection, rather than studying translated texts in strict comparison with their source-text counterparts, instead "what is studied is text embedded within its network of both source and target cultural signs (12). Within the field of medieval translation, these models have indeed made some headway. Here we might think of Sif Rikhardsdottir's study of the translation of French and English texts into Old Norse (*Medieval Translations and Cultural Discourse*). However, as the previous example suggests, the interest in these models has largely been applied in vernacular-vernacular context, with the field of Latin-vernacular translation still lagging somewhat behind.

reifying pre-existing assumptions about the relationship between Latin and vernacular, medieval and modern—or in the narrowly insular rhetorical terms (particularly *amplificatio* and *abbrevatio*) that medieval scholars themselves used to categorize and describe their own practices of retextualization. Although rhetorical concerns certainly structure medieval translations to some degree, an exclusive focus on such factors inevitably ignores the larger cultural or institutional factors at play in the construction of the translated text, and these studies, too, often rely on certain outdated and problematic assumptions about the nature of the relationship between Latin and the vernacular.

1.1: The Disciplinary Divide: The Place of Medieval Literature in the Modern University

Already in 1948, in his seminal *Europäische Literatur und Lateinisches Mittelalter*, E.R. Curtius was lamenting that the "division of European literature among a number of unconnected philologies" prevented the study of European literature as any sort of unified whole (12).[6] This partitioning of the field of philology into many sub-fields structured primarily in terms of national languages and literary traditions has had and continues to have particularly profound effects on the study of the Middle Ages, namely that the study of medieval Latin literature has often been cordoned off into Classics departments, where it remains largely isolated from engagement with the vernacular languages, both modern and medieval. As a result of these divisions, as Curtius puts it,

"The medieval Latinists, the historians of Scholasticism, and the political historians, however, have little contact with one another. The same is true of the modern philologists. These also work on the Middle Ages, but they usually remain as aloof from medieval Latin philology as they do from general literary, political, and cultural history. Thus the Middle Ages is dismembered into specialties which have no contact" (13).[7]

Some fifty years later, the situation Curtius describes likely doesn't sound too foreign to scholars of the medieval period, who often find themselves working as much in other departments as they do their own. Curtius' writings, of course, did much to draw attention to the problems that arise from such an institutional structure, and individual scholars and universities alike have—at the individual level, by practicing more interdisciplinary approaches, and, at the institutional level, by encouraging the pursuit of more interdisciplinary and comparative approaches to medieval literature—made much progress in remedying this regrettable state of affairs since that point, to be sure.

Still today, however, more often than not, medieval Latin literature is studied in less than ideal conditions, often isolated at the fringes of another departments (Classics, for example, or national languages) or in departments with less literary interests (e.g. history or religion), and, as such, the continuing linguistic isolation of Latin from the vernacular languages in the context of the modern university fundamentally misrepresents the position of Latin in the medieval world David Townsend, in a discussion of the major questions and issues in the field of medieval Latin literature, describes, for example, the continuing ramifications of this same institutional structure that Curtius had first critiqued, arguing that the:

---

[6] In the original, Curtius writes of the "Die Aufteilung der europäischen Literatur unter eine Anzahl unverbundener Philologien" (22). For the English translations, I have depended on Willard R. Trask's translation of the text.

[7] In the original: "Die Mittellateiner, der Historiker der Scholastik und die politischen Historiker haben aber untereinander wenig Berührung. Dasselbe gilt von den neueren Philologien. Diese bearbeiten auch das Mittelalter, halten sich aber von der mittellateinischen Philologie meistens ebenso fern wie von der allgemeinen Literatur- politischen und Kulturgeschichte. So ist das Mittelalter zerstückelt in Spezialfächer, die ohne Fühlung bleiben" (23).

"hiving off of the field [of medieval Latin] from more diachronically engaged conversation within traditional disciplines enabled the unchallenged subdivision of vernacular medievalism within the MLA along lines of national literatures, thus obscuring the pre-national continua of most medieval literary production" (4).[8] Townsend's acknowledgment here of this "pre-national continua" highlights the extent of the discrepancy between the way medieval Latin is studied in the modern university setting and the way it actually existed in the world, that is, in close contact with the European vernaculars. In practice, the opposition of Latin and German was never as clearly cut within the Middle Ages as it has been made out to be in subsequent scholarship. The medieval situation was, in fact, characterized by a state of *diglossia*, in which speakers of Latin and speakers of the vernacular German not only existed side-by-side but were often the very same individuals. To be sure, Latin speakers were only a small segment of the general population, and it's use would have been heavily associated with particular cultural spheres and institutions, but it nevertheless remains true that there was, at the very least, no Latin speaker who was not also a speaker of a vernacular language. Though scholars debate the exact point at which the Romance vernaculars meaningfully diverged from Latin, still it is widely agreed that already by the eighth century, Latin was nobody's mother tongue, nobody's native language.[9] As such, in a disciplinary context based on the concept of national languages and literatures, medieval Latin, by definition, does not fit in.

Although this separation of the field of Latin literature from the study of other literatures may not, at first, appear so pernicious, both aspects of it—that is, both the linguistic and diachronic components—create certain problems for the study of medieval literature. On the linguistic side, the separation of Latin from the vernacular in the context of university departments is often reified in scholarship in the form of relying on the assumption of a strict binary opposition and separation between Latin and the vernaculars, which, as previously noted, does not accurately reflect the extent of the overlap between the two spheres in the Middle Ages, preferring instead narratives of rivalry and competition. However, this annexing of Latin into Classics departments also entailed a diachronic separation of Latin from modern literary theory or, as Townsend puts it, a "liberation from the demands of immediately engaged response to a larger academic community" (5). The field of medieval Latin, as a result of this freedom, still lags somewhat behind its vernacular counterparts in the application of emerging trends in literary theory and instead approaches tend to remain more firmly rooted in traditional philological practices and interests (such as the construction of critical editions and questions of origin, provenance, dating, etc). Although such deeply philological studies have laid the foundation for richly detailed accounts of Latin intellectual culture and history, still there remains a general reluctance in scholarship to acknowledge the extent of the genuine intellectual engagement between Latin and vernacular literary cultures in the Middle Ages.

---

[8] In the opening chapter of the *Oxford Handbook of Medieval Latin Literature* (p. 3-24), David Townsend provides a detailed assessment of the history and present state of the field of medieval Latin, further suggesting certain areas in which the field could improve in order to maintain the relevance of the field in modern universities. One of these areas he singles out is, in fact, translation. More specifically, he calls for "a rigorous critique of the binary by which Latinity and vernacularity are articulated as a stable and mutually exclusive opposition—a critique that…must engage postmodern translation theory on issues of intertextual and interlinguistic exchange and the cultural work effected by the act of translation" (9).

[9] For more on the topic of when precisely Latin and the Romance vernaculars became mutually unintelligible languages, see Carin Ruff's "Latin as an Acquired Language" in the *Oxford Handbook of Medieval Latin Literature*.

Consider, for example, the scholarship on the macaronic poems of the *Carmina Burana* (Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek Clm 4660), which combine Latin and Middle High German verses into a single text. For much of the history of scholarship on the codex, the discussion centered on the question of origin—that is, of determining whether the Latin or German portions existed first[10]—to the exclusion of literary concerns. Although more recently, the function of the mixing of languages has been addressed, still today, the poems are almost never read as integrated literary productions in and of themselves, despite the fact that the manuscript itself makes no visual distinction or division between the two portions. Instead, scholars routinely overemphasize the distinction between the Latin and German portions of the poem and read the German verses that conclude these poems as mere citations, showing either the inspiration for the Latin poems or indicating some sort of formal or melodic similarity. According to Burghart Wachinger, for example, "die Vorbilder blieben in der Überlieferung zitathaft mit den Kotrafakturen verbunden" (99). Frequently, editions and translations of the text—seemingly ignoring the material evidence that the two parts could and perhaps should be read as one whole—present the German and Latin portions as two distinct poems or include only the Latin portion, discounting the vernacular portions entirely.[11] Such editorial decisions can be seen both in relation to philology's traditional emphasis of the pursuit of a supposedly authoritative text as well as to the general failure in medieval Latin scholarship to reckon seriously with the engagement between Latin and vernacular literary cultures.

Moreover, when scholars of medieval Latin literature do directly address the relationship of Latin and vernacular literature, they often rely on the assumption of a clear binary distinction and opposition between Latin and the vernacular and explain the relationship in terms of the cultural hierarchies and power dynamics at play, generally to the disadvantage of the vernacular. Again, scholarship on the *Carmina Burana* stands as a good example. Here, the biases of scholars against the vernacular are often quite apparent in their approaches to the poems, frequently reinforcing an understanding of the relationship between Latin and the German as both hierarchical and fundamentally separate. Consider, for example, Wachinger's claim that the difference between Latin and the vernacular was greater than that between two vernaculars ("…der Unterschied zwischen diesen Sprachen impliziert, wohl noch mehr als der zwischen verschiedenen Volkssprachen, eine Fülle von sozialen Barrieren, Gegensätze der Lebensform und des kulturellen Bewußtseins," 97), despite the fact that people who spoke Latin necessarily also spoke a vernacular, or his description of the "archaischen Primitivität" [archaic primitivity] of the German strophes (113). Similarly, Jeffrey Ashcroft's study of the Reinmar poems in the collection—one of the few literary approaches to the Carmina Burana's macaronic poetry—concludes that in "reclothing Reinmar's exemplary demonstration of proper love in a Latin idiom, the clerical poet implicitly asserts the superiority of Latin culture, unmasks the Minnesänger as the exponent of an upstart lay vernacular art" ("Venus Clerk" 628). Such approaches to medieval translations depend on and thus work to reify existing biases in scholarship that paint the vernacular as both entirely separate from and also somehow less than Latin.

The artificial scholarly separation of Latin from the other medieval vernaculars has had a different but related set of effects on the perception of Latin from the perspective of scholars of

---

[10] For examples from both sides of the debate, see Olive Sayce's argument in *The Medieval German Lyric, 1150-1300* p. 234-264 and Burghart Wachinger's "Deutsche und lateinische Liebeslieder," especially p. 98-100, which also provides a more extensive bibliography on the topic.

[11] See, respectively, Hilka and Schumann's edition of the text and P. G. Walsh's *Love Lyrics in the Carmina Burana*.

vernacular literature in departments of national literatures, though to be sure, not all of the results of the disintegration of philology into national literatures were negative. Unlike with medieval Latin, the study of the medieval vernaculars, which was more readily compatible with the ideology of and work being done in departments of modern languages and literatures, experienced far more productive intercourse with developments in literary theory. In general, scholars engaged in the study of the medieval vernaculars have been more receptive to the agendas and methodologies of such intellectual trends as New Philology and New Historicism than their counterparts studying medieval Latin. Indeed, the move away from the Old Philological ideology that stressed the construction of critical editions originated in the context of departments of national languages and literatures, most notably in departments of French literature, where medievalists (Paul Zumthor and Bernard Cerquiglini, for example) were productively influenced by the post-structuralist thought of their modernist colleagues. These variant-focused approaches to medieval literature—which sought to read each different version of the text in relation to their own specific cultural and material context, rather than to reconstruct a supposedly original text as traditional philology had done—were later formalized under the heading of New Philology, again largely in the work of scholars of medieval vernaculars. In the 1990 edition of *Speculum*—dedicated to this then emerging methodology— not one of the six contributors (Stephen G. Nichols, Siegfried Wenzel, Suzanne Fleischman, R. Howard Bloch, Gabrielle M. Spiegel, and Lee Patterson) was a specialist of Latin literature but were instead focused primarily on vernacular texts, and most were members of departments of national literatures.[12] Ultimately, the productive intellectual exchange within such departments between scholars of medieval literature and their more modern-focused counterparts is easy to see.

That said, not all of the effects of an institutional structure based on an idea of national languages have been equally positive. In the context of national literature departments, the study of medieval Latin is often granted only the ancillary role of serving and facilitating a deeper study of a particular vernacular literature. In such situations, a basic proficiency in Latin is treated as a necessary tool that allows claims about vernacular literature to be grounded in Latin discourse. The relegation of Latin to Classics departments coupled with the general institutional separation between Latin and the vernaculars has led to the development of certain misconceptions about Latin as a linguistic phenomenon, most conspicuously the portrayal of Latin as a monolithic and fundamentally conservative linguistic force that shows little temporal, regional, or individual variation. Viewing medieval Latin through this lens is problematic in that, in the service of an overarching narrative, it irons out all of the individual variation that would help deconstruct or, at the very least, nuance this narrative. Moreover, just as on the Latin side of things, there exists similar tendency among scholars of the medieval vernaculars to overemphasize the separation between Latin and the vernacular, which again leads to persistent narratives of hostility and rivalry between the two linguistic spheres.

Both of these common biases in the way Latin as a language is represented in vernacular scholarship—that is, the tendencies to portray Latin as a monolith or solely in terms of its opposition to the vernacular—are readily apparent in the scholarship on the *Lux Divinitatis,* that is, the Latin translation of Mechthild's *Fliessendes Licht*. Germanist Gisela Vollmann-Profe's study, for example, reads the tendency in the *Lux Divinitatis* towards objectification and

---

[12] Scholars of Latin literature, in contrast, have occasionally even questioned the relevance of New Philological practice to their area of study, given the supposed stability of Latin literary culture. See, for example, Haijo J. Westra's article "New Philology and the Editing of Medieval Latin Texts."

universalizing as a sort of backlash against the subjective, individualized nature of Mechthild's original account,[13] further asserting that "in der Übersetzung gerade das Eigentümliche des FL, seine Individualität, verlorenging" (153).[14] In other words, then, Vollmann-Profe presents the Latin translation as a reaction against the perceived threat of Mechthild's innovative vernacular style to the literary and cultural hegemony of Latin. Susanne Köbele makes this relationship of antagonism, rivalry, and control between Latin and the vernacular explicit, claiming, "Die Argumentation aus der Feder des Klerikers ist nicht zuletzt gegen die Volksprachlichkeit des Werkes gerichtet" (38).[15] The Latin translation, according to her, is an attempt to return (*zurückholen*) Mechthild's work to the hermetic exclusivity of the Latin ("die hermetische Exklusivität des Lateinischen") that does away with the innovative aspects of Mechthild's thought and language ("löste…das Innovative der Denk- und Sprachgestalt des 'Fließenden Lichts' auf"). Both Vollmann-Profe and Köbele, then—in ways that are typical both of scholarship on the FL and of scholarship on the relationship of Latin and the German vernaculars more generally—represent the Latin translation of Mechthild's writings as a reaction against some type of literary or spiritual innovation in the vernacular and, in turn, as an attempt to control or limit vernacular literary expression.

Thus, although scholars on both sides of the linguistic debate have often addressed the topic of the relationship between vernacular and Latin literature and culture in the Middle Ages, the distinct disciplinary histories and institutional contexts of the two fields ultimately result in one-sided approaches and answers. As a result, there exists a need to move away from, on the one hand, the resistance of the discipline of medieval Latin to modern critical approaches and, on the other hand, the tendency on the vernacular side to treat Latin literature as a site of uniform, largely unvaried discourse. From both sides of the institutional divide, moreover, there has been a tendency to understand the Latin-vernacular relationship through metaphors of general cultural domination, opposition, and control that thus downplays the extent to which Latin and the vernacular languages often co-existed in a shared intellectual space and overlooks more specific institutional and cultural dynamics at play.

1.2: Discourse-Analysis: An Alternative to Rhetorical and Hermeneutic Approaches to Medieval Translation

Within this disciplinary context, a study of the theory and practice of translation in the Middle Ages would seem to stand as a natural arena in which one might push back against such narratives of hierarchy and opposition between Latin literary culture and the emerging literary cultures of the vernacular languages, in that translations naturally stand at the intersection of two languages or linguistic cultures. However, although a study of medieval translation theory and practice thus offers scholars a vantage point from which the relationship between Latin and the

---

[13] In "Mechthild von Magdeburg—Deutsch und Lateinisch," Vollmann-Profe writes that "was aus literarhistorischer Sicht als Verzicht auf die 'modernen' Elemente des Werkes erscheint, dürfte aus der Sicht des Theologen ein Heimholen ins Traditionelle in einer noch tieferen Weise bedeutet haben, ein Zurückdrängen dessen, was im FL als bedenklich, ja gefährlich angesehen werden konnte" (154). (In English: …what appears from a literary-historical perspective as the abandonment of the "modern" elements of the work, from the view of the theologians might in a still deeper way have meant a home-coming into the traditional, a pushing back against whatever in the FL that could be seen as questionable or even dangerous.)

[14] In English: "in the translation, it is precisely the most characteristic aspects of the FL, it's individuality, that go missing".

[15] In English: The argumentation from the quill of the cleric is directed not least against the vernacularity of the work.

vernacular languages might be re-theorized apart from the standard antagonistic narrative, similar sorts of issues plague not only studies of specific Medieval translations but also in more general studies of translation—or of the wider category of retextualization—in the Middle Ages. More specifically, like the studies of specific medieval translations that we have seen so far as examples of the state of the field of Medieval Studies more generally, studies that seek to offer an overarching theory of translation in the Medieval period tend to focus on traditional philological concerns to the exclusion of other concerns and to take the narrative of conflict and contention between Latin and the European vernaculars for granted, rather than seeking, if not to fully deconstruct it, then at least to complicate our understanding of the linguistic and cultural dynamics at play in medieval translations.

      The field of Medieval studies' continuing focus on traditional philological approaches and question, for example, is easily recognizable within the scholarly discourse around medieval retextualizations, where most approaches have focused more on the application of rhetorical strategies to the exclusion of other literary and historical concerns. Frank Bezner, in "Zwischen 'Sinnlosigkeit' und 'Sinnhaftigkeit: Figurationen der Retextualisierung in der mittelateinischen Literatur," succinctly summarizes the state of the field and its persistent habit of understanding medieval retextualizations through rhetorical categories and techniques:

> "*Amplificatio* and *abbrevatio* bilden—als zwei für die mittelalterliche Poetik grundlegende Verfahren—in nahezu allen einschlägigen Studien den methodischen Angelpunkt, von dem her die Problematik der Umschreibung thematisiert wird; und „rhetorische Bewährung" wird wie selbstverständlich zum entscheidenden Horizont, under den Retextualisierung, Umschreibung, ‚Wiedererzählen' gestellt wird." (206)[16]

In other words, these two rhetorical techniques—that is, *amplificatio and abbrevatio* or, respectively, the rhetorical elaboration or condensing of a particular material or theme—were fundamental concepts frequently referenced in medieval Latin treatises concerning the rules and norms guiding the composition of poetic texts (that is, the "Artes Poetrie"). Modern scholarship, as Bezner argues, has in large part structured its investigation of medieval forms of rewriting and translation through the lens of these rhetorical terms, [17] though the consensus on the interpretive implications of the ubiquity of these techniques has evolved over time. Initially, Bezner notes, scholars tended to view the reliance of medieval writers on these rhetorical approaches as evidencing a Medieval prioritization of the superficial style of a text over its sense and thus as an obstacle to meaningful interpretation. Curtius, for example, asserted that these rhetorical techniques of *amplificatio* and *abbrevatio* underlay the medieval Latin poetic theory concerning

---

[16] In English: "A*mplificatio* and *abbrevatio* represent—as two fundamental techniques in medieval poetics—the methodological angle from which the problematic of rewriting is thematized in almost all relevant studies; and the "rhetorical proving" becomes, as a matter of course, the deciding horizon under which retextualization, rewriting, and 'retelling' are placed."

[17] Bezner takes the approaches of the Germanist Franz J. Worstbrock (especially as evidenced in his "Dilatatio materiae" and "Wiedererzählen und Übersetzen") and Rita Copeland as his primary examples of rhetorically-structured approaches to medieval retextualizations and translations, but the trend of viewing medieval translations through the lens of rhetorical technique extends beyond the German/Latin sphere. Compare Douglas Kelly's approach to translation (exemplified by his articles "*Fidus Interpres*: Aid or Impediment to Medieval Translation and *Translatio*?' and "Translatio Studii: Translation, Adaptation, and Allegory in Medieval French Literature), which similarly locates medieval practices of translation in relation to Classical rhetorical conceptions of the subject but focuses on translative movement between vernacular languages (e.g. German adaptations of French Arthurian material) rather than between Latin and a vernacular. For further examples of a rhetorical approach to medieval translation, see Karen Pratt's article "Medieval attitudes to translation and adaptation."

retextualization, while also disparagingly noting the "absurdity of these excessively generalized precepts" (482).[18] Later, however, the situation was reversed such that a Medieval poet's rhetorical elaboration or contraction of the material was not seen as an interpretive challenge but heralded instead as an "analytischer Königsweg" (Bezner 207), since differences between source and target text inevitably arise during the process of retextualization, which then can be (and have been) mined for interpretive significance by literary scholars. Whether these rhetorical precepts have been seen by scholars as useful or frustrating may indeed have changed over time, but rhetorically structured approaches to medieval translation remain undeniably common in modern scholarly discussions of medieval retextualizations.

Rextextualization is, as previously noted, a more general category than translation proper, but this rhetorically-structured approach is common in studies that focus more explicitly on translation, as well, and is often mobilized in ways that reify the existing scholarly opposition between Latin and German. Consider, for example, Rita Copeland's widely influential work on medieval translation—*Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*—in which she, in her own words, attempts to locate the medieval conception and practice of translation "within a large disciplinary nexus, a historical intersection of hermeneutical practice and rhetorical theory" (1). More specifically, according to Copeland, medieval practices and theories of translation arose out of hermeneutic practices of exegesis and textual commentary and ultimately constitute the means by which the vernacular languages gain access to their own, self-sufficient hermeneutic discourse. For Copeland, translation theory and practice in the Middle Ages can be understood as a medieval re-formation of the classical conception of translation as *translatio studii,* in which Roman writers encouraged the practice of rewriting Greek texts in order to build up their own cultural and literary capital. Copeland seeks to show that "displacement of the source text is a maneuver that medieval hermeneutics takes over from ancient rhetoric, which represents the ideal of oratorical discourse as a form of aggressive rivalry with a source or opponent" (4). Viewed from this perspective, the goal of medieval translation of Latin academic texts into the vernacular is thus understood as a "re-invention" of the source text in order to displace and thereby supplant it, adopting for the vernacular the hermeneutic right to engage directly in academic discourses previously exclusive to Latin. In Copeland's depiction, translation in the Middle Ages thus appears as a direct descendant of Roman rhetoric and further relies on an explicit narrative of binary opposition between Latin and the vernacular. In one sense, then, Copeland's approach can be called innovative in its incorporation of hermeneutics as a new lens through which to view medieval translation, but still it persists with the standard focus on rhetoric in studies of Medieval translation. Ultimately, the focus on the rhetorical techniques of translation to the exclusion of other factors and the persistent narratives of aggression and rivalry between Latin and the German vernacular offers, at best, only an incomplete picture of translation in the Middle Ages.

Bezner's study, however, does not simply point out problematic trends and dynamics within the study of medieval retextualization but further, drawing on the fields of discourse analysis and intellectual history, models a new approach that might help to move beyond the focus on rhetorical techniques and hermeneutics. In the course of the project, Bezner examines

---

[18] The full quote, in the original: "Für die Lateinische Dichtungstheorie um 1200 stellen sich die Dinge also so dar: die Kunst des Dichters hat sich in erster Linie an der rhetorischen Behandlung seines Stoffes zu bewahren; dabei kann er zwischen zwei Verfahren wählen: entweder zieht er die Sache kunstvoll in die Lange oder er macht sie möglichst kurz. Die Sinnlosigkeit dieser so über Gebühr verallgemeinerten Anweisung scheint den Theoretikern nicht ins Bewufitsein getreten zu sein" (482).

two important contexts of medieval Latin retextualization, namely the "Artes Poetrie"—that is, the treatises and schooltexts concerning the proper composition of Latin texts produced during the 12th through 13th century—and hagiographic literature. Crucially, however, Bezner does not simply apply the theoretical understanding presented in the Artes to the hagiographical texts he discusses. Rather, in each case, he attempts to dissect the particular "institutional and epistemic dynamics" (205) that retextualization itself embodies in that context. In the case of the Artes Poetrie, for instance, he maintains that retextualization—which, he notes, the Artes do treat differently than initial in-textualizations of invented material (214)—becomes the "Aspekt, Mittel und Moment des Versuches, eine über die antike Rhetorik hinausgehende Disziplinierung und Ordnung der Sprache…zu implementieren" (218), which is itself made necessary by the epistemic threat presented by the "infinite Intertextualität" of the Middle Ages. On the other hand, Bezner shows, in the case of the hagiographic literature, practices of retextualization depend not so much on epistemological concerns or aesthetic norms but rather on the "kommunikative Dimensionierung der Textualität (und die damit verbundene Aufwertung sprachlicher Rücksichtnahme auf ein Publikum)" (236). Bezner, as previously noted, focuses on intralingual retexualization—that is, Latin rewritings of earlier Latin texts—but many of his critiques of existing scholarship as well as his general approach more generally might productively be applied in interlingual discussions of translation, as well.

1.3: Outline of Dissertation

In the coming chapters, I hope to expand Bezner's approach to medieval practices of retextualization to an interlingual context and apply his discourse-analytic lens to three particular instances of interlingual retextualization between Latin and the German vernacular in the Medieval era: namely, 1) Notker III's Old High German translation of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae,* 2) the German-Latin macaronic poems of the *Carmina Burana*, and finaly 3) the Latin and Middle High German translations of Mechthild von Magdeburg's originally Low German *Das Fliessende Licht der Gottheit*. Although the scope of my project— beginning in the 10th century and ending in the 15th century—thus essentially spans the Medieval period, I do not seek to advance a single, over-arching thesis about medieval translation theory or about the historical development of translation over the course of the Middle Ages.[19] Rather, precisely in order to move away from such all-encompassing narratives—particular those that paint the relationship of Latin and the German vernaculars as fundamentally antagonistic to each other—as well as from the rhetorically-structured approaches, I will approach the three translative moments as embodying particular constellations of Latin and German, which are themselves made up of particular epistemic, institutional, social, and even aesthetic discourses and practices. Beyond locating each moment of translation precisely within its own intellectual

---

[19] Though the practices of translation and retextualization are central to literary production in the Middle Ages, explicit discussion of retextualization or translation is rather rare in Medieval Latin poetic treatises, particularly so if we carefully distinguish between the discussion of initial in-textualizations of a given material and the retextualization of existing texts, as Bezner convincingly argues (214). Moreover, although medieval translators do frequently explicitly discuss their work in introductions and prefatory letters, still their comments tend to focus specifically on exactly that—their own translations, that is, rather than on general principles—without interest in the wider relevance of their remarks, all of which presents a challenge to scholars seeking to develop broadly applicable principles of medieval translation. Medieval translations themselves, as previously noted, vary widely in approach and execution and are far too varied to be meaningfully understood via all-encompassing theoretical precepts or historical narratives that iron out any variation. Thus, although the challenge of such an approach is high, the value is also questionable, at best.

and institutional framework, I hope to investigate the specific function of the translative activity itself within this sphere and, simultaneously, to explore the ways in which our own modern institutional biases and narratives have structured the ways in which these translations have traditionally been read and understood.

Notably, of these three moments of translative activity between Latin and the German vernacular, only one—Notker's translation of Boethius—concerns translative movement *from* Latin *into* the German vernacular; the other three moments of translation that this study concerns itself with all move in the opposite direction, that is, from the vernacular into Latin. Translation in this direction is admittedly far less common in the Middle Ages than is translation into vernaculars from Latin or between vernaculars, but it is both understudied in general and uniquely poised to bring certain questions to light about the purpose and function of translation within certain spheres in the Middle Ages and to thereby complicate the existing narratives of cultural struggle and rivalry between Latin and the vernacular. Namely, when a text is translated from Latin into a vernacular, generally one can assume that the different language of the translated text reflects a largely different audience and likely one that could not read or understand Latin. In Copeland's model of medieval translation, this linguistic shift and the translation's audience's unfamiliarity with the specific text in the original language, is part of translation's project of "displacing the authoritative text" (4). And yet, although the audience of a translation into the vernacular would likely have been individuals who could not read Latin themselves, still they may have been members of the larger "textual community"—in the language of Brian Stock[20]—surrounding the original text. The readers of the translated text, as such, are not encountering the translation in isolation but rather, as part of the wider textual community of the original text, are equipped with a similar interpretive toolkit and framework for understanding the text as the original readers. As we shall see in the first chapter, taking Notker's translations as our primary example, even in the case of vernacular translations of Latin school texts, the translation, thus, figures not as an attempt to supplant the original but as a particular node within a larger discursive network that depends, to varying degrees, on the audience's familiarity with the original.

When, on the other hand, a text is translated into Latin from a vernacular language, these mechanics often appear even more clearly. Though sometimes such a translation may entail a full-scale shift between audiences and textual communities—that is, the audience of the translation has little to no familiarity with the original text beyond the translation itself (we might think of the Latin translation of Mechthild's work as an example)—here again, the significance of the translation often depends precisely on the assumption of its audience's familiarity with the original source material or pre-text. As Franz-Josef Holznagel, in his discussion of contrafacted lyrics and melodies within the corpus of Middle High German *Minnesang*, writes:

> "Bei Retextualisierungen wird immer nur eine Seite eines größeren semiotischen Komplexes dargeboten, die dann von den Rezipienten aufgrund ihres Vorwissens um die jeweils andere ergänzt werden muss, und erst unter dieser Bedingung, dass die Leser oder Hörer Vergangenes und Gegenwärtiges verbinden und Errinnertes und aktuell

---

[20] For more on the concept of textual communities, see *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the 11th and 12th Centuries*, where it generally describe social groups—including fully literate to largely nonliterate individuals—whose lived experience is structured around the interpretation of a given authoritative text, often mediated by an interpreter for the less literate members of the community (90-92). A vernacular translation of an authoritative Latin text might, in that sense, be considered a part of the larger textual community surrounding the original text, even though it's readers may not speak or read the original language.

> Dargebotenes miteinander vergleichen, wird jenes Denken auf zwei Ebenen etabliert, das
> für jede Form von Retextualisierung typisch ist."[21]

This sort of "thinking on two levels" that Holznagel outlines here in the context of intralingual retextualizations is often productive for—sometimes even demanded by—interlingual ones, as well, and such an approach that seeks to dissect the larger discursive network in which a particular translation is embedded can thus ultimately help to deconstruct the conception of medieval translation as a practice of rhetorical oneupsmanship, where the goal would be to supplant and ultimately replace the original text. To the contrary, as we shall see in the case of the *Carmina Burana*, sometimes translation itself works to open a hybrid space between languages and discourses that allows for the negotiation of these discourses in a way unavailable in either the target or source language alone.

Chapter 1 focuses on Notker III's interlingual, Old High German translation-cum-commentary of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, which—along with the other texts Notker translated for his students at the Abbey of St. Gall in the late 10th and early 11th century—is one of the earliest book-length translations into a German vernacular. Though Notker's translations have received much interest for their linguistic contributions to the German language, more literarily-minded approaches to his translations have been less common, and those that do exist frequently rely on the standard rhetorical focus.[22] Via an examination of Notker's translative choices and his own prefatory letter to his translation, I argue that Notker's translations are structured in accordance not primarily with rhetorical principles but rather dialectical ones, choices which stem in turn from his pedagogical agenda, which seeks both to inform students of the content of the translated text even as it improves their own facility in reading Latin. Finally, I will explore how the very need for a translation in the first place—becomes a site of reflection on the nature of the relationship between Notker's era and its Classical ancestors.

In the second chapter, my dissertation turns its focus to the Latin-German macaronic poems of the *Carmina Burana*, which combine Latin and Middle High German verses into a single text. Though some forty percent of the love poetry included in the Codex is macaronic and despite the fact that the manuscript itself makes no visual distinction or division between the two portions, the poems are almost never read as integrated literary productions in and of themselves. Instead, as previously discussed, scholars routinely read the concluding German verses as mere citations, showing a loose vernacular inspiration for the Latin poems or simply indicating a formal or melodic similarity. In contrast, I argue—via a reading of select poems in relation to the original German Minnesangs that inspired them—that the material evidence should be taken at face value. Rather, the poems can, and indeed should be read as just that, a complete poem that stages an intentional, interlingual dialogue with the source text. Ultimately, the macaronic poems retextualizae the original *Minnesang* and thereby create a space in which the compilers of the codex are able to pull together competing literary models of romantic love (including Classical,

---

[21] From ",Habe ime wîs und wort mit mir gemeine...': Retextualisierungen in der deutschsprachigen Lyrik des Mittelalters. Eine Skizze" (52). (In English: With retextualization, only one side of a larger semiotic complex is presented, which then must be augmented by the recipients based on their prior knowledge of the other side, and first under this condition—that the reader or listener connect the past and the present and compare what is remembered with what is currently presented—is each thought established on two levels, which is typical for every type of retextualization.")

[22] See, for example, Copeland's discussion of Notker's approach to translation in Chapter 4 of *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages* (87-126).

Christian, and vernacular conceptions) and negotiate the role of love and sexuality in their own lives.

Chapter 3 explores the role of translation within the various versions of the visionary writings of the 13th-century Beguine mystic Mechthild von Magdeburg. Though Mechthild's text was originally written in Low High German, it remains extant only in the contemporary Latin translation and a later, 14th-century Middle High German translation. The Latin translation has received considerably less attention in scholarship, and—as we have already started to see—the discussion is often underpinned by the standard narrative of antagonism and opposition between Latin and vernacular literary and spiritual cultures, ultimately presenting the Latin translation as a reaction against some perceived threat to Latin's literary or religious hegemony. To the contrary, I maintain that the Latin translation actually works to lend the cultural authority of the Latin language to Mechthild's original text and thus works discursively—via a precise interplay of intertextual references between the language of Minnesang in the MHG translation and that of Scripture as well as of contemporary Latin discourse—validate vernacular religious expression outside the bounds of the church. On the flip side, the MHG translation has, for various reasons to do with both the translator's strategies as well as the subsequent reception of the text in scholarship, often been treated almost as a perfect equivalent of Mechthild's original text. In contrast to this trend in which the role of the translator is overlooked or elided in discussions of Mechthild's text, I will instead focus on the ways in which the MHG translation seeks itself to develop a sense of immediacy and faithfulness.

Taken together, the three chapters seek to expose and critique certain biases and persistent trends within the study of translation in the Middle Ages and to encourage instead an alternative approach to studying medieval texts that straddle the divide between two languages, one which—rather than seeking to theorize medieval translation on a grand, overarching scale—instead seeks to respond more narrowly to each individual moment of retextualization as invoking a specific union between Latin and vernacular literary cultures and as serving a particular role and function within that specific context.

2: Language *Extra Se*: Dialectical Discourse in Notker's Old High German Translations of Latin Academic Texts

> *Teutonice propter caritatem discipulorum plures libros exponens*
> Primus barbaricam scribens faciensque saporam
> *In German, on account of his love for his students, he expounded many books.*
> He was the first to write in the barbarian tongue and make it savory.[23]

So writes Ekkehard IV, the head of the school at the Abbey of St. Gall in the early 11th century, of his own former teacher, Notker III (mid-10th century-1022). Notker—tasked, as the head of the Abbey's school from the turn of the century until his death, with the instruction of his pupils in both the Latin language and their conceptual knowledge of the Liberal Arts—had embarked on a project of translating and commenting upon many of the major Latin texts that formed the basic curriculum at the Abbey in his own native tongue, a Franconian dialect of Old High German. Ekkehard's respect and admiration for his former teacher's scholarly endeavors is clear—making the "barbarian" language "savory" is clearly put forth as no small feat—but at the same time one can perhaps recognize in Ekkehard's description a sort of uncertainty about exactly what sort of work Notker has engaged in. Ekkehard, namely, describes the project as one of expounding or explaining (*exponens*) the original Latin texts, a term that encompasses more than simple translation and frequently connotes a hermeneutic, interpretive engagement with the text in the form of extended commentary. In addition, his choice of "scribens"—from the verb *scribere* (to write)—to describe Notker's efforts would likely not have carried the same implications of authorial, creative engagement as it might for many modern readers but could just as well apply to the activity of scribes, whose goal would be to produce a correct, error-free copy of an original text, not to embark on their own creative productions. Certainly, in the early medieval era when Ekkehard and Notker were writing, formalized distinctions between these categories—that is, between commentary, translation, adaptation, etc.—were not well-developed, but that only contributes to the ambiguity present in Ekkehard's description.

This tension between hermeneutic creation and translative reproduction continues—perhaps not surprisingly, given the nature of Notker's writings—to be reproduced in modern scholarship on Notker's oeuvre as well. Scholars have used disparate terminology to describe Notker's work, ranging from "paraphrase" to "interlingual commentary"[24] to "translation-commentaries" (Hehle 258), all attempts to signal Notker's creative involvement in the translation and the extent to which the translations diverge from or go beyond the Latin original. The difficulty of categorizing Notker's project is understandable, of course, given the unique features of his prose and translative style. In general, his texts follow a certain form: first, a line of the original Latin text, followed by an Old High German gloss, and supplemented finally by further commentary and explanation, often in what is frequently referred to in scholarship as a *Mischprosa* that combines both German and Latin together within a single sentence or even

---

[23] The above text is taken from Verse 62 of the poem entitled "Item de aliis sincellitis amborum" from Ekkehard's *Liber Benedictionum*, as well as the accompanying interlinear note from the same author (in italics above). For the text of the poem, I have relied here and elsewhere in the essay on *Der Liber Benedictionum Ekkeharts IV*, ed. Johannes Egli, 230. The discussion from Peter Osterwalder in *Das althochdeutsche Galluslied Ratperts und seine lateinischen Übersetzungen durch Ekkehart IV* (222-226) has guided my translation.

[24] Rita Copeland, for example, does refer to Notker's works as translations on the whole, but when she is discussing the specific interlinear structure of the text, she describes the German portions as specifically "paraphrases" (99) of the original Latin structure, a loaded term that appears to carry with it some assumptions about how closely Notker is or isn't following his source material.

semantic unit. Sometimes even this pattern is interrupted by lengthy digressions—of Notker's own composition, though often drawing heavily from existing commentaries—on other, related topics. If we are to take the general scholarly uncertainty about how to properly refer to Notker's project as any indication, there continues to be an underlying discomfort with the ways in which Notker's project defies simple categorization as either a simple translation or a work of pure commentary.

At any rate, whether one deems Notker's works literal translations or some looser type of adaptation or commentary, they remain—as one of the first major projects of retextualization between Latin and the vernacular—a crucial moment in the history of literary exchange between the Latin and vernacular spheres in the Middle Ages. Scholarship on these works has, however, often been bogged down by problematic generalizations about the nature of the relationship between the Latin and Germanic literary and cultural spheres that assume both separation and rivalry between the two. More specifically, although scholars have often understood Notker's retextualizations in terms of a rhetorical struggle between Latin and vernacular, ultimately, the aspects of Notker's retextualizations that make his works difficult to categorize within modern frameworks of translation —for example, the combination of gloss and commentary, the *Mischprosa*, the long digressions—make sense in light of his own particular disciplinary allegiances and interests. Notker, namely, employs a two-pronged approach in his retextualizations that simultaneously seeks to improve his students' command of Latin even as it instructs them in the "extra-linguistic,"[25] conceptual knowledge needed to fully understand the text. Both prongs of this approach, however, are aimed at increasing student comprehension of the original text, not at rhetorically supplanting the text with a German version. This focus on comprehension as well as many of the individual translative strategies employed are, moreover, a product of Notker's dialectically structured approach and pedagogical motivations, not rhetorical principles or agendas or any sort of decrease in the quality of Latin education or knowledge at the Abbey.

2.1: Notker Teutonticus: Nationalism and Rhetoric in Previous Scholarship

Although much has indeed been written about Notker over the years, much of the scholarship produced—particularly the early studies of his work—has relied on the problematic assumption of a fundamental separation and opposition between the Latin and Germanic spheres. The earliest scholarship on Notker approached the corpus from a primarily linguistic perspective. Given the detail that Notker put into both his orthographic system as well as his systems of accents, designed to help guide his student' pronunciation, his translations are an invaluable source of historical knowledge about Old High German as a language, and specifically about the Franconian dialect in which Notker wrote, but such studies have less to say about the literary aspects of Notker's texts or the function of his translative project within the sphere for which he was writing. The scholarship, however, that has approached Notker's oeuvre from a less strictly linguistic perspective has often put forth certain problematic narratives about the relationship between Latin and the vernacular German spheres, frequently colored by nationalist overtones. As Paul Hoffmann wrote in his 1910 dissertation, in Notker's translations, "erhalten wir die früheste Lebensgeschichte der deutschen Litteratur, zugleich die Lebensgeschichte des ersten

---

[25] I am drawing here on the terminology used by Daniel Gile in his basic "equation" of comprehension, in which an reader's total comprehension of a text is defined as the sum of their "linguistic knowledge" of the language combined with their "extralinguistic knowledge," or in other words, their knowledge of the world outside the text (*Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training* 82).

deutschen Schriftstellers" (*Die Mischprosa Notkers des Deutschen* 3). Hoffmann's characterization of the significance of Notker's oeuvre in terms of its service to German literature is characteristic of early scholarship's fixation on Notker as "Notker the German" specifically, a poet striving in his translations to construct a literary or scholarly language for the vernacular in hopes of freeing the vernacular from Latin's cultural tyranny. Here, as in many of these early works of scholarship, the focus is placed on the poetic quality of the German portions of Notker's texts, thus advancing an image of Notker as a German poet specifically and ignoring his deep engagement with Latinity.

One sticking point, however, in the studies of translation that have sought to portray the scholar as a father figure in the history of the German language and literary tradition has always been Notker's persistent mixing of Latin and German in his writing. Why, one might well wonder, would a writer intent on constructing a literary or scholarly language for the vernacular leave certain concepts and phrases untranslated? Why, too, would somebody compose an interlinear translation at all, if the goal is to produce viable vernacular alternatives to the original Latin texts? The mental gymnastics early Notker scholarship engages in to avoid having to reckon seriously with these questions is truly astounding. One scholarly edition of Notker's translations from 1837, for instance, excises all the original Latin from Notker's text and appends the Latin bits again as supplementary footnotes, leaving Notker's Old High German passages to stand alone as an apparently independent text and making both his use of *Mischprosa* and the interlinear nature of his translation all but invisible (Graff). Another scholar—struggling to make sense of the presence of untranslated Latin words and phrases within Notker's Old High German prose in conjunction with his vision of Notker as working to create a functional philosophical vocabulary in the vernacular—resorts to arguing that the monk, a native speaker of the vernacular, found himself incapable of finding suitable Old High German alternatives for certain Latin words and just…gave up?[26] The enduring image in scholarship of Notker as a German writer translating in order to empower the German vernacular combines an assumption of cultural rivalry between Latin and German with an assumption of fundamental separation between the two languages, simultaneously arguing that Notker creates a new German literary language but that he also fails to do so because of his linguistic limitations.

While scholars have almost completely abandoned such explicitly nationalistic approaches to Notker's translations, even so the notion that Notker's project was designed to, in some way, wrest away some of Latin's cultural capital on behalf of the vernacular continues to pop up even in more modern studies. Consider, for example, Rita Copeland's discussion of Notker, specifically his translation of Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, within her widely influential study of medieval vernacular translations of Latin academic texts. "Vernacular translation," she writes, "allies itself with the ancient rhetorical models of translation through its recovery and rehabilitation of *exercitatio*, using translation to develop and perfect literary skills in the native language" (92). Vernacular translators, in this model, are driven by the "motive to contest and hence reinvent the text," with the ultimate goal of creating "a vernacular canon which will substitute itself for Latin models in the very process of replicating them" (93). Here again, as previously, the argument hinges on the assumption of a fundamental rivalry between Latin and the vernacular, and the underlying goal of not just

---

[26] Rudolf Kögel, namely, refers to the Latin terms within Notker's otherwise vernacular commentary as "Residua" (literally, remnants) and argues that Notker "ist mit seiner Neuerung gewissermassen auf halbem oder Dreiviertelswege stehen geblieben" (*Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters,* vol. 1.2, 614).

Notker's translations but vernacular translations of Latin academic texts more generally appears to be the development of the vernacular as a language of scholarship. Copeland's overall argument, then—that early medieval translations enact a sort of *translatio studii*, based on revised Roman rhetorical principles and motives, with the hopes of winning for the vernacular the rights to engage in intellectual discourse—essentially reproduces the terms in which older, nationalistic scholarship discussed Notker's project, even if she is more focused on Notker as scholar than on Notker as poet.

To be fair, within this general scheme, Copeland does admittedly distinguish between "primary" translations, amongst which she numbers Notker's works, that "announce themselves as translations by calling attention to their dependence upon—and service to—the original text" (94) and "secondary" translations that emphasize "the inventional power of the translator" (93). In this sense, then, Copeland does recognize the ways in which Notker positions himself as enacting a service to the source text and the Latin language; nevertheless, she maintains that the ultimate goal is the "discovery and augmentation of a native literary language" (94). Moreover, Copeland's assertions that Notker's practice of paraphrase "both incorporates and annexes the text, relegating the original to a virtually dependent position" and that, in doing so, the interlingual paraphrase itself "becomes the focal *lectio*" (99) remains suspect. Although Notker is, in some way, necessarily obliged in making these translations to construct an academic idiom for the vernacular, nevertheless it is important to keep in mind that elevating the German vernacular to an academic language was not a stated, or likely even an implicit, goal on Notker's part. His translations, as we shall see in the next section, are not rhetorically motivated to hermeneutically transform or supplant the source, as Copeland argues, but instead to foster conceptual and linguistic understanding to allow students to engage more fully with the Latin originals.

2.2: *Res paene inusitata*: Notker's Introductory Letter, the Emphasis on Understanding, and the Status of Latin and the Vernacular in the Medieval Classroom

Much of what we know of the specifics of Notker's project of retextualization—beyond Ekkehard's mention of his work in the *Liber Benedictionum* and, of course, the textual and material evidence comprised in Notker's extant works themselves—comes from a letter (c. 1015) Notker himself wrote to the Bishop Hugo of Sion, in which the St. Gall monk describes his intent and the reasons for the project, enumerates the texts he has translated thus far, and offers to make copies for the Bishop, provided that he is interested in the project and willing to finance it with "much parchment and payment for writing" (*plures pergamenas et scribentibus praemia* [lines 30-31]).[27] Notker's letter, in particular his detailed description of the texts he has worked on, offers scholars a more complete view of the scope of the project and his intentions in translating than what would otherwise be available from the manuscript evidence alone. Though many of his listed translations are still extant today—including his translations of Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, Aristotle's *De Categoriis* and *De Interpretatione*, Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, and the Psalter[28]—other translations that he mentions in the letter, such as either a translation of the Book of Job or Gregory the Great's

---

[27] For the Latin text of Notker's letter, I have relied on Ernst Hellgardt's edition ("Notker des Deutschen Brief an Bischof Hugo von Sitten" 172-173). The translations are my own, though influenced by Copeland's translation in *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation* (98).

[28] Notker's extant German translations exist today in a ten-volume critical edition prepared by James C. King and Petrus W. Tax, which is the edition I've relied on throughout this chapter.

commentary on it, Virgil's *Bucolica*, Terence's *Andria*, and the *Disticha Catonis* are no longer extant (or likely, were never finished at all, if they were even begun[29]). Besides these vernacular retextualizations, Notker also offers in his proposal to Bishop Hugo some original works of his own in Latin: "a new rhetoric, a new computus, and certain other Latin works."[30] More importantly, however, Notker's letter offers valuable perspective on both his own intentions in his translation as well as on the status of the vernacular in the classroom. More specifically, Notker's letter reveals that his project is not intended as a rhetorical rewriting of the Latin originals aimed to supplant them, nor does it appear to be motivated simply by a decrease in the quality of Latin instruction or proficiency at the Abbey but instead by a more general concern for student understanding in general that stems both from the nature of the relationship between Latin and vernacular at the Abbey and from Notker's own philosophies of language.

In the letter, Notker describes his project of translation as follows:

Sunt enim ecclesiastici libri – et praecipue quidem in scolis legendi –, quos impossibile est, sine illis praelibatis ad intellectum integrum duci. Ad quos dum accessum habere nostros vellem scolasticos, ausus sum facere rem paene inusitatam, ut latine scripta in nostram [linguam] conatus sim vertere et syllogistice aut figurate aut suasorie dicta per Aristotelem vel Ciceronem vel alium artigr[aph]um elucidare.[31]

For there are ecclesiastical books—and particularly those to be read in schools—which are impossible to be brought into full comprehension without this first sip. As I wished our students to have an introduction to them, I dared to do a thing almost unprecedented, in that I attempted to convert Latin writings into our [tongue] and to elucidate the syllogistic and figurative and rhetorical expressions in Aristotle or Cicero or some other writers in the Liberal Arts.

Two features of Notker's characterization of his work stand out as particularly meriting discussion: first, Notker's characterization of his translations as a "praelibatus" and "accesus" and, second, his assertion that such a project is "almost unprecedented." The first point of interest helps to clarify Notker's own understanding of the relationship of his translations to the Latin originals, while the second—a focus of much discussion in Notker scholarship—raises the question of the status of the vernacular in the classroom as well as of the quality of Latin education at the Abbey at the time.

Notker's characterization of his German translations as a *praelibatus*—which might literally be translated as "a foretaste"—to the Latin originals reveals that his goal was not to write German versions of the traditional Latin school-texts that would stand on their own and compete with the Latin original but rather that, by allowing his students to encounter the same ideas in a familiar language, they would be better prepared to engage with the original text. He

---

[29] In *Deutsche Übersetzungen lateinischer Schultexte*, Nikolaus Henkel makes a convincing argument, based on a reading of Notker's letter to the Bishop of Sion, that Notker distinguishes clearly between the translations he was asked to make of metrical texts (that is, of Virgil, Terence, and the *Disticha Catonis*) and the texts he actually translated, which he describes in the letter as "prose and arts" ("prosam et artes") texts (76-77).

[30] In the original letter: "et novam rhetoricam et computum novum et alia quaedam opuscula latine" (Hellgardt, "Notker des Deutschen Brief" 173.27-28).The extant versions of the Latin writings commonly associated with Notker and his school can be found in *Die Werke Notkers des Deutschen*, vol. 7 (*Die kleineren Schriften*, commonly abbreviated as Nks), edited by James C. King and Petrus W. Tax.

[31] Lines 11-17 in Hellgardt's edition. The brackets are Hellgardt's addition.

reaffirms this stance a second time in his further explanation that he wished to provide his students an *accessus* to the challenging texts they would be required to read in school. Notker chooses here to employ a more technical term generally used to describe the brief, introductory prologues appended to the start of authoritative academic texts in manuscripts that provided information about the text and its author and oftentimes some sort of conceptual framework for understanding the text (e.g., a discussion of the purpose, the author's intent, or simply a description of the area of philosophy to which it pertained).[32] In styling his text as an *accessus*, Notker thus clarifies the secondary nature of his translations. They are intended to serve as an entrance to the original Latin text, preparing students to engage with the original text, not as legitimate alternatives or rivals to the original.

Indeed, Notker appears, above all, pragmatically concerned with the ability of his students to understand not only the content of the Latin school texts—which could, of course, have been expressed solely in the vernacular without the use of Latin at all—but also the Latin language itself. After all, as Notker himself notes at the end of the letter, "cito capiuntur per patriam linguam, quae aut vix aut non integre capienda forent in lingua non propria" (lines 35-36),[33] and yet still he has elected to create not a continuous vernacular commentary or translation but, instead, includes Latin text alongside and even within his vernacular additions. Numerous times throughout the letter he emphasizes comprehension and conceptual understanding, referring to his desire that his students gain a complete understanding of the texts ("ad intellectum integrum") and the necessity of elucidating ("elucidare") certain grammatical, logical, and rhetorical principles within them, which would seem, in large part, to turn the focus back to the linguistic surface of the original Latin text. His specification, too, of the books "to be read in schools," might perhaps be understood as distinguishing the Classical authors, whose style was often loftier and more rhetorically and grammatically complex, from the terse prose of the Scriptures, which would also have been ecclesiastical texts (and which Notker does admittedly eventually include in his translation project, although, as we shall see, the particular nature of his translation of the Psalms is distinct from that of his other works in certain, revealing ways). Notker's Old High German translations, then, should not simply be considered a heralding of the vernacular and a displacement of the original Latin text. In fact, Notker's translations work primarily to uphold the cultural dominance of the Latin, even as they employ the vernacular in support of that pursuit and, in so doing, inadvertently work to legitimize the vernacular as a language of academic study.

The second moment in the excerpt from Notker's letter that has consistently drawn the attention of scholarship is his portrayal of the work as a "thing almost unprecedented" ("rem paene inusitatam")*. Scholars have not always agreed on what precisely is so unprecedented about Notker's project. In his own description, Notker points to two different aspects of unprecedentedness: he has not simply translated from Latin into Old High German, but he also commented upon the text. Scholars have alternately emphasized one of these two aspects, some

---

[32] A. J. Minnis's *Medieval Theory of Authorship* provides an excellent summary of the evolution of the *accessus* during the Middle Ages and an outline of the different types and the information each includes (15-28).

[33] In English: Things which are understood only partially and with difficulty in a language that is not one's own are quickly grasped in one's native tongue.

focusing more on Notker as translator[34] and others focusing more on Notker as commentor.[35] Notker's classroom use of the vernacular—even in a written form—is not, however, entirely unprecedented (nor, it's worth noting, does he claim it to be such; he maintains rather that it is "almost" unprecedented). Already in the Carolingian period, there existed an anxiety among the political and religious elite that inadequate knowledge of the Latin language amongst the Frankish people would lead to heretical statements or interpretations of the Bible.[36] The Carolingian solution, of course, was to improve the quality of Latin education and writing in the kingdom, but it's clear that the monastery schools created for this purpose were also from early on using the reverse approach—that is, translation into the vernacular—in order to help ensure correct understanding of the most important texts. The St. Gall library itself had housed a pair of the earliest Old High German glossaries (Cod. Sang. 911 and 913) since at least the early 9th century, one of which also contains Old High German translations of shorter religious texts (a Paternoster and Credo).[37] Though one can imagine that these essential religious texts may well have been intended for the instruction of laypeople outside the monastery, who would likely have been fairly unfamiliar with Latin, the existence of an interlinear translation of the *Rule of St. Benedict* from the early ninth century (Cod. Sang. 916) makes clear that Old High German was being used for the instruction of monks specifically. It is clear, too, that even much earlier in the monastery's history, although the quality of Latin instruction was widely renowned to be high, nevertheless the Abbey appears to have included individuals who could speak or understand no Latin at all,[38] and it is likely, as Anna A. Grotans has argued, that the vernacular was also being employed orally in the classroom as well.[39]

At any rate, although vernacular may well have been present already in the classroom context, there nevertheless remains an uneasy tension within Notker's letter regarding the reaction his translations might draw, even as he commends the text to his correspondent. After his initial characterization of the project as a "rem paene inusitatam," he closes the letter in a similar vein:

---

[34] Johann Kelle (*Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur von der ältesten Zeit bis zur Mitte des elften Jahrhunderts* 233; „Die S. Galler deutschen Schriften und Notker Labeo," 63) and Helmut De Boor (*Die deutsche Literatur von Karl dem Großen bis zum Beginn der höfischen Dichtung 770-1170* 401-402) might both be placed into this camp, although they disagree on the extent of Notker's familiarity with earlier forays into vernacular retextualization, such as the OHG *Tatian*, a word-for-word, side-by-side column translation of the Latin version of Tatian's gospel harmony.

[35] See Schröbler, „Die St. Galler Wissenschaft um die Jahrtausendewende und Gerbert von Reims" 32 as well as *Notker III. Von St. Gallen als Übersetzer und Kommentator von Boethius' De consolatione Philosophiae*; also Henkel, *Deutsche Übersetzungen lateinischer Schultexte*, particulary chapter III.2 ("Die Übersetzungen Notkers III. von St. Gallen" 73-86).

[36] See, for example, Charlemagne's "Epistola de litteris collendis."

[37] For more details on the early Old High German works composed and housed at the Abbey, see Stefan Sonderegger's "German language and literature in St. Gall" in *The Culture of the Abbey of St. Gall* (161-182, esp. 166).

[38] As evidence for this point, we might consider an anecdote Ekkehard IV includes in his *Casus Sancti Galli,* which relates how the scholars at the Abbey—Notker Balbulus, Ratpert, and Tuotilo—switched from speaking in the vernacular to speaking in Latin, after becoming aware that a fellow monk who did not speak Latin was eavesdropping on their conversation (*CSG* 36, 80-84).

[39] For more on this topic, see Grotans, *Reading in Medieval St. Gall*, particularly chapter 3 "Language use and choice" (111-154).

> Scio tamen, quia primum abhorrebitis quasi ab insuetis, sed paulatim forte incipient se commendare vobis, et praevalebitis ad legendum et ad dinoscendum, quam cito capiuntur per patriam linguam, quae aut vix aut non integre capienda forent in lingua non propria"
> I know, however, that at first you will recoil as if from something unusual, but bit by bit perhaps [the translations] will begin to commend themselves to you, and you will prevail in reading and in recognizing how quickly things are understood in one's father tongue, which would be understood little or not completely in a tongue not one's own.

Here, for a second time, Notker notes the unusual and unfamiliar nature of his project and anticipates from his reader a critical response. His comment at the end about the advantages of translation make clear that what is unusual is, at least in part, the use of the vernacular, but further emphasizes that both Notker's emphasis on conceptual understanding as well as the situation of the language of scholarship and pedagogy not being the native language of the students give impetus to such a project.

A similar tension regarding the place of the vernacular in pedagogy appears, too, in Ekkehard IV's *Casus Sancti Galli*, a continuation of an earlier history of the Abbey composed in the early 11th century, likely around the time of or shortly after Notker's death. The *CSG*—which relates the history of the Abbey beginning in the ninth century with the abbacy of Salomo III— cuts off abruptly in the late 10th century, well before Notker's tenure as schoolmaster, but, although Ekkehard thus never directly comments on his former teacher's instructional techniques in the text, he does makes comments that seem, at least superficially, critical of certain ways in which the vernacular is incorporated in the classroom:

> Unde male docere solent discipulos semimagistri dicentes: "Videte, quomodo disertissime coram Teutone aliquo proloqui deceat, et eadem serie in Latinum verba vertite!" (CSG 80, p. 168)
> Half-magistri are in the habit of teaching pupils badly and saying: "Note how it is fitting to speak out most clearly to a German, so translate the words in the same word order into Latin."[40]

Although Ekkehard's comment is sometimes cited as evidence of his preference for Latin and disdain for the vernacular, one need not take such a harsh stance. Superficially, the practice Ekkehard criticizes here bears remarkable similarities to Notker's own pedagogy. As we shall see, Notker frequently simplifies and rearranges the syntax of the original Latin text to make it more accessible to his native-German-speaking students. However, the context of Ekkehard's remark is critiquing a Latin poem—composed "in school" (*in scolis* [CSG 80, p. 168]) by a former schoolmaster of the same name, Ekkehard I—that was plagued throughout by Germanisms and idiomatic expressions and that the monks later felt compelled to correct. Thus, Ekkehard's critique concerns more the application of the stylistic and grammatical rules of the vernacular to original compositions in Latin and therefore wouldn't apply directly to Notker's instructionally-minded retextualizations of Latin works. At any rate, though, even if Ekkehard's comment does, as Grotans notes in her discussion of the passage, confirm that the vernacular was being used not just in the Abbey but specifically in the classroom as a component of Latin instruction, it nonetheless also makes clear that its specific place and role in pedagogy was controversial and still being negotiated, even after Notker's interventions.

---

[40] The translation here is borrowed from Grotans discussion of the passage in *Reading in Medieval St. Gall*, 127, which in turn is based on Haefele's original German translation of the passage.

It is possible that Notker's concern for his students' understanding stems, at least in part, from the state of Latin education at the Abbey at the time he was writing, but, in general, the evidence does not seem to support this conclusion. On one hand, it is only some two hundred years after the Carolingian educational reforms had revitalized, if only temporarily, the study of Latin and imposed a new regularity and order on the Latin language, and already Notker's students—if we are to take the schoolmaster at his word—appear unable to parse the Latin grammar of what would have been some of their most basic school texts. It is somewhat less clear, though, whether the students' struggle is unique to the students of the Abbey during this period in particular or due to a decline in the quality of education at the Abbey or simply a product of an arduous educational system in which students must simultaneously master both the subject matter as well as the foreign language in which they receive their instruction. That the Abbey's Latin education would have declined so rapidly after the Carolingian reforms seems rather unconvincing, particularly given the Abbey's longstanding reputation since as early as the early 800s as a center of learning and Latin mastery. Scholars have often distinguished between the Abbey's Golden Age, lasting from the beginning of Gozbert's abbacy in 816 until the Hungarian invasion in 926, during which manuscript production at the Abbey scriptorium was of both high volume and high quality, and the following Silver Age,[41] where the output of the Scriptorium slackened to some degree. The Abbey did suffer some misfortunes in the middle of the tenth century—besides the Hungarian invasion, there was also a fire in 937, which left the monks temporarily homeless—that may have temporarily disrupted the quality of education, but evidently the Abbey school was able to recover rather swiftly after these upheavals. Gunzo of Novara—himself a Latin grammarian—relates a humorous anecdote about his visit to the Abbey in 960, in which monks at the Abbey castigate and poke fun at him for a grammatical error made over dinner (Grotans 49), attesting to the high quality of Latin education at the Abbey only some a few decades or so before Notker's tenure in charge of the Abbey's schools. Overall, it seems likely, then, that Notker's decision to embark on this extensive project of retextualization was motivated not in response to a lapse in quality of Latin instruction at the institutional level, though the vernacular almost certainly was already in use at the Abbey, even within the context of the classroom.

Ultimately, what appears most unprecedented about Notker's project is not simply his pedagogical use of the vernacular but, more specifically, his incorporation of elements of Latin textuality, such as commentary, into his vernacular translations. Although the vernacular was likely already being used in an educational context and although Notker was likely familiar with some earlier translations into the vernacular, the scope of his project—that is, the sheer number of texts he translated, the type of texts he chose to translate, and his use of the vernacular as more than merely a means to understand foreign words—far outstrips any previous project of retextualization into an Old High German dialect. Notker's motivations for the project, too, do not appear to be a rhetorical supplanting of the Latin originals or simply a reaction to decreasing Latin knowledge. Rather—as I will argue in the next section—Notker's project appears instead to have been driven not only by the scholar's recognition of the ever-present difficulties that simultaneous second-language and subject instruction must have posed but also by his specific philosophies of language and knowledge. In some ways, then, it is perhaps more interesting to consider the ways in which Notker's translations are precedented—that is, the ways in which

---

[41] The Silver Age is generally dated as having lasted form 926 until 1076, after which point the Abbey was largely distracted from the production of new manuscripts by the Investiture Controversy and other attempts at reform (Vogler 18).

they relate to and emerge from the larger institutional context of the 11th century St. Gall monastery and the specific disciplinary interests of Notker and his school. More specifically, as I hope to show, Notker's very decision to translate into the vernacular as well as his specific choice of Latin texts and the particular features of his translation should be considered in relation to the growing interest at the Abbey in the field of dialectics, and the Abbey's early interest in applying dialectical reasoning to the study of language, which, in Notker's view, create space for a conceptual understanding of a text to exist outside the original language in which a text is written.

2.3: Language *Extra Se:* Notker's Latin Treatises and the Role of Dialectics in His Curriculum

Notker's emphasis on understanding as well as his choices as a translator ultimately make the most sense when one views his translative project through the lens not primarily of rhetoric or grammar but rather of dialectics, the third component of the medieval trivium—alongside rhetoric and grammar—which focused on determining truth via the construction of logical arguments. That Notker exhibited a particular interest in dialectics in his writings is hardly a new observation. Anna A. Grotans, in *Reading in Medieval St. Gall*, includes an extended discussion of the significance of the discipline within Notker's pedagogical curriculum as well as in his Latin treatises.[42] Other scholars, too, have demonstrated a widespread increase of interest in the field of dialectics amongst scholars at various centers of learning—including the Abbey of St. Gall, specifically—as early as the ninth century, well ahead of the discipline's heyday during the Scholastic period of the High Middle Ages.[43] Within this context, then, Notker's passion for dialectics is not all that interesting or unique, and it's hardly surprising that the field would occupy a significant portion of the Abbey's curriculum. What is intriguing, however, is the extent to which Notker's understanding of dialectics is, in a sense, already a theory of language, which, as such, has profound influence on his project of (re)textualization. More specifically, it is dialectical principles and motivations that underpin Notker's translations and guide its particular structure and the translation strategies he employs. Although grammar has often been considered the most fundamental subject in the trivium—both by medieval scholars and modern ones[44]—Notker, in his curriculum, turns this structure on end and ultimately reframes both grammar and rhetoric in terms of logic and dialectics.

Marenbon's study of the tradition of glossing commentaries on Aristotle in the early Middle Ages makes clear that there was a large and growing interest in the fundamental logical writings of Aristotle well before the rise of Scholasticism and the increasing availability of Latin translations of Aristotle's more advanced texts during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries;

---

[42] See, in particular, pages 79-91. My hope, in this project, is largely to extend and corroborate Grotans' more tentative assertion that Notker's specific pedagogic strategies "may have grown out of the tenth-century curriculum of dialectic" (2); however, while Grotans primarily approaches Notker's texts as evincing a "union of grammar and dialectics" (87) with the study of rhetoric standing as a distinct but still important component of Notker's curriculum, I, rather, would argue that Notker reconceptualizes both grammar and rhetoric through the lens of logic.

[43] For more on the study of logic at St. Gall specifically, see John Marenbon, "Glosses and Commentaries on the 'Categories' and 'De Interpretatione' before Abelard," particularly pages 26-27.

[44] Sonja Glauch, for instance, in her discussion of Notker's translation of Martianus Capella, writes that "die *grammatica* ist in der Praxis der *rhetorica* und der *dialectica* oder *logica* nicht ebenbuertig. Sie ist so elementar, dass sie eher die Grundlage als die Partnerin der anderen ist" (*Die Martianus-Capella-Bearbeitung Notkers des Deutschen*).

however, Marenbon is careful to note that most early exegetes did not understand Aristotle to be advancing a philosophy of language, but of things. This question of whether Aristotle's *Categories* concerns words or things had preoccupied scholars since early in the text's history, with the Platonist thinker Porphyry first arguing that Aristotle, in the *Categories,* was not attempting to describe reality as such but rather the perception of reality as experienced through language. This distinction was later of great importance to Scholastic thinkers, occupied with the problem of universals—that is, the question of whether universal categories actually existed in the world or were simple names or concepts, positions labelled "realist" and "nominalist," respectively. Boethius, following Porphyry, had similarly argued in his commentary to Aristotle's *Categories* that the intent of the text was to discuss "words which signify things as signifying" ("de voicibus res significantibus, in eo quod significantes sunt pertractare" [*Patrologia Latina* vol. 64, col. 160A]), rather than to discuss reality itself. In general, however, according to Marenbon, early medieval exegesis of Aristotle did not show signs of this early sort of nominalist reading of Aristotle. Prior to the 1100s, Marenbon argues, the most widely available and popular way to encounter Aristotle's ideas from the *Categories* and *De interpretatione* was not through Boethius's translation of the texts into Latin or his commentary but rather via what is commonly referred to as the *Categoriae Decem*, a Latin translation not of the original Greek text but instead of a Greek "paraphrase" of the original, which Marenbon describes as a "pre-digested version of the Categories along with a commentary" ("Glosses and Commentaries" 25). The standard set of interlinear and marginal glosses commonly found in these texts, according to Marenbon, does not advance a linguistic understanding of Aristotle (29).

Even if, at the time, the practice of approaching Aristotle's logical treatises as a study of language was not generally widespread, it was nevertheless well established at St. Gall, well before Notker's time. Though the *Categoriae Decem* were known and available at St. Gall specifically, so too were Boethius's translations and commentaries, and these, in particular, seemed to have structured the study of logic and dialectics at the Abbey. Marenbon notes, in his study, the presence of certain "eccentric" glosses to the *Categoriae Decem*—that is, glosses that contain unique material diverging from the standard set of glosses—which do appear to advance an early precursor to nominalist readings of Aristotle, drawing on Boethius. In particular, one St. Gall manuscript (Cod. Sang. 274), likely glossed in the second half of the ninth century, evidences the early influence of Boethius's translation and commentary to Aristotle's first two logical works (Marenbon, "Glosses and Commentaries" 28-29). Specifically, a marginal gloss at the beginning of the manuscript directly echoes Boethius's language in his commentary,[45] repeating his claim that Aristotle's intention in the Categories was to discuss words "as signifying" (*significantes*) rather than in terms of their form. Besides this text, as Marenbon notes, "the only properly free-standing logical commentary from the early period…may have originated in St Gall" (26) and it, too, "resumes Boethius's views" with respect to the question of names and things (29). There is, in other words, already well ahead of Notker an active tradition at St. Gall of understanding Aristotle's introductory logical texts not as a discussion of reality, but as a discussion of the relationship between words and reality.

In the Latin treatises attributed to Notker, a similar understanding of Aristotle that clearly draws on Boethius can be found. We see this sentiment perhaps most clearly in the *Distributio*,

---

[45] The gloss in Cod. Sang. 274 reads: "In hoc igitur opere haec intentio est de primis rerum nominibus et de uocibus res significantibus disputare, non in eo quod secundum aliquam proprietatem figuramque formantur, sed in eo quod significantes sunt" (Marenbon, "Glosses and Commentaries" 28, note 27).

in which Notker attempts to map the grammarian Priscian's different classes of nouns onto Aristotle's categories, thus already suggesting Notker's interest in viewing the *Categories* as a fundamentally linguistic approach to the world. In the treatise, Notker opens with a revealing comparison between Aristotle's ten categories and the eight parts of speech of grammar:

> Octo partes orationis in gramatica . quales in se ipsis dictiones sint . liquido ostendunt; Decem uero aristotilis cathegoriae . quae ad logicam pertinent . quid ipsae partes orationis extra se significant . subtilius docent. Et primum est . noscere quid uoces significent . deinde quales per se sint ispae. Hunc ordinem in pueris natura ostendit . qui prius intellegunt ea uox quae est homo . unde praedicetur . quam in ipsa uoce fieri discant hanc flexionem . homo hominis homini hominem ab homine. Et a prima origine linguarum omnes se ad intellectum solum sermonum ferebant. Postea aliqui ceperunt de ipsa quoque uoce sermonum tractare. (*Kleinere Schriften* 3-13)
>
> The eight parts of speech in grammar show clearly what words, in themselves, are. The ten categories of Aristotle, on the other hand, which pertain to logic, show more simply what the parts of speech signify beyond themselves. First of all, moreover, one must know what words mean and afterwards what they are in themselves. Nature shows us the same sequence in children, for they learn to understand what the word "person" (*homo*) is predicated of before they learn the form's inflection: *homo*, *hominis*, *homini*, *hominem*, *ab homine*. Ever since languages began, everyone has had to learn to understand words; only later did some people begin to study the form of words.[46]

In the above passage, Notker concretely links the eight parts of speech with the field of grammatical study ("gramatica"), while affirming that the ten categories of Aristotle pertain to the field of dialectics ("ad logicam pertinent").[47] However, despite their different disciplinary realms, Notker makes clear that both classification systems are fundamentally linguistic in nature. Grotans, in her commentary on this same passage, astutely points out that Notker's use of the word "pueri," though translated here as "children," might specifically refer to schoolboys (86), evoking a specifically academic context, but her overall assertion that this passage, as well as Notker's oeuvre more generally, evidence simply a "union of grammar and dialectic" (87) is questionable. After all, Notker's "uero"—suggesting contrast—makes clear that dialectics is not so much being likened to grammar as it is being contrasted with it. Both may indeed concern the study of language, but they do so from different perspectives with different goals in mind. While grammatical study allows for the discussion of "words…in themselves" ("in se ipsis dictiones"), the study of dialectics, though still a study of language, allows for the discussion of what words or parts of speech mean beyond themselves ("extra se"). Grammar, in other words, is a self-contained study of language—its governing structures and rules—in itself and for itself, while dialectics is a study of the relationship between words and the world outside the text. Notker, in other words, makes a sort of *avant-la-lettre* distinction between linguistic signifiers and the things signified—that is, the real-world concepts behind the term—and thus imbues the field of dialectics with a considerable amount of hermeneutic and epistemological power and

---

[46] The translation here is based on Vivien Law's translation of the passage in her *History of Linguistics in Europe: From Plato to 1600* (155).

[47] Notker, it's worth noting, often uses the terms "logica" and "dialectica" interchangeably to refer to the entirety of the third branch of the *trivium* that we today commonly refer to as dialectics. He does, however, in certain instances distinguish the term *dialectica* as a specific sub-field within the study of logic, which concerns the study of plausible arguments—that is, arguments based on commonly held beliefs—as opposed to more rigorous syllogistic proofs.

responsibility. It is hard not to see not simply a distinction between but even a preference for dialectics over grammar in Notker's comment that grammar teaches its lessons "clearly" (*liquido*), while dialectics teaches its lessons *subtilius,* a comparative adverb which might be translated alternatively as "more finely," "more simply," or "more precisely." Though the exact sense of *subtilius* might not be entirely clear, it is clear that Notker considers dialectics to teach its lessons about the relationship of language and reality *better*, in some way, than grammar does on its own.

The example Notker offers further emphasizes not only the chronological primacy of dialectical study—that is, that one would inevitably learn what the word *homo* refers to before one would learn how to correctly decline it—but also its universality. Though the word *homo* is a Latin word, the concept behind the word is universal, a fact which distinguishes the field of dialectics from its counterparts. While two-thirds of the trivium, grammar and rhetoric, are, to varying degrees, specifically bound to the Latin language, dialectics—as Notker here points out—is the only discipline that can be applied fully within the vernacular, precisely because it concerns the logical expression and assessment of truth claims, a sort of extra-linguistic knowledge. In other words, students of dialectics, even if they have only ever studied the topic in Latin, would nevertheless be able to apply the logical principles learned to the assessment of truth claims made in another language, provided they were sufficiently familiar with it. The same cannot be said, however, for grammar and rhetoric. Old High German, of course, does have its own grammar, in the modern sense of the governing rules controlling the combination of linguistic units, and there is evidence even that Notker understood as much to be true, a remarkable feat at a time when *grammatica* referred specifically to Latin grammar. The study of rhetoric, similarly, often involved learning specific literary devices, figures of speech, and poetic meters, and, although some of these features might be easily translated into the vernacular, others would not have been commonly seen or even possible to replicate to the same effect in the vernacular. Here, too, Notker clearly recognizes that the vernacular does have a comparable set of stylistic devices and rhetorical features,[48] but again, a knowledge of Latin rhetorics would not necessarily allow a student to make sense of a German poem. Notker thus presents dialectics as a window to the real world of things to which language—whether oral or textual—refers, ascribing the field with hermeneutic power while simultaneously decoupling the discipline from a strictly Latin field of study.

Again, in *De dialectica*—in which Notker first gives an overview of Aristotle's general logical curriculum before turning to a more thorough discussion of the subfield of dialectics—Notker reiterates this same point about the primacy of logical study as opposed to grammatical in his introductory description of Aristotle's *Categories*, which he refers to as a "librum inter philosophicos pene incomparabilem" (that is, a "book almost without compare among the philosophical [ones]):

"Convincitur enim . nihil integrum . nihil perfectum scire . et neque se ipsum scire . qui cathegorice sit penitus expers industrie. Sicut ergo rusticus est . qui ex grammatica non novit octo partes orationis . et quales in se ipsis sint .i. casibus debeant flecti . aut

---

[48] In his discussion of *elocutio* within his predominately Latin *Rhetorica*, for instance, Notker gives a few examples of rhetorical devices from Old High German. He follows, for instance, a quote from Virgil—used to demonstrate a "pleasing stylistic beauty" (*gratam concinnitudinem* Nr 161.19-20)—with the note that, with diligence, such compositions can be made in every language, for the purpose of delight ("fit per industriam talis compositio in omni lingua . causa delectionis" Nr 161.21-22) and even includes a few lines of rhymed OHG verse (Nr 161.23-26) to support his claim.

temporibus . aut forte inflexibiles sint ! sic multo peius desipit . qui ipseas partes orationis .i. singulas dictions non novit substantia aut accidens significare . et rerum natuam quamlibet extra se notare" (Nd, 203-205)

For one who in the *Categories* is thoroughly without diligence is established to know nothing wholly, nothing completely, and to not know oneself. Just as one is considered unrefined, who doesn't know the eight parts of speech from grammar and what they are in themselves, that is, in the cases that ought to be declined, or in the tenses, or in [what is strongly inflexible], so much more foolish is he who doesn't know that these parts of speech, that is singular statements, signify substance or circumstance and that they denote the nature of things, as it pleases, beyond themselves.

Here, Notker stages Aristotle's *Categories* as the most fundamental academic text and portrays the field of logic contained therein as, again, a type of knowledge that transcends linguistic boundaries, in contrast to grammar, which does not. In the above passage, *grammatica*—as it often does in the Middle Ages—appears to refer as much to knowledge of the Latin language itself as to the specific subdivision of the trivium, particularly when we consider that the adjective "rusticus" had long since been used to refer to the vernacular Romance dialects that had diverged from Classical Latin.[49] Across Notker's Latin oeuvre, we see a concentrated effort to position the field of dialectics as being more essential and elementary than the study of grammar and to position the discipline as a type of universal knowledge transcending linguistic boundaries.

Grammar is not the only subject of the trivium to receive this treatment; Notker's depiction of rhetoric, too, is, in large part, recast through the lens of logic. Notker, for instance, closes *De dialectica* with a discussion of how the field of logics relates to the field of rhetoric, or, more specifically, how the program of dialectical invention laid out by Aristotle, primarily in the *Topica*, relates to Cicero's treatment of rhetorical invention. Following Aristotle's own distinction, Notker considers dialectical argumentation as "probabilem argumentationem, id est verisimilem" in contrast to apodictic argumentation, which is understood as "necessariam and ueram argumentationem" (251.2-3). Dialectical arguments, in other words, are not resolved via the construction of rigorous syllogisms but via appeal to commonly held or believable propositions using standard argument structures, which Aristotle divides into different types that he calls *topoi*. Although Notker acknowledges that there might appear to be differences between Aristotle's *topoi* and Cicero's treatment of rhetorical invention,[50] he nevertheless maintains that

Aristoteles loca argumentorum philosophis et oratoribus communis demonstrauit . et quod sub his comprehendduntur omnia que cicero commemoravuit quasi alia loca. … Sumpta sunt autem ex ea parte logice . quam nunc agimus . id est dialectica . quod interpretatur de dictio. Liquet enim ex ipso uocabulo . ad oratorium usum magis ea pertinere . quia sermo est phylosophorum . oratorum est dictio. (*Nks* 253.14-257.6)

Aristotle reveals the *loca argumentorum* of the philosophers and of the orators to be communal and that everything that Cicero mentions as other *loca* is included under these [i.e., under Aristotle's scheme of *topoi*]. … [The *loca argumentorum*] are taken from that

---

[49] As, for example, in Canon 17 of the Council of Tours in 813, which instructed that priests deliver their sermons either in a "rusticam romanam linguam" (literally, a "rustic Roman tongue") or in German, such that their audience might better understand them (*MGH*, *Concilia* 2.1 [*Concilia aevi Karolini*] 38.17, p.288).

[50] He responds, more specifically, to the tension between Boethius's statement in his commentary that there are no further *topoi* beyond those listed by Aristotle and the fact that Cicero does, in fact, list further, or at least different, *loca* for arguments beyond what Aristotle had included.

part of logic, that we now consider, that is dialectics, which is understood to concern speech (*dictio)*. For it is clear that this term is of great use for orators, since discourse (*sermo*) belongs to the philosophers, speech to the orators (*dictio*).

Here, Notker clearly places dialectical reasoning and invention within the wider discipline of logic and further positions Cicero's rhetorical invention as a subset of dialectical—that is, logical—invention as it appeared in Aristotle. He further stresses the overlap between rhetoric and logic on the grounds that, while philosophers engage in discourse or debate (*sermo)* and, in contrast, rhetoricians practice speech or oratory (*dictio),*[51] both philosophical reasoning and rhetorical persuasion are still fundamentally linguistic practices in nature, though applied to different ends. That Notker thus ascribes the power of argumentative invention to the field of logic as much as to rhetoric is important, particularly so since, for Notker, rhetorical invention appears to be the most important component of rhetoric, if his own *Rhetorica* is to be any indication. Half of the Latin treatise is devoted to the invention of arguments (*inventio*), with a further one fourth of the text being devoted to elocution (*elocutio*) and with far less to be said about the other three components: pronunciation, memorization, and organization (*pronuntiatio*, *memoria*, *dispositio*).

Another of the Latin treatises associated with Notker and his school, "De partibus logicae*"* (Nl), appears to reaffirm this same decoupling of the field of dialectics from the study of Latin, while again simultaneously positioning the field of dialectics as the source of argumentative invention. The text—only about three folios long, in its extant form—once again begins with a summary of the logical curriculum of Aristotle and Isagoge before, again, listing the *loca argumentorum* and giving examples of each type of argumentative scheme. For arguments made *a genere*—that is, arguments that draw conclusions about an individual from knowledge of the group—the reader is given a number of different examples in Latin, such as "in uirgilio varium et mutabile semper est femina. Ergo et dido uarium et mutabile videatur" (NkS 192.11-13),[52] before they are provided with a further example "in German" (*Teutonice*): "V́be man álliu dîer fúrtin sál nehéin só harto só den mán" (NkS 192.13-14).[53] Crucially, the examples given are not translations of each other but independent sayings in Latin and German that provide parallel and presumably familiar examples of specific types of arguments. In general, it is unclear whether "De partibus logicae" is a direct product of Notker or not. The text is transmitted anonymously in four codices and does not bear many of the characteristics associated

---

[51] Elsewhere in his Latin writings—namely, in his Latin-German treatise "De syllogismis"—Notker further clarifies the distinctions between the *sermo* of the philosophers and the *dictio* of the orators, here more clearly affirming the supremacy of logic over rhetoric, while still stressing that both are fundamentally linguistic disciplines: "Dignior est namque sermo et gravior . ut sapientes decet. Dictio humilior est et plus communis . data rhetoribus. Uerbum autem omnium est. ... Sermo enuntiat quid uerum quid falsum.. Hoc possunt soli philosophi. Dictio uero suadet . ueris et uerisimilibus. Hoc est officium rhetorum." (*NkS* 308.10-309.10). [Translation: For indeed, *sermo* is more dignified and serious, as befits the wise. *Dictio* is more humble and more common, given to rhetoricians. The word (*verbum*), however, is given to all. ... Sermo reveals what is true, what is false. Only philosophers are capable of this. Dictio, however, persuades. This is the job of the rhetoricians.]

[52] English translation: "In Virgil, women are always variable and changing. And thus Dido appears as variable and changing."

[53] In English: "If one should fear all animals, [one should fear] none more so than man." Similar saying also appears in Latin in the *Disticha Catonis* and in the Middle High German *Parzival*. For more on this saying, see vol. 7a ("Notker latinus" zu den kleineren Schriften) of King and Tax's editions of Notker's works, 122.

with Notker's own writing.[54] Prantl has suggested that the text should, at least, be considered a product of Notker's school, perhaps a sort of homework or a set of notes based on Notker's lectures, if it is not a product of Notker himself (64). Ultimately, whether or not we accept *De partibus logicae* as Notker's own writing, the treatise still provides clear evidence of the use of the vernacular in the classroom, specifically within the context of dialectical study and the invention of arguments, and functioning as more than a simple tool for glossing foreign words.

   Across his Latin writings, Notker—drawing particular emphasis from Boethius's treatment of Aristotle—consistently presents dialectical study as a study of language and specifically as one that, unlike grammar or rhetoric, is not necessarily restricted to the Latin language. In doing so, Notker stages dialectical study as a universal subject and ultimately recasts both grammar and rhetoric in terms of logic, rebalancing the more traditional disciplinary hierarchy, in which grammar is seen as the fundamental subject and in which rhetoric holds the power of *inventio*. Notker's view of dialectics' relationship to language as well to the other disciplines has profound effects on the specific character of his translations as well as on his very decision to embark on such a project of translation as a whole.

Dialectics in Action: Conceptual Knowledge and Linguistic Instruction in Translation

   The dialectical underpinning of Notker's project is structured, on the one hand, to supplement the students' conceptual knowledge via the inclusion of the interlinear Old High German translation in conjunction with the incorporation of additional commentary and supplementary excursuses that promote a more complete understanding of the text. On the other hand, Notker's inclusion of the Latin text and the ways in which he simplifies the Latin work to develop his students' linguistic and grammatical knowledge and their ability to parse Latin. Both prongs of this approach, however, operate with the same goal in mind: improving students' comprehension and empowering them to engage with the original Latin texts. Far from intending to create any sort of academic or literary vocabulary in the vernacular, Notker's translations actually are structured with quite the opposite purpose in mind: that is, introducing students to the world of Latin textuality and scholarship.

   To begin, Notker's very decision to translate into the vernacular as well as his particular choice of texts to translate reveals the importance of dialectics within his pedagogy and his consistent emphasis on both conceptual understanding and linguistic development. Complex concepts and ideas are more understandable in one's native tongue than in a foreign idiom, Notker stresses in his letter to the Bishop of Sion, making clear that his translations aim, first and foremost, to provide a working conceptual understanding of both the texts themselves and the disciplines to which they pertain. Moreover, if we accept Henkel's argument that Notker, in his letter, distinguishes between the texts he was simply asked to translate—the *Disticha Catonis*, Virgil's *Bucolica*, and Terence's *Andria*—and the texts he actually ended up translating, then Notker's selection of texts appears particularly telling. The metrical texts that Notker neglected to translate were, in many ways, more traditional texts for beginning students. In particular, the *Disticha Catonis*—a collection of moral proverbs written as hexametric couplets—was one of the most fundamental texts used to provide reading material and demonstrate grammatical concepts for young Latin students. A vernacular translation of such a text would, in some ways,

---

[54] More specifically, Nl does not contain the descriptive subsection headings common in Notker's writing, and the distribution of the vernacular material diverges from Notker's normal practices, in that it all appears in the second half of the work rather than being distributed throughout. For more on this debate, see King/Tax, NKs, LXIV-LXV

negate its original function of teaching Latin,[55] and the pithy sayings included hardly require extensive commentary to make sense of. Notker's decision to retranslate Boethus's translation of Aristotle is also revealing, since there already existed a widely available, pre-digested Latin summary of the *Categories* at least (that is, the previously mentioned *Categoriae Decem*). If a simplified Latin digest had been sufficient for Notker's purposes, he might instead have relied on this text[56] in his pedagogy, which, as Marenbon notes, "allow[s] the reader to dispense with reading…the original text and Boethius's commentary and rely instead on the digest [the *Categoriae Decem*] it provides" ("Glosses and Commentaries" 27). Notker's choice, then, to offer a vernacular translation alongside the Latin text thus both reveals the importance of dialectics and logic within his pedagogical curriculum and also helps evidence Notker's sense of his translations as a stepping stone towards more meaningful and direct encounters with the original texts.

One challenge of studying Notker's translations is the considerable variation in terms of the specific translation strategies and techniques that Notker employs both between the various translations he produced and even within individual translations. Neither the translation of *De interpretatione* nor his translation of Martianus Capella's writings, for instance, include the long excursuses set off from the actual text via descriptive headings that pepper the translation of Boethius (though only Books II-V). Moreover, as compared to the two prosimetric texts, the Aristotle translations employ a greater percentage of Latin within Notker's *mischprosa* commentary. In general, scholarship has accounted for such differences in translation strategy between the various texts in terms of the position of the text within the pedagogical curriculum—that is, in terms of what subject and what level of study the various translation were intended to facilitate. Grotans, for instance, has argued that the translations of Aristotle were intended primarily as a more basic introduction to dialectics (94), after which the students, using the translations of Boethius and Martianus Capella, could "move on to a study of literature…taught by the steps outlined by *grammatica* and *rhetorica*" (97). Grotans' approach—which does admittedly assume some previous basic instruction in Latin—is satisfying in that it evidences the importance of dialectics within Notker's disciplinary hierarchy and fits with his comments on the chronological primacy of the field as compared to grammar. Sonja Glauch, in contrast, contends that Notker's translations could not have been for true introductory study because they do not fit with the traditional early focus on grammatical study (*Die Martianus-Capella-Bearbeitung Notkers des Deutschen* 31-32), though she neglects to consider the ways in which Notker, in his Latin treatises, turns the traditional disciplinary hierarchy on end.

While the translation strategies Notker employs are likely, in part, related to how the texts were being used in the classroom at the Abbey and the level of instruction they were intended to facilitate, it is nevertheless worth considering how his translation strategies develop across the course of his work, particularly when comparing his earliest translation to his later works. In his

---

[55] German vernacular translations of the *Disticha Catonis* were eventually made later on, beginning in the 13th century. As Henkel puts it, however, in these German translations „bestand ein literarisches Muster in deutscher Sprache, das dem lateinischen ‚Cato' z.T. inhaltlich, vor allem aber formal und damit auch wirkungästehetisch weitgehend kongruent war" (86). The emphasis on form and effect over sense in translation might thus be taken as evidence that the translations were meant to be read, to a larger degree, independently from the Latin and were not being used as tools of Latin grammar instruction.

[56] At least one copy of the *Categoriae Decem* is attested at the Abbey of St. Gall in Cod. Sang. 274, a manuscript from the 9th century, so the text was presumably both known and available at the Abbey when Notker was writing.

letter to the Bishop of Sion, Notker provides a general sense of the order in which he composed his translations:

> Quod dum agerem in duobus libris Boethii, - qui est de consolation Philosophiae et in aliquantis de sancta trinitate -, rogatus (sum), et metrice quaedam scripta in hanc eandem linguam traducere, Catonem scilicet ut Bucolica Virgilii et Andriam Terentii. Mox et prosam et artes temptare me voluerunt, et transtuli Nuptias Philologiae et Categorias Aristotelis et Periermenias et principia arithmeticae. Hinc reversus ad divina totum Psalterium et interpretando et secundum Augustinum exponendo consummavi; Iob quoque incepi, licet vix tertiam partem exegerim. (Hellgardt, "Notkers Brief" 173.18-26)
> Because of what I had done on the two books of Boethius—that is, the *Consolation of Philosophy* and a considerable amount of *On the Holy Trinity*—I was asked also to translate certain metrical texts into that same language, namely the *Distichs of Cato,* Virgil's *Bucolics*, and Terence's *Andria*s. Soon they wanted me to try both prose and arts texts, and I translated the *Marriage of Philology*, Aristotle's Categories and *On Interpretation*, and the *Principles of Arithmetic*. Afterwards, returning to divine subjects, I completed the entire Psalter, both translating and, following Augustine, commenting. I also began the Book of Job but was hardly able to finish a third of it.

Notker, then, outlines three major waves of translative activity. He began with Boethius's *Consolatione Philosophiae* and his work on the Trinity (no longer extant) and only some time later—after having been requested to work on more works—progressed through the first two books of Martianus Cappella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* and Boethius's translation of and commentary on Aristotle's *Categories* and *De interpretatione* (though, perhaps not necessarily in that exact order),[57] before culminating with his translations of Scripture. Notker's translation project, then, by his own characterization, is rather piecemeal, developing over time alongside his own desires and interests as well as his perception of his students' need. Though Notker does not explicitly say as much in his letter, Ekkehard's later comment that his teacher translated "on account of love for his students" (*propter caritatem discipulorum*) might indicate that his initial translation was composed, if not directly at the behest of his students, then likely at least due to some perception on Notker's part that his students were struggling.

Because Notker's translation of Boethius was thus composed first and likely, to some degree, extemporaneously, it might be the most haphazardly constructed in terms of Notker's translation strategy, but—for precisely this reason—it offers perhaps the best window into how such academic texts were actually being engaged with in the classroom. In his translation of Boethius, Notker's meta-pedagogical Latin interjections and asides reveal that the text was being studied primarily within a dialectical framework and at a fairly introductory level. In comparison to his later translations—particularly those of Aristotle—the commentary portions of Notker's translation of Boethius are composed of the vernacular to a larger degree. Nevertheless, Notker does, as we will see, include some Latin words and technical terminology, often, though not always, precisely to introduce concepts from the field of logic and dialectics (and to a lesser degree rhetoric, which, as previously discussed, Notker considers to have considerable overlap with dialectics anyway). At essentially every opportunity, for instance, Notker clarifies which particular *locus argumentorum* is being employed by the textual Boethius and his interlocutor

---

[57] Notker also mentions in the above passage a *principia arithmeticae*, though the translation has not been preserved and the original text to which Notker is referring has not been conclusively identified.

Philosophia. In his translation of the final line of the introductory poem, in which Boethius laments the inconstancy of fortune, Notker writes:

> *Qui cecidit . non erat ille stabili gradu.* Ter dóh îo uîel . fásto nestûont ! úbe er fásto stûounde . so neuî<e>le er. Argumentum a repugnantibus. Repugnant enim stare et cadere. (7.16-18)
>
> *He who falls was not of stable step.* He who did ever fall was not standing fast. If he stood fast, he wouldn't have fallen. Argument from oppositions. For *to stand* and *to fall* oppose each other.[58]

Here, Notker first gives a fairly loose translation of the Latin line that to provide a sense of the meaning. He then follows the translation with a second paraphrase in the vernacular that clarifies the argumentative logic behind the phrase by restructuring it into a more traditional format (e.g., if this, then that). Finally, sans any indication of this sudden shift from translation to a more meta-pedagogical discourse except for the accompanying shift to Latin, Notker notes the standard name of this particular argumentative scheme—"argumentum a repugnantibus"—and gives a further clarification in Latin of the concepts being set in opposition. Across the course of his translation, Notker clarifies the argumentative scheme in this way a total of sixty-eight times,[59] thus revealing the extent to which, in the context of Notker's classroom, Boethius's text was functioning as a source of examples to facilitate the students' study of logic and dialectical argumentation, since, as previously discussed, Notker equates the rhetorical discovery of arguments with dialectics—for Notker, a subfield of logic dealing with, in modern terms, inductive arguments.[60]

Similarly, at various points throughout his translation beginning in the Book III, Notker makes note not simply of inductive reasoning but also of deductive—that is, syllogistic—argumentative structures as well. In Book III, as Philosophia attempts to define true happiness for Boethius, Notker breaks up the passage with a number of brief Latin headers:

> PROPOSITIO. *Nam quod quisque petit pre ceteris . id iudicat esse summum bonum.* Tés îogelichêr gnôtôst kérôt . táz áhtôt ér uuésen daz pézesta. ASSUMPTIO. *Sed summum bonum beatitudinem esse diffiniuimus.* Uuír éigen áber geságet . táz sáligheit sî daz pézesta. CONCLUSIO. *Quare beatum esse iudicat quisque statum . quem desiderat pre ceteris.* Fóne díu áhtôt îogelichêr dîa státa sâliga . dîa er gnôtôst fórderôt. (113.12-114.5)

---

[58] For my translations of Boethius within Notker, I have employed S.J. Tester's translation as a general guide, though occasionally—as here—I have aimed for a somewhat more literal translation to better compare and contrast the Latin to Notker's translation. The italicization—following the convention established in King and Tax's edition of Notker's works—signals the lines from the source text, whereas Notker's translation and commentary is not italicized. When Notker employs a single Latin word in his translation or commentary, I have generally tried to signal it via the inclusion of the Latin term in brackets following the English translation.

[59] For a more precise breakdown of these references, see James C. King, "Philosophia kommt Boethius mit Rhetorik und Disputation entgegen,"207.

[60] Less frequently, in his translation of Boethius, Notker does refer to a number of textual elements that might be considered more purely rhetorical, pointing out certain figures of speech or rhetorical strategies of persuasion that occur in the Latin text (for example, the usage of exempla to support a point [47.8-10] or the presence of homeoteleuton in a specific passage [49.19-20]). Most of the notes on the rhetorical qualities of the passage, however, occur within the second book, in which—as Notker himself explains—Philosophy attempts to "rhetorically" (secundum artem rhetoricam [76.12]) assuage the speaker's mental anguish before switching to the "stronger speech" (stárcheren rédon [76.10-11]) of philosophical disputation for the rest of the text. in general, Notker's commentary aims first and foremost to elucidate the logical argumentation schemes behind the text.

> PROPOSITION. *For whatever a man seeks above all else, that he reckons the highest good.* For whatever a man most intensely desires, that he consider to be the best. ASSUMPTION. *But we have defined the highest good as happiness.* We ourselves, however, stated that happiness is the best. CONCLUSION. *Wherefore each man judges that state to be happy which he desires above all others.* Hence each man considers that state happy which he most strongly desires.

In this passage, Notker provides a simple translation of each line without further commentary, but the included headers make clear the role this passage actually played in his classroom instruction: namely, as an example of the three necessary components of a deductive syllogism. After this instruction comes a lengthy excursus—set off from the translation itself with the heading "QUANTA SIT VIS SYLLOGISMI"—in which Notker explains the three requirements of a complete syllogism in more detail and gives further examples of both complete and incomplete syllogism (114.5-29). Throughout Notker's translation of Boethius, the apparent classroom function of particular passages is thus embedded in the translation itself, revealing the specific role the text played in Notker's pedagogy as well as the importance of dialectical and logical study within that same context.

In general, Notker's longer excurses in his translation of Boethius's text work similarly, introducing, in a rather ad-hoc way, certain very fundamental disciplinary terms and distinctions, primarily, though not exclusively, from the field of dialectics or else, occasionally, clarifying historical or literary allusions in the original text.[61] Many of asides introduce and define not just fundamental concepts within a discipline (e.g., syllogism) but also entire disciplines themselves. For instance, one lengthy aside—entitled "QUID SIT RHETORICA"—is, as its name suggests, focused on introducing the entire field of rhetoric (Section 10, 54.21-55.21). The material from this chapter and the subsequent ones (Section 11-14, 55.21-61.14) is—if we accept the chronology Notker presents in his letter—later reworked into the independent Latin treatise entitled *De arte rhetorica*, which might perhaps have been envisioned as a more intermediate treatment of the same material for students with a greater command of Latin. Notker's use of these largely vernacular excursuses is clearly intended to develop students' conceptual, extra-linguistic knowledge—that necessary to understand both the text and the academic disciplines themselves—but the actual content of these excursuses suggests that the translations were being used for the instruction of fairly low level students, who almost certainly had some previous instruction in Latin grammar but apparently had not advanced far enough to parse the language of the original texts or, perhaps, even to comprehend a lecture given entirely in Latin.

Thus, at the same time as Notker incorporates vernacular translation and excursuses to improve his students' conceptual understanding of both the text and the academic disciplines it was being used to study, he simultaneously uses tactical shifts back to Latin in his otherwise Old High German commentary as a tool to develop his students' linguistic capabilities in Latin, clearly showing that, ultimately, his goal was not that his translations stand as an independent alternative to the originals. Consider, for instance, Notker's translation of the opening lines of Boethius:

> *Qui peregi quondam carmina florente studio . heu flebilis cogor inire mestos modos.* Íh-tir êr téta frôlichív sáng . íh máchon nû note chára-sáng. *Ecce lacerę camenę dictant mihi scribenda.* Síh no, léidege muse . lêrent míh scrîben. Tîe míh êr lêrton iocunda carmina .

---

tîe lêrent míh nû flebilia. *Et rigant ora elegi* . i . i miseri . *ueris* . i . non fictis *fletibus*. Únde fúllent sie mîniv óugen . mít ernestlichên drânen.

I, who once made verses with flourishing zeal, alas, must now begin tearful, sad meters. I, who before made happy songs, I must now make mourning songs. *See how the wounded muses bid me write.* See now, the sorrowful muses teach me to write. What I battle, they battle. Before, they taught me pleasant songs [*iocunda carmina*]. Now, they teach me sad ones [*flebilia*]. *And these elegies*, i.e., the unhappy ones, [*.i. i miseri*] *wet my face with true,* i.e., not feigned [*.i. non fictis*] *tears*. And fill my eyes with genuine tears.

In terms of his actual translation of the passage, Notker first gives a fairly straightforward translation of the third line of Book 1 from Boethius, translating "Ecce lacere camene dictant mihi scribenda" as "Sih no leidege muse lerent mih scriben"; however, in his subsequent commentary, he repeats words already encountered in the Latin text (i.e., *carmina*, *flebilia*) but places them in new, sometimes different, grammatical contexts (e.g., *flebilis,* a plural accusative adjective modifying the masculine *modos* in line 14, becomes *flebilia* when modifying *carmina* in line 17). Moreover, the opposition here between the Latin terms *iocunda* and *flebilia carmina* reflects the same contrast set up in Notker's translation of the first line between *frolihiv sang* and *chara-sang*. His additions thus frequently function to expose students to different forms of familiar Latin words and to reveal synonyms between the Latin and German, thereby fleshing out a student's understanding of Latin grammar and vocabulary. Additionally, in the final line of the passage, Notker twice directly interjects into the original Latin, adding in two clarifications in Latin of terms in the original text that may be unfamiliar to the students (such as *elegi,*) or are being used in a nonstandard or figurative sense (such as, in this case, *uerus*, which the students likely were most familiar with in opposition to *falsus*). The inclusion of Latin terms in Notker's text appears, in general, designed to support students' acquisition of and improvement in Latin, but, at least here, in this early translation, the choice of terms remains rather unsystematic and arbitrary, suggesting that Notker was still developing his pedagogical translation strategies.

Nevertheless, in general, Notker's translative choices consistently facilitate parsing and interpretation over an understanding of the grammatical intricacies or rhetorical surface of the original Latin text—in other words, privileging his students' conceptual understanding of the texts' meaning but simultaneously stressing their potential function as tools of Latin instruction. When, for instance, we compare the Latin passages from Notker's translation to the version of them in the manuscript on which he based his translation (Cod. Sang. 844), it is immediately clear that Notker has simplified the word order of Boethius's original Latin text in the interest of easier parsing. In Cod. Sang. 844, the opening line of Boethius's text reads "Carmina qvi qvondam stvdio florente peregi flebilis heu mestos cogor inire modos." However, in Notker's rendering, the Latin text is rearranged such that semantic units appear more closely together, thus facilitating parsing for native speakers of Old High German. The subject ("qui") and verb ("peregi") appear together at the beginning of the sentence, for example, and the adjective *mestos* is no longer separated from the noun it modifies ("modos"). Throughout his translation of Boethius, Notker frequently rearranges moments of particularly convoluted syntax in the original Latin text in favor of a more simple Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) word order.[62] Ultimately,

---

[62] Various scholars have argued that Notker's syntactical choices follow, in large part, the guidelines for construing Latin sentences laid out in the *St. Gall Tractate* (abbreviated Ntr in Tax and King's system), one of the various Latin documents attributed to Notker. Grotans, in particular, has extensively discussed the role of the *St. Gall Tractate* in

Notker's treatment of the original Latin text appears designed to facilitate easy parsing by readers inexperienced with the interpretation of Latin poetic texts.

In his later translations—that is, of the Aristotle and Martianus Capella texts—we see the further development of Notker's approach. The three translations from this second wave of translation, beyond simply including more Latin terms and phrases within Notker's commentary, also include a greater amount of commentary, and this commentary is—when compared to the translation of Boethius—to a larger degree integrated into Notker's translation. That is, whereas in the *Consolatio* Notker frequently included lengthy asides of pure commentary, set off from the translation via the use of descriptive headers, he employs this practice less frequently in the *Categories* and not at all in his translations of Capella and of *De interpretatione*. Nevertheless, these later texts have, in general, a greater ratio of commentary, as compared to strict translation, but this commentary is integrated fluidly into the translation and, in this sense, is generally more focused on the elucidation of the specific passage at hand than on introducing larger, extra-textual concepts, suggesting perhaps that these texts were, to a greater degree, being studied in their own right and less so as general introductions to entire fields of knowledge. The later translations also exhibit a shift from the haphazard clarification of various generalized vocabulary in the translation of Boethius (e.g., *caminae*, _flebilis_) to a more strategic repetition of technical terminology as well as, in general, a greater preponderance of Latin text within Notker's translation and commentary. When, for example, Notker presents John the Baptist and John the Apostle as examples of Aristotle's definition of *aequivoca*, he takes advantage of the chance to present a new piece of terminology to his students:

> Sic in euangelio sunt equiuoci uterque iohannes sed diuersam sue substantie rationem habent secundum nomen. Iohannes under aber iohannes sint kenammen .i. habent kelichen namen . unde aber ungelicha . unde ungemeina diffinitionem. Diffinitio ist . tiu dir saget . uuaz sie sin. Eadem est et ratio substantie . in hunc modum. (*Nk* 3.23-4.6)
> *Thus in Scripture the two Johns are homonyms but, following their names, are distinct in the nature of their substance.* John and the other John are named, i.e., they have the same name, but nevertheless dissimilar and distinct *definitions*. A *definition* is that which says what they are. *And the same thing is the nature of their substance in this way.*[63]

Here, as indeed throughout his translation of the *Categories*, Notker introduces a new piece of vocabulary—in this case, *diffinitio*—by first offering a vernacular synonym or definition and then employing the original Latin term within his commentary. In this specific instance, he also provides for the newly introduced term a further Latin synonym—*ratio substantiae*—a concept that students would have encountered in the very first sentence of the *Categories* and thus would have already been somewhat familiar with (although it is still rather vaguely defined). Via this strategic introduction and subsequent repetition of newly introduced Latin terminology, Notker is able to reinforce the vocabulary for students, further revealing the extent to which Notker's texts seek to provide students with the abilities needed to engage with the original Latin texts.

Thus, Notker appears to have refined his technique somewhat in his translation of the *Categories,* but this trend continues even more strongly in his translation of *De interpretatione*—the following text in the logical sequence of Aristotle. Here, not only does Notker frequently neglect to include an initial vernacular clarification of the sense of the technical terms that arise

---

relation to Notker's decision to syntactically rearrange the Latin text and also the way in which the treatise is structured around dialectical principles (*Reading in Medieval St. Gall*, ch. 4).

[63] In my translation of this passage, I have italicized the Latin portions of Notker's commentary in order to better highlight his increased usage of the language here, as compared to in his translation of Boethius displayed on p. 36.

(Grotans 94), presumably because his students should already have become familiar with them during their time spent reading the *Categories*, but he also moves away from his previous strategy of simplifying Latin word order. In *De interpretatione,* instead of presenting only a simplified, rearranged version of a line from the source text, Notker adopts a different strategy that adds a third level of grammatical investigation. Frequently, particularly in *De interpretatione*, Notker leaves the Latin first in its original syntax but then offers a grammatical clarification—also in Latin—of unclear aspects before offering a vernacular translation. For example,

> *Enuntiativa uero non omnis* .I. Non omnis oratio enuntiatiua est . *sed in qua uerum uael falsum est.* Nehein oratio neist mer enuntiatiua . ane diu uuar . alde lugi saget. Uuir mugin ouh tiuten enuntiatio . saga. Saga ist pediu . uuar ioh lugi. (16.8-13)
> *But declarative [includes] not every [statement]*—that is, not every statement is declarative—*except those in which there is truth or falsity.* No statement [*oratio*], in fact, is declarative [*enuntiativa*], except those that speak true or false. We might also interpret declaration [*enuntiatio*] as "saga". A "saga" is either true or false.

As we saw previously, in his translation of Boethius, Notker primarily used the scribal abbreviation for the phrase "id est" (I.) in order to clarify the sense of Latin vocabulary that may have been unfamiliar to the students or that was being used in a non-standard way. Here the scribal notation has taken on a new role, as it frequently does in the translation of *De interpretatione,* as an opportunity to clarify the grammatical structure of the original passage. In this particular interjection, Notker's additions make clear both that "oratio" is the subject of the Latin sentence—which, having been mentioned in the previous line of the translated text, was left merely implied in the Latin—as well as that the verb *est* at the end of the second clause really applies to the first clause as well. His interjection simultaneously rearranges the word order of the clause similar to his rearrangement of the source text in his earlier translation, but here, crucially, both the original syntax as well as Notker's streamlined rearrangement of it are included.

Sometimes in Notker's translation of *De interpretatione,* in his elucidation of the sentence, he even employs actual grammatical terminology. For example:

> *Quorum autem he primorum note . eadem omnibus passiones anime sunt.* Quorum unde primorum . daz sint neutra . fure feminine. Iz chit. Eedem passiones anime sunt omnibus gentibus . quarum primarum .s. passionum . he uoces note sunt. Allen liuten sint tie uore gedancha gelih . tero zeichen die uoces sint. (5.4-11)
> *But what these are in the first place signs of, these same affections of the soul are the same for all.* "Quorum" and "primorum" are neuter forms [*neutra*] in the place of feminine [*feminine*]. That means: These affections of the soul are the same for all people, of which first affections the voice is the sign. For all people, the first thought is the same, of which the voice is a sign.

The grammar of the original passage is confusing, perhaps even incorrect. As Notker points out, there is not a clear masculine or neuter plural noun to which the 'quorum' and 'primorum' could be referring, so—following Boethius's own explanation of the passage in his commentary—he subs in the more sensical feminine forms in the syntactical rearrangement of the sentence that follows. Interestingly, then, as he guides his students further along Aristotle's logical curriculum, Notker places *increasing* emphasis on his students arriving at a grammatical understanding of the original text. Whereas before in his translation of Boethius and even in his translation of the *Categories*, Notker was content to include only the simplified word order, here, in *De*

*interpretation*e, he elects to include the original text as is, mistakes included. This progression towards increasing engagement with and concern for the specific language and phrasing of the original text both shows that, for Notker, a fundamental conceptual understanding of the text—made available via the vernacular translation—precedes any more thorough grammatical understanding of the original and simultaneously reaffirms that this detailed grammatical understanding of the original was ultimately being pursued, if perhaps primarily with the needs of more advanced students in mind.

Overall, then, the strategies Notker employs in the translations themselves thus fit with the philosophy of language and knowledge that Notker advances in his Latin treatises, in which he maintained that a conceptual understanding of language was the first and most fundamental stage of learning and that such conceptual understanding of a text was not strictly bound to an advanced knowledge of the original language of the text but could be gained independently via translation. To this end, Notker's translations of academic texts sets out to develop students' conceptual, extralinguistic knowledge alongside their linguistic capabilities. Moreover, the differences between Notker's translations across his oeuvre offer a window into the specific role the texts played within Notker's curriculum.

2.4: *In Quo Omnes Multum Delectantur*: Scriptural Authority and the Reception of Notker's *Psalter*

Not all of Notker's translations—we might take his translation of the Psalter as an outlier in this sense—are equally focused on improving the reader's Latin abilities, but even here, the reasons for these differences are instructive. Superficially, the very inclusion of the original Latin text of the Psalter alongside his own vernacular translation might at first seem to signal that readers of the text might—as with Notker's other translations—closely compare the translation to the original and thereby flesh out not only their general comprehension of the conceptual content of the text but also their grammatical understanding and abilities of Latin as a language. In practice, however, the particular features of Notker's *Psalter* in comparison to his other retextualizations would seem to suggest that the *Psalter* was not intended for such use. Notker's translation of the Psalter places much more emphasis on presenting a simple conceptual understanding of the Psalms within a Christian framework rather than aiming at any sort of grammatical understanding of Notker's source text. Of all Notker's extant translations, the *Psalter* alone appears to have been written neither as an academic text prepared for higher-level students of theology nor a pedagogical tool of lower-level Latin instruction but instead as a work designed more to be read by those outside the monastic and academic sphere.

Although it bears the same general structure of Notker's other translations, Notker's translation of the Psalter stands out from his previous translations in terms of the amount of both Latin and commentary. As always, the translation alternates between the original Latin texts and the interlinear Old High German translations, but, unlike in his other translations, Notker only leaves a few words and short phrases in Latin within the German portions, rather than oscillating rambunctiously between the two. The brief passages that are left in Latin in his translation and commentary are generally stock phrases, likely terms (*ecclesia* [11.21], *evangelium* [11.22]) and phrases (*in passione domini* [11.1] *christianam religionem* [11.9]) that would have been familiar from liturgical use to church-goers, even if they were otherwise uninstructed in Latin. In terms of his treatment of the original Latin syntax of the Psalms, Notker refrains from rearranging the word order, though this decision, of course, likely stems in large part from a desire not to

interfere with the authoritative language of Scripture.[64] As we saw previously, Notker generally maintained the original word order in *De interpretatione* as well, but, unlike there, in the *Psalter* he does not generally supplement the original passage with a revised version with more straight-forward syntax. In general, the *Psalter* contains not only far less Latin within Notker's commentary but also far less commentary in general. The snippets of commentary that are included—drawing heavily on the writings of Augustine and Cassiodorus—generally offer a sort of typological reading of the Psalms that position them as a metaphorical depiction of the relationship of the Church and Christ.[65] In other words, although the Psalms often were the first introduction of young Latin students to the written word, Notker's *Psalter* does not appear to have been intended to be used as a component of early Latin instruction for young readers in the same way as his earlier translations, since it does not include to the same degree the many tools and devices used in the other translations to develop Latin understanding. At the same time, however, since students of theology would not have progressed so far in school without already having developed the skills to read the Latin original without recourse to a German translation, it seems unlikely that Notker's *Psalter* would have been employed for more advanced theological study, though some scholars have suggested as much.[66]

What we know about the actual reception and use of Notker's *Psalter* from both Ekkehard's discussion of it as well as from its material history appears, moreover, to corroborate the notion that Notker's *Psalter* was not being used solely in the context of academic study, whether grammatical or theological. Ekkehard's poem in the *Liber Benedictionum* alludes to one of the actual readers of Notker's *Psalter*. After his introduction of Notker as the first to write in German and "make it savory," Ekkehard continues describing Notker's work:

> *Ipsa die qua obiit librum Iob finiuit opus mirandum.*
> Notker mox obiit ubi Iob calamo superauit
> *Confessionem palam fassus cucullatus . non multum dolens in corpore*
> Facta palam fassus . residens . neque grandia passus
> *librum Iob in quartum linguam exponens . nimis*
> Quem uas in quartum transfudens fecit apertum.
> *Moralia. Teutonice.   Ab illo .*
> Gregorii pondus dorso levat ille secundus
> *Psalterium in quo omnes barbaricam legere sciunt . multum delectantur;*
> *Kisila imperatrix operum eius avidissima . Pslaterium ipsum et Iob sibi exemplari*
> *sollicite fecit*
> Post Davidis dicta simili iam robore victa.[67]
> *On the same day he died, he finished the Book of Job, a wonderous accomplishment*

---

[64] Even Jerome—in his "Letter to Pammachius"—had made a similar distinction between his general, "sense for sense" (*sensum de sensu*) approach to translation and the specific exception of translating Scripture, "where even the order of words is holy" (*ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est*).

[65] For an example of this approach, see the incipit of his translation of Psalm 22 of the Vulgate Bible (Psalm 23 in the Masoretic numbering system used commonly in English Bible translations): *DOMINUS REGIT ME ET NIHIL MIHI DEERIT.* Truhten selbo rihtet mih . chît ecclesia de CHRISTO . unde niêhtes ne brístet mir (70.2-4). By way of commentary, Notker adds in a clause—following Augustine *(Notker Latinus: Die Quellen zu den Psalmen. Psalm 1-50*, vol. 8a of *Die Werke Notkers des Deutschen,* 72)—interpreting the Psalm as the Church addressing Christ.

[66] Sonja Glauch, for example, maintains that "Die Psalteruebersetzung weist...primaer auf den thematischen Bereich der *sacra eruditio*, der eigentlichen Theologie" (32).

[67] In the above passage, the italicized passages refer to interlinear notes written by Ekkehard between the lines of his poem.

> Soon after he conquered Job with his quill, Notker died,
> *making his public confession in his habit, not suffering much bodily pain*,
> having confessed publicly, smiling, not suffering greatly,
> *expounding the book of Job in the fourth language, too much*
> He made it [e.g the book of Job] clear, pouring it into a fourth vessel
>   *the Moralia in German   from him*
> The weight from Gregory's shoulders he lifted as his successor
> *The Psalter, in which all who know how to read German greatly delight*;
> *The Empress Gisela, being most desirous of his works, had copies made of the Psalter and Job for herself.*
> After he had already conquered the words of David with similar strength.
> [*Liber Benedictionum* XLIV, 230-231]

Ekkehard's comments—which, it should be noted, focus almost exclusively on Notker's translations of Scripture rather than the more traditional academic texts—draw attention to various aspects of Notker's translations. He notes, of course, that Notker had both translated and commented on the text. Notker's translation, more specifically, not only transfers the Book of Job to a fourth language (German) beyond the traditional Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, but also expounds (*exponens*) it, making it accessible and understandable (*apertum*). And yet, although Ekkehard initially claims that Notker translated "out of love for his students" (*propter caritatem discipluorum*), he also notes that not only can the *Psalter* be read by anybody who knows German but, more than that, it is actually capable of delighting its reader, a comment which suggests the potential for the text to be read independently from the original as a stand-alone text and without academic betterment in mind. The poem, if nothing else, provides near contemporary evidence of actual popular readership of Notker's translations outside the monastic, scholarly sphere. Ekkehard himself presents the fact that a noble woman read the translation as support for his claim that Notker's translations—at least, his biblical translations—could be read and, even more importantly, enjoyed by anybody who knew how to read the vernacular.

Similarly, in the most complete manuscript version of the text (Cod. Sang. 21),[68] a set of interlinear glosses from a secondary reader appears as even further evidence that the people who were interacting with this version of the Psalter had very little, if any, capacity to understand Latin. Though occasionally the interlinear comments seem to function more as commentary (i.e., interpretation) than strict linguistic glossing, frequently they are simply that—that is, a second gloss returning any remaining Latin words in Notker's *Mischprosa* to Old High German. Frequently, in scholarship, the set of glosses has commonly been attributed to Ekkehard IV himself,[69] but the exact function of these secondary glosses is not entirely clear. The returning of

---

[68] Besides this 12th century manuscript, which contains a translation of the entire Psalter, Notker's translation of the text is attested in large portions in two other manuscripts (Wien 2681 and Cgm 12) as well as in a number of smaller fragments, making it the best attested of Notker's works. For a more thorough discussion of the manuscript evidence, see Tax, *Notker der Deutsche Die kleineren Schriften*, xvi-xix).

[69] Stefan Sonderegger has, for instance, convincingly argued for Ekkehard's authorship (*Althochdeutsch in St. Gallen* 118-123), but, as Tax points out in his helpful summary of the state of scholarship on this question in the preface to his edition of the text, there are certain comments that cannot come from Ekkehard, such as a misattribution of the translation to a "Noricus quidam" (found in Cod. Sang. 21, p. 550 next to lines 12-15) rather than "Notkerus." For Tax, the fact that the glossator uses *quidam* rather than just the name alone suggests that

the Latin phrases to the vernacular could signal that the text was being prepared for use by an audience with virtually no knowledge of Latin, perhaps in the context of preaching outside the monastery or in tutoring young nobles.[70] On the other hand, the interlinear glossing could simply indicate a stylistic preference on the part of the redactor for a uniform style and a complete and thorough translation. Such a sentiment would potentially fit well with Ekkehard's critique of Ekkehard I's Latin poem about Waltharius as bearing too many Germanisms that required correcting.[71] At any rate, however, certainly these corrections—and their presence only in this particular text amongst all of Notker's translations—signal that Notker's *Psalter*, to a much greater degree than his other translations, was being read as a stand-alone text in the vernacular and was not functioning as a tool of Latin instruction or for the higher level study of theology.

Notker's application to the language of Scripture of his belief that a meaningful conceptual understanding of a text can, in large degree, be divorced from language of the original might still appear somewhat rather radical, but the material history of the Notker's *Psalter* suggests a greater concern that the authority of the original text be established. As mentioned previously, Notker's own choice to refrain from amending the Vulgate syntax and limit the amount of commentary and digression—and thus to more closely follow the original text, leaving less space for his own interpretative interventions—might be seen in relation to a desire not to overstep the original text. These features, particularly the unchanged syntax, would not have been visible to an audience unfamiliar with the original text, however, although the simple inclusion of the Latin text alongside the translation—far from annexing the Latin to a dependent position, as Copeland would have it—did ensure that even individuals who could not read Latin would recognize Notker's project as a translation. Nevertheless, at least two extant manuscript versions of the text (Cod. Sang. 21 and the fragmentary Cod. 905/0, housed at the Benedictine Abbey of St. Paul in Lavanttal) go even further in their efforts to visually distinguish the words of Scripture from Notker's translation and commentary. In Cod. Sang. 21—a twelfth century manuscript—while Notker's own words are written in a standard black ink, the words of Scripture are entirely rubricated, set off from the rest of the text in a bright red ink. Though the descriptive section headings are rubricated in manuscripts of many of Notker's other translations, no other manuscript visually distinguishes the original text from Notker's translation and commentary in this way. The remaining one page fragment of Notker's *Psalter* in Cod. 905/0— also from the twelfth century—similarly distinguishes the Vulgate text by enlarging it such that the Latin is "zwei- bis dreimal so groß ist wie der normale Text" (Tax, *NP* XXVIII). Also like Cod. Sang. 21, Cod. 905/0 similarly includes a set of interlinear glosses, mainly in the vernacular, though not an identical set, a feature unique to only these two versions of Notker's *Psalter.* That the scribes took greater care to visually distinguish the words of Scripture from the

---

Noricus is not simply a miscopying of the same set of glosses in an older manuscript (XLII, footnot 71), but I would suggest that the Noricus's comment is likely a corruption of Notker's name and that the glossator—whether Ekkehard or not—referred to "a certain Notker" and not just "Notker" in order to distinguish Notker III from the other monks of the same name who had preceded him at the Abbey.

[70] If Ekkehard was indeed the glossator, he had previously served as a schoolmaster at the cathedral school in Mainz from 1022 to 1031, so an interest in developing functional teaching texts for Scripture as well as the traditional academic canon would make sense.

[71] More specifically, in CSG 80 (p. 168 in Haefele's edition), Ekkehard IV writes of Ekkehard I: "Scripsit et in scolis metrice magistro – vacillanter quidem, quia in affectione, non in habitu erat puer – vitam Waltharii manufortis. Quam Magontie positi, Aribone archiepiscopo iubente pro posse et nosse nostro correximus; barbaries enim et idiomata eius Teutonem adhuc affectantem repente Latinum fieri non patiuntur."

translation in precisely the same manuscripts that have interlinear vernacular glosses might further be taken to suggest that these texts were indeed being read by individuals with little to no command of Latin, since such visual interventions would make it immediately obvious to a non-Latin speaking reader that the text was indeed a translation.

Tax, in his introduction to his edition of the Psalter, further speculates that the template manuscript from which these two manuscripts were copied might actually have been the very copy made for the Empress Gisela that Ekkehard mentions in the *Liber Benedictionum* but that she—via some sort of mix-up or perhaps intentionally—ultimately departed with Notker's original copy, which might have also contained the only version of his Job, upon which he was still working (Tax, *NP* XLII).[72] If these assumptions are true, then the theory satisfyingly wraps up the question of what happened to Notker's Job as well as of why the manuscript from which this one was likely copied would have been so much more elaborately rubricated than are the other early versions, all fragmentary, of Notker's *Psalter*. According to this speculative history of the events, the copy of the *Psalter* intended for the Empress—which, given the audience, presumably would have been more elaborate than Notker's own copy—would have remained in the hands of Ekkehard, to whom, as previously mentioned, the secondary interlinear translations are often attributed. Cod. Sang 21 and Cod. 905/0, both composed in the twelfth century, would be at most a copy of the exemplar intended for the Empress. Without the manuscript or any codicological description of it from the sixteenth century Humanist Melchior Goldast, it is ultimately impossible to be sure, but if Tax is correct, the template manuscript, too, quite likely had some sort of hierarchy of scripts that visually distinguished the words of Scripture from Notker's words, in turn suggesting that this concern that the authority of Scripture over the translation be made evident was present very early in the text's history and, particularly so, precisely when the manuscript was about to move definitively outside the monastic, academic sphere.

Only in this circumscribed realm of Notker's translations of Scriptural texts, then, might it be fair to argue that the translation was intended to offer any sort of alternative to the original text; however, even here Notker's translative goal can hardly have been to supplant the original text in any meaningful way. After all, for Notker and his contemporaries, the Latin Psalter was written by God. Instead, we must imagine Notker's translation of the Psalter in the context of a larger textual community,[73] designed for the moral and spiritual edification of individuals—perhaps equipped with the ability to read Latin, perhaps not—outside the monastery and the realm of academic studies. Like Notker's other translations, his translation of the Psalter is thus distinct in certain ways. However, though each of Notker's translations is similarly distinct in its own right, ultimately his translations—considered both in relation to one another and to Notker's own Latin writings—reveal the complexity as well as the mutually constructive nature of the relationship between Latin and the German vernacular. Far from staging translation as an arena of cultural struggle executed via rhetorical means, Notker draws instead on the dialectical

---

[72] He also suggests that this template manuscript is the same one possessed Melchior Goldast, which unfortunately is no longer extant (XLII). Goldast did, however, include a transcription of Notker's Psalm 134 in a letter to Bonaventura Vulcanius.

[73] I am drawing here primarily on Brian Stock's original sense of the term as referring to a community organized around particular authoritative text, the study of which is guided by "an individual, who having mastered [the text], then utilized it for reforming a group's thought and action," ultimately resulting in a "two-tiered structure" comprised of "a small inner core of literates" and the "semi-literates" and "non-literates" who were nevertheless participating in a textual, literate culture (*The Implications of Literacy* 90-91).

tradition to advance a theory of language and a pedagogical practice, in which the study of a text can be decoupled from the specific language that the text is written in. By employing features of Latin textuality in a vernacular context, Notker does, in some sense, appropriate for the vernacular the right to engage in academic discourse. Even so, despite this effect, Notker's intent—as his specific translation strategies reveal—is clearly not that his students engage in this discourse in the vernacular in its own right, but rather that his students ultimately be integrated into the world of Latin discourse and scholarship.

3: Retextualization as Negotiation: The Use of Vernacular Poetry in the Macaronic Poems of the *Carmina Burana*

The variety and diversity of the two-hundred-some poetic texts included in the *Carmina Burana* (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliotek CLM 4660) have long since frustrated scholarly attempts to read and understand the work as any sort of integral whole. The predominately Latin 13th century codex opens with a collection of moral-satirical poems encouraging the proper cultivation of virtue and critiquing the ever-present abuses of power within the Church and closes with a pair of liturgical dramas. The didactic, moralizing tone generated in these two sections bookending the codex is, however, interrupted by the rather more frivolous, discordant, and perhaps even antithetical interests of the second and third subsections of the codex, which contain, respectively, an assortment of love poems ranging from romantic to bawdy and a collection of songs celebrating drunkenness and gambling. Reconciling the disparate interests and tones across the collection and making sense of the compilers' decision to bring such markedly different poems, topics, and themes together in a single manuscript has proven difficult, if not impossible. As a result, scholarship has generally tended to largely sidestep the question of the compilers' intent in bringing such disparate pieces together and arranging them with such seeming deliberation. Instead, they approach the codex more as an ad hoc anthology—whose project is to collect, preserve, and provide easy access to numerous potentially contradictory individual texts—than as a carefully organized work with its own macrotextual structure and agenda.[74]

And yet, even in more microtextually focused studies of specific subsections or poetic sequences within the codex, this question about the reasoning behind bringing such apparently dissimilar texts together is often unavoidable, perhaps most notably in scholarship on the sixty-two macaronic poems included in the collection, which must address not simply the contrasting tones or themes but also the juxtaposition of two different languages entirely. Why, for instance, is a verse from a Middle High German dawn song—a traditional subset of *Minnesang* that celebrates consummated love—appended to a Latin call to crusade in CB 48? Why, too, does CB 211, a song celebrating gluttony, end with a verse from Walther von der Vogelweide's *Palästinalied,* describing a crusader's first laying eyes on the Holy Land? And, finally, if we accept the common notion in scholarship that the German verses are included simply as citations of other poems and not as integral parts of a new Latin-German hybrid poem themselves, why would the compilers include different strophes from a single *Minnesang* in both CB 151 and CB 169? Although a handful of these multilingual poems are distinct in their use of the vernacular

---

[74] For examples of the traditional, anthological approach, see Bernard Bischoff's introduction to his edition of the manuscript, in which he likens the collection to the moral encyclopedias popular at the time and argues that the choice of texts included depended simply on the whim of the compilers and the particular texts they had at hand (9), as well as Marisa Galvez's discussion of the codex in *Songbook: How Lyrics Became Poetry in Medieval Europe* (17-57), in which she describes the compilation of songbooks as a "fluid, often ad-hoc process" (4). In her interpretation, the intention of the compilers and the paradigms of organization they employed in the construction of such manuscripts never outweigh the "heterogeneous nature of the songbook" (10), resulting in codices that are "open enough for readers to use as they see fit" (19). I have argued against this view of the codex in an as-of-yet unpublished essay (entitled "Compilation as Creation: Scribal Construction of Meaning in the Fortuna Poems of the *Carmina Burana*").

languages,[75] most of the poems—forty-six of the sixty-two, to be exact—do, at least, share a set of general characteristics. Each of these poems, which appear almost exclusively within the love poetry section, consists of some number of Latin strophes followed by an additional strophe (or occasionally two) of Middle High German verse. Only ten of the German strophes included in the codex are elsewhere attested in other manuscripts, but verses from many of the biggest names in the world of *Minnesang*—from the aforementioned Walther von der Vogelweide to Reinmar der Alte, Neidhart, and Heinrich von Morungen—are present in the *Carmina Burana*, though they, like all the codex's other poems, are transmitted anonymously in this particular codex. The importance of these ten German strophes to the compilers' overall project, both in the codex and in the larger history of medieval German lyric, can hardly be overstated. Indeed, almost forty percent of the poems within the love poetry section include a Middle High German strophe; moreover, as an early 13th century codex, the *Carmina Burana* stands as the earliest extant collection of *Minnesang*, since the earliest Middle High German *Liederhandschriften* were composed in the late 13th and early 14th centuries.

Nevertheless, despite the fact that the manuscript itself makes little, if any, visually discernible distinction or separation between the German verses and the Latin verses that precede them, scholarship—though it has certainly not neglected to discuss the codex's *inclusion* of German verses—has consistently failed to reckon with the material evidence in the manuscript indicating that the German verses are indeed an integral part of the poems in which they are included and not simply as citations of loosely related poems or as indications of a particular melody for the Latin. In contrast with past approaches, I seek in this chapter to show, by comparing those macaronic poems whose final verses are actually attested elsewhere to the original *Minnesang* that inspired them, the value of reading the *Carmina Burana*'s macaronic poetry through a translator's lens and thereby more in line with the material evidence presented by the manuscript itself: that is, not as Latin poems with almost random, syntactically separate German strophes tacked on at their ends but as complete, intentionally Latin-German hybrid compositions. Though these macaronic poems can hardly be considered translations in the traditional sense, they do nevertheless enact a sort of retextualization of the various lyrics from which they draw, either by borrowing a verse from an existing text and thereby either entering into dialogue with it or else by placing the borrowed strophe in a new discursive context and thereby advancing a new point altogether. Overall, such an approach reveals a clear expectation on the part of the compilers of the *Carmina Burana* that the audience of their collection be deeply familiar not only with both the individual vernacular poems from which they borrow as well as the tropes and imagery of *Minnesang* more generally but also with the world of Latin literature, both religious and secular. As such, the macaronic poetry of the *Carmina Burana* reveals the extent of the connection between the world of vernacular *Minnesang* and Medieval Latin secular poetry and, in turn, an often overlooked but surely obvious fact that the compilers and their audience were equally a part of vernacular and Latinate spheres and their participation in the realm of vernacular poetry was not exclusively, or even primarily, as outsiders looking *in* on—or worse, looking *down* on—a rival literary world. The productive nature of reading the

---

[75] Besides the main category of multilingual poems with a concluding vernacular verse, Ulrich Müller has divided the remaining multilingual poems into two subgroups: those in which a vernacular language and Latin are syntactically integrated ["syntaktish integriert"] (22) within a single line or strophe (i.e. CB 42, 118, 177, 184, 185, 195, 218, 222, 225) and those which contain a non-Latin refrain (i.e. CB 51, 94, 95, 149, 180, 204, 205). Some of these poems, it's perhaps worth noting, include other vernacular languages besides Middle High German (i.e., Old French and Provençal).

macaronic poems of the collection as exactly that—complete, cohesive poems—further demonstrates, at a microtextual level, the role the compilers of the *Carmina Burana* played not merely as collectors of texts but in a very precise and artful construction of poetic meaning.

3.1: Previous Scholarship on Macaronic Poetry of the *Carmina Burana*

Throughout a sizeable portion of the early scholarship on the macaronic poetry in the *Carmina Burana*, the conversation has centered around questions of origin, with scholars asking whether the Latin verses preceded—and, thus, possibly inspired—the German portions, or vice versa. Olive Sayce, for example, argues in her study of medieval German lyric that the German verses that are not transmitted in parallel in other manuscripts were likely written in response to the Latin strophes with which they are paired (234–264). Burghart Wachinger, in contrast, maintains that "in der Mehrzahl der Fälle das lateinische Lied sekundär ist" (99), though he admits there are almost certainly some exceptions to that assumption. Apart from often being problematically wrapped up in gnarlier conversations about the relationship between Latin and German in general during the Middle Ages and in attempts to portray the vernacular and its literary culture as alternatingly superior or subordinate to that of the Latinate world, answers to the question of the primordiality of the Latin vs. German verses within in the *Carmina Burana*—when asked of the collection as a whole—generally fail to offer any concrete or productive conclusions.. Ultimately, the question of whether the Latin or German portions came first is likely best asked of the poems on an individual basis, although even in these cases a unassailable answer is not always available. Some of the German strophes in the codex were almost certainly composed as contrafactura written after the Latin—with new, a new vernacular strophe set to the same melody[76]—but, in the relevant cases for this study (that is, the ones in which the German verse is elsewhere attested as part of a longer poem), it is, of course, almost unthinkable that the German verse was written as a response to the Latin. However, the opposite assumption—that is, that the Latin was written in response to the German—is not necessarily valid either, since it is possible that the compilers of the *Carmina Burana* culled both the Latin and the German portions from existing poems, bringing them together as a single poem for the first time in the *Carmina Burana*.[77] At any rate, in the cases where there is reason to believe the German strophe was written independently, it is clear that there must have been some sort of motivation or creative agenda behind the compilers' decision to either compose new Latin strophes in response to the German or to combine portions of extant poems together.

Nevertheless, even in studies that concern themselves more with the function and effect of the linguistic mixing than with settling the question of the chronological precedence of the Latin or German portions of the poems, the scholarly answers have remained less than satisfying. One common, initial assumption—as previously mentioned—was that the vernacular verses served simply to provide the melody for the Latin verses,[78] but this approach has largely been discounted. Though there are some poems in the collection where the two halves were possibly

---

[76] Here I would particularly point to the German strophes that are composed in the *Vaganten-dichtung* style, with interior rhyming and mid-line caesura, as well as those that employ vocabulary particularly uncharacteristic of traditional *Minnesang* (for example, CB 162 and 170, which refer to the beloved as "Venus") as the most likely candidates to have been written in direct response to the Latin.

[77] As Vollmann has suggested of certain poems—notably, as we shall see, CB 147—in his critical edition of the text.

[78] In their edition of the melodies of both poems, Müller et al., namely, extrapolate the melody of the German strophes—transmitted elsewhere—to the preceding Latin strophes, as well (135-139, 198), but Vollmann maintains that the two halves of both poems were likely sung to different melodies (1230-1232, 1237-1238).

sung to the same melody—such as, for example, CB 203 and CB 211[79]—and, though many of the vernacular strophes do have neumes written above them to indicate the melody, nevertheless, in many cases, the claim that melody was the driving factor for coupling the vernacular and Latin portions does not hold up under closer scrutiny. Many of the vernacular verses do bear some formal or metrical similarity to the Latin verses with which they are coupled, but rarely is the poetic structure completely identical in the two halves, and, in some cases, the vernacular verses have markedly different rhythmic structures and rhyme schemes than the Latin, which would make a shared melody rather less likely.[80] In other poems, the difference in melody is even more apparent. In CB 150 and CB 151, for instance, both the initial Latin strophes and the vernacular strophes are neumed, but the two sets of neumes do not match. Though the neumes may well have been added by a later hand and not necessarily by the compilers themselves, the fact that either the readers or writers of the text found it necessary or, at least, helpful to add neumes to both portions would indicate that the German verses—at least in some cases—were probably not included only in order to signal the proper melody for the Latin poem.

With the notion of the German strophes providing melodic information if not fully rejected then at least complicated, scholars have largely moved on to claiming that the pairing of Latin and German strophes is driven by some sort of looser formal or thematic similarity between the two portions. In other words, scholars often treat the vernacular verses as intertextual references indexing a loosely related text, designated for comparison or even as contrast or signaling simply the vernacular poem from which the Latin was contrafactured. Wachinger, for instance, writes that, in the instances where the German poem can safely be assumed to have preceded the Latin, "die Vorbilder blieben in der Überlieferung zitathaft mit den Kontrafakturen verbunden" (99). In other words, Wachinger diminishes the function of the German strophes to mere citation. Vollmann, in his critical edition of the text, adopts a similar approach, in that most of his commentary on the vernacular portions focuses on highlighting the formal similarities to the Latin, while thematic resonances between the two often go unnoted or are downplayed.[81] Sayce advances perhaps the most radical version of this stance. Having rejected the notion that melody is the driving factor determining the coupling of the Latin and German verses, she instead ultimately argues that "the compiler was chiefly concerned with structural parallels between the Latin and the German" (237) and further maintains that "in none [of the CB poems with German verses attested elsewhere] is there any similarity of theme,

---

[79] For further discussion on this topic, see Müller, *Mehrsprachigkeit in der Carmina Burana,* 96-97.

[80] As in the case of CB 147, for example, in which the Latin strophes differ in both rhythm and rhyme scheme from the German strophe that concludes the poem. The German strophe is neumed, but—based on the differences in form—the Latin and German portions quite clearly must have been sung to distinct melodies.

[81] See, for example, Vollmann's discussion of CB 112 and 113 and their accompanying German strophes. In both cases, Vollmann notes the "Änlichkeit (nicht Gleichheit!) im Formalen" but maintains the two sections exhibit „Gegensätzlichkeit im Inhaltlichen" (1096), based on whether or not the speakers in the two sections do or don't desire consummation of their love. In CB 112, for example, he sees the speaker of the Latin as desiring sexual fulfilment (and here I agree), while the (assumed to be different) speaker of the German strophe, he claims, is filled only with "die ungestillte Sehnsucht nach der 'Huld' der Dame" (1096). Certainly, any desire for sexual fulfilment is not made explicit by the speaker in the German portion, but a more critical reading might ask whether the point of coupling these two portions—both of which, Vollmann himself admits, hinge on a male speaker's request for some sort of romantic, if not explicitly sexual, mercy from the beloved—might be precisely to unmask the underlying sexual motives behind the German speaker's plea that his lady "die ungenade wende" ["give up the hostilities"] (112.4.5) by effectively positioning the concluding German strophe as the Latin speaker's sentiments translated into the language of *Minnesang*.

except in the cases of 151 and 151a, where it is probably a coincidence" (236). Her wholesale dismissal of the semantic and thematic connections between the vernacular and Latin portions of the poems, though certainly extreme, evidences the shared unwillingness in scholarship to interpretively engage with the macaronic poetry of the *Carmina Burana.*

A third but closely related tack in scholarship on the *Carmina Burana* sees the German strophes of the macaronic poems as signaling a particular target of parody for the Latin portions. Here, too, of course, though such studies do at least interpretively engage with the relationship between the Latin poem and the vernacular poem that inspired it, they still tend to treat the German portion as a simple citation rather than as a legitimate verse of the poem as it appears in the *Carmina Burana*. Furthermore, such studies often advance problematic assumptions about relationship of the Latin and vernacular literary spheres. In his essay on the two verses from Reinmar that appear in the *Carmina Burana*, for example, Jeffery Ashcroft—though he admits that, in the two poems, "The poet presupposes his audience's familiarity both with the Middle Latin lyric and with the *Minnesang*, in particular with Reinmar's characteristic style, his distinct place in the courtly tradition, and his clash with Walther" ("Venus Clerk" 627–628)—fails to read the German and Latin portions as an interdependent whole, instead treating the final strophe as a general index not simply of a specific poem but of Reinmar's oeuvre more generally. Moreover, despite admitting this assumption of close familiarity with the realm of *Minnesang*, Ashcroft ultimately sees the underlying attitude of the Latin poem toward its vernacular inspiration as one of haughty disdain. "By reclothing Reinmar's exemplary demonstration of proper love in a Latin idiom," he writes, "the clerical poet implicitly asserts the superiority of Latin culture [and] unmasks the Minnesänger as the exponent of an upstart lay-vernacular art" (628). In a similar vein, Ulrich Müller argues that the mixing of languages in the *Carmina Burana* most frequently has a parodistic effect, pointing to CB 203—which borrows its final verse from a no longer extant version of the Middle High German *Eckenlied*—and CB 211 as particularly good examples. For Müller, the included German strophes not only signal the target of the parody but also function as a semantically integrated conclusion to the contrafactured Latin verses: "Auf die bekannte Strophenform und Melodie eines weitverbreiteten mhd. Liedes wurden durch Kontrafaktur lateinische Strophen zum Thema Fressen, Saufen und Spielen verfaßt; an diese wurden zum Abschluß die Anfangsstrophen der verwendeten mhd. Lieder angefügt, die jetzt in diesem Kontext eine eindeutig parodistisch-komische Funktion erhalten" ("Mehrsprachigkeit" 97). Müller does, at least, recognize that the redactors of the collection intended the poem—both the Latin portion and the final German strophe—to be read as a unified whole,[82] but his approach, like Ashcroft's, still effectively reduces the value of the vernacular material in the codex to mere source material for Latin parody and, in this sense, depends on the assumption of rivalry and competition between Latin and Germanic poetic modes and ideology.

Almost invariably, then, analyses of the function of the German strophes have presented the German strophes as subservient in some way or another to the Latin strophes—as loosely connected addenda, butts of parodies, and offhand melody indicators rather than as legitimate conclusions to the Latin poems—and thereby scorn any consideration that the Latin authors of

---

[82] More specifically, Müller writes: „Die Setzung der Initialen und die gliedernden Zwischenbemerkungen, die die Sammler bzw. Schreiber der Handschrift (wohl schon der Vorlagen) vorgenommen haben, zeigen nämlich mit unbestreitbarer Klarheit an, daß diese die mittelhochdeutsche(n) Schlußstrophe(n) nicht als Zusatz zu den lateinischen Texten, sondern beides als zusammengehörige Einheit angeshen haben bzw. als solche gelesen haben wollten" ("Mehrsprachigkeit" 95).

these poems might have had genuine respect for and interest in the vernacular as a literary language and source of poetic inspiration. Essentially all studies of the *Carmina Burana* neglect the material evidence of the manuscript itself and fail to treat the German strophe as an integral part of the entire poem, a trend well apparent even in the various critical editions and translations of the text. Vollmann's critical edition is fairly unique in that it employs the same numbering system across the German and Latin portions of the poem, rather than labelling the vernacular strophe as a distinct subsection, and thus bucks the common approach to labeling the German strophes in critical editions.[83] That said, in his commentary, Vollmann does wind up physically separating his discussion of the final strophe from that of the Latin portion with separately labeled subsections. Either approach, of course, is preferable to editions of the poems that fail to include the German strophes at all.[84]

Even in cases where the Latin portions are widely agreed to be *contrafacta* of German originals, the poems are almost never read as the manuscript presents them—that is, as unitary poems integrating more than one language—but rather as two separate pieces entirely, despite the fact that the manuscript itself makes virtually no distinction between the Latin and German portions. The codex, written throughout as a single column of prose, takes great care to distinguish each poem from the previous. New poems consistently begin on a new line, and the start of each poem is indicated with large (around 3–4 lines high) rubricated and pen-flourished initials. Following these *litterae notabiliores*, the rest of each poem's first word is capitalized, though now only slightly bigger and bolder than the regular text, with an additional bit of rubricated decoration on each letter. Though the poems have no formal titles, the compilers have included brief, rubricated sub-headings (e.g., *item aliud, unde supra*) between the poems to further clarify where one poem ends and another begins. Subsequent strophes—whether in Latin or German—commence with a small rubricated initial[85] but do not start on a new line. The German strophes, in other words, are visually placed on par with non-initial Latin strophes in the manuscript's hierarchy of scripts and indeed are designed to be read as natural conclusions to the preceding Latin strophes, as the following analysis seeks to show.

---

[83] More specifically, for example, in Vollman, the fifth and final verse of the CB 147 would be labelled as 147.5, while in most previous editions, it would be labelled as CB 147a, which might signal that the vernacular portion is being approached not quite a separate poem on its own but also not a fully legitimate part of the poem in question either. Both Hilka and Schumann's edition and Bernard Bischoff's facsimile reproduction of the manuscript employ this labeling system.

[84] In *Love Lyrics of the Carmina Burana*, for instance, P. G. Walsh gives translations of the Latin but not of the German portions of select poems from the codex. He does at least mention the German in his discussion, however.

[85] Sayce, in her codicological description of the manuscript, maintains that the "German strophes begin with a medium-sized capital, intermediate in size between the large initial [of the first word] and the small capital [of subsequent Latin verses]" (235, clarifications my own), but this description overemphasizes both the extent and the consistency of the difference between the two. In some poems (e.g., CB 138, 165), the capital commencing the German strophe does admittedly appear to be a few millimeters larger than the capitals at the start of Latin strophes; however, even in these instances, the German initials are consistently much closer in size to those commencing subsequent verses than to the elaborate initial at the start of each poem. In other poems (e.g., CB 136), there is no difference in size at all between the initials in the interior Latin strophes and the concluding German strophe.

3.2: Courtly Love and the Latin Poet: The *Carmina Burana*'s Retextualization of Reinmar in CB 147 and CB 166

CB 147 and CB 166, both of which conclude with Middle High German strophes taken from poems by Reinmar der Alte, are particularly useful both for demonstrating the ways in which the bilingual poems of the *Carmina Burana* have historically been read as well as for indicating how productive an inclusive reading that integrates the Latin and German portions can be. More specifically, the two poems have previously been read, by Ashcroft in particular, as parodies of Reinmar's courtly romantic ethos, which supposedly prized sublimated, unreciprocated devotion over the debasement of consummation. Beyond thus depending on the questionable distinction between the notions of *hohe* and *niedere minne*, Ashcroft views the German strophes, moreover, primarily as an index of Reinmar's poetic style in general rather than as an actual part of the CB poems, leaving the question still open as to why the compilers would have selected these two particular verses as this index of Reinmar's style more generally, particularly with respect to the final strophe of CB 147, of which the Latin portion is unlikely to have been a direct contrafacture of the German, since the melodies of the two sections are so obviously different, as the neumes make clear. In both CB 147 and CB 166, in fact, a close examination of the intertextual resonances between the *Carmina Burana* poem and the Reinmar poems from which they take their final strophes reveals that the Reinmar verses operate at a level far more specific than simply evoking a general familiarity with the particular characteristics of Reinmar's poetry in general. The poems of the *Carmina Burana*, rather, depend on their readers' having a detailed knowledge of the specific poems in question. Moreover, beyond any simple indexical function, the compilers recontextualize and reframe the borrowed verse, placing it in a new context and incorporating it in what is designed to be read as an independent poem, ultimately resulting in the creation of new poems that pick up on issues being negotiated both in the original vernacular poems themselves as well as in other portions of the *Carmina Burana*. In this way, the inclusion of the *Minnesang* strophes in the *Carmina Burana* create a space for the redactors of the collection—whether via compilation and juxtaposition of existing poems or via contrafacture and new composition—to engage in a productive metadiscourse about the nature of romantic love, both as it appears in vernacular poetry and as it is represented in both secular Latin literature (both Classical and contemporaneous), and to explore the theme of love in the specific context of the university and academia. Most importantly, however, the choice of the two Reinmar verses in the collection exemplifies the ways in which the poems in question were—already in the world of vernacular literature—being interpretively engaged via different forms of retextualization.

In the Reinmar poem from which CB 147 draws its final verse, "Sage, daz ich dirs iemer lône" (MF 177,10),[86] the notion of courtly love is not so much endorsed as problematized, even though, superficially at least, the characters in Reinmar's original poem do seem to be operating within the *hôhe minne* paradigm, as it is traditionally understood. The poem—attested in the *Codex Manesse* (Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cpg 848) and the *Weingartner*

---

[86] Here and throughout the chapter, I first introduce poems by reference to the page and line number of the initial line of the poem in *Des Minnesangs Frühling*—an edition of German *Minnesang* through Reinmar inclusively begun by Karl Lachmann and ultimately completed and published by Moritz Haupt and again reedited by Friedrich Vogt—which has become the standard convention when citing the poems. After the initial introduction when actually quoting the poem, however, I have relied on Hugo Moser and Helmut Tervooren's updated edition of *Des Minnesangs Frühling* (1982), which uses Roman numerals to refer to each song and labels the subsequent strophes and lines with Arabic numerals (e.g. strophe 1, line 2 is formatted as 1.2 in the in-text citation).

Liederhandschrift (Stuttgart, Landesbibliothek., Cod. HB XIII 1)—consists of a five-strophe dialogue between a lady and a messenger of sorts, speaking on behalf of the lady's beloved. That the woman likes and is attracted to the man being discussed is evident in her reference to him as the "vil lieben man" [very dear man] (1.2) and in her concern for his emotional well-being. Despite her apparent romantic interest in him, however, the lady remains concerned that the poems he has been writing and performing in her name will mar her good reputation. After hearing from the messenger that her beloved's happiness is predicated on her favor, the lady replies that she would never deny his joy but suggests that he leave off singing about some particular, yet unspecified topic: "Ich verbiute im vröide niemer; lâze eht eine rede, sô tuot er wohl" (2.1–2.2). The content of the "rede" is left open, but the lady's claim that the topic in question is such that one ought to deny such accusations—or, at least, remain silent on the issue ["deme ist alsô, daz manz versagen sol"] (2.4)—suggests that she is concerned with the effect of such talk on her reputation. She goes on to ask if the man has agreed to write poems only when she allows it (3.1–3.3) and, receiving an affirmative, launches into a two-stanza soliloquy about the pros and cons of granting him her consent. Should she forbid the poet to write songs about her, her happiness will suffer and the rest of society will criticize her for denying a skilled poet the subject matter needed to produce a beautiful song (4.1–4.4). At the same time, however, she fears that if she allows him to continue producing poetry, he will end up writing something that will call her virtue and honor into question (3.6). As Ingrid Kasten discusses in her commentary on the poem, the female perspective allows Reinmar to reveal that the women so often decried in his poems for their apparent indifference to the suffering of their admirers are actually not necessarily indifferent at all but instead worried about maintaining a good reputation and avoiding scandal. Here, it is clear that, though the lady is thoroughly moved by the singer's words ["durchaus von der *rede* des Sängers bewegt" (Kasten 868)], she nevertheless restrains her feelings out of concern for her "êre"—that is, her honor and reputation in society. In this sense, the woman, at least, does seem to represent the ideal model for a courtly lady within the ideology of *hôhe minne*.

If, however, from the perspectives of the male lyrical personas in Reinmar's poetry, it is often the lady who seems reserved and disinterested, from her own perspective—as we encounter it in MF 177,10—it is the poet whose affections and intentions appear uncertain, a first indication that Reinmar's portrayal of courtly love in this poem is not wholly positive. The messenger's replies throughout the poem are oddly non-committal, suggesting that the lady is more dependent on the poet for happiness than he is on her. Although the messenger has claimed that the poet's happiness depends on her showing him favor in the first stanza, he seems unwilling in the later stanzas to explicitly commit his friend to the promises the lady desires. To her request that the poet drop the unspecified topic, he simply replies, "Vrowe, nû verredent iuch niht / er sprichet: allez daz geschehen sol, daz geschiet" [Lady, now don't speak so unfairly. He said: Everything that should happen, happens.] (2.5–2.6). To a reader unaware of the intertextual (self-)reference in the final line, the messenger's words essentially appear as an offhand dismissal—Que será, será!—of the lady's concern for her reputation. The messenger's reply to her question about her power over the poet's writing is, again, somewhat cryptic: "vrowe, ez was sîn múot, dô ich vón ime schiet." [Lady, he was of that mind when I parted from him.] (3.4). In refusing to speak for the current mindset of the man and reporting instead only the evidence from their last discussion, the messenger pointedly allows for the possibility that the man has had a change of heart and reneged on his promise not to sing. The lady's final words in the poem, moreover, further suggest that the lover in the relationship may not be as courtly as first appears.

The lady in MF 177,10 laments the thin line between propriety and public disgrace that a virtuous woman must walk, saying "Daz wir wîp niht mugen gewinnen / vriunt mit réde, si enwellen dannoch mê, / daz müet mich" [That we women are unable to win a friend with our words, without them wanting more, that tires me]. The implication, here, seems to be that the man in question wants more from the lady than she is willing to offer. Whether this "mê" is of a sexual nature or something more in line with the values of courtly love—a friendly smile, perhaps, or a nod from afar—remains unclear. However, if—as Ashcroft would have it—the goal of the compilers in borrowing a stanza from Reinmar was to signal that he, the speakers in his poems, and the paradigm of courtly romance itself were their target for parody, it seems an odd choice for them to have selected a verse from a poem that even hints that the male figure might be desirous of a physical relationship.

A medieval reader familiar with Reinmar's other poems, moreover, would likely have noticed that the messenger, in line 2.6, directly quotes from another of Reinmar's poems, "Mich hœhet, daz mich lange hœhen sol" (MF 163,23), in which the male-poet figure similarly declares, "swaz geschehen sol, daz geschiet" in line 2.9. On some level, then, as many scholars have suggested, the imagined man being discussed in MF 177,10 might be identified with the speaker in MF 163,23, which in turn might be seen as a discussion of the same conflict as we find in MF 177,10—that is, whether the poet has overstepped the bounds of propriety in his poems—but viewed from the male perspective. The two poems certainly do address many of the same points of contention, at least: the poet's denial in the first strophe that he has ever spoken other than well ["anders…danne wol"] of a woman in his songs (1.3), for example, or his promise in the fourth strophe that he will stop singing if she commands it (4.8–4.9).[87] At any rate, when when MF 163,23 and MF177,10 are read as two sides of the same discussion, from the male and female perspectives, they seem to jointly offer some critique of courtly culture, at least to the extent that neither the singer nor the beloved is happy with the relationship. From the man's perspective that we find in MF 163,23, the beloved lady seems cold hearted and aloof, but, from her own point of view, in MF 177,10, it is the man who seems distant. Neither partner appears particularly pleased by this state of affairs, and, in the final verse of MF 177,10, the lady seems to reject the system of courtly love outright, saying "ine wil niht minnen" [I don't want to love] (5.3). Rather than presenting an idealized image of courtly love, Reinmar's "Sage, daz ich dirs iemer lône"—when read in conjunction its masculine perspective counterpart—appears more so to critique the courtly system itself. As such, it hardly seems likely that the compilers of the *Carmina Burana* would have chosen this particular verse of Reinmar as either an object of parody or an emblem of the ideological system they were attempting to emulate. At the very least, however, the intertextual connections between MF 163,23 and MF 177,10 demonstrate the extent to which different forms of retextualization—in this case, direct quoting from a related

---

[87] With this intertextual link in mind, the suggestion of the messenger in MF 177,10 that the lady already ought to already be aware of her beloved's intention to stop writing songs comes across not only as a passive-aggressive jab at the superfluity of her inquiry but further begs the question of how the woman would have come to know this fact, if not from his messenger. The messenger might simply be saying that the poet's decision is well known and gossiped about in society. However, we might perhaps interpret his reply again in relation to MF 163, which ends with the poet's conclusion that, because the virtues of his beloved are so numerous, he is unable to list them all and, ultimately, must stay quiet ["iemer muoz gedagen"] (7.9). Perhaps the messenger is suggesting that the woman should know of the poet's decision to be quiet from the poet himself, that is, via his previous song (MF 163,23). That the poet announces his intention to stop singing in a song makes him claim of silence appear somewhat ironic.

poem by the same author[88]—were practices applied already in the realm of vernacular *Minnesang* to connect distinct songs together as part of a larger conversation and to clarify the discursive context being evoked.

In his reading of CB 147 and CB 166, Ashcroft maintains that "In both songs Reinmar's artistic persona and courtly *modus amoris* are recast in the mould of Ovidian latinity." The speaker of CB 147, however, makes it quite clear that his love is not courtly in any meaningful sense, though it certainly does appear to be unrequited. Unlike in a typical high courtly German *Minnesang*, it features no discussion of the virtue or chastity of the beloved, and the speaker suggests that what separates him from the object of his affections is not his beloved's virtue and self-restraint but her other relationships. In the second strophe, he claims he can only sing about Venus's inconstancy ["de vano statu Veneris"] (2.1–2.2). This phrase can be read in two different ways. Either the speaker is referring to Venus's inconstancy as shorthand for his romantic misfortune in general—that, though he was once lucky in love, Venus has now turned her favor and, by extension, the heart of his beloved against him—or he is using the figure of the Goddess of Love as a stand-in for his beloved herself, implying that she herself has been unfaithful. In the context of the poem, the latter sense of the phrase appears more likely, for in the very next strophe the sexual insinuations continue. The speaker's usage of the figure of Clytemnestra is particularly complex, mixing multiple aspects of the legend into a single allusion:

In palestra, Clitemestra,	[Play strongly, Clitemnestra,
lude fortius!	in the ring!
unus vivit, quem non vidit	One lives, who did not see
mors cum fratribus.	death with his brothers.
cras enim est tucius,.. (3.1–3.5)	For tomorrow is safer…]

The first two lines reference Agamemmnon's traitorous, murderous wife, Clytemnestra, and allude at the same time to the "aus Ovid, Heroiden XVI 151f. bekannte Sitte der Spartanerinnen, nackt mit den jungen Männern in der Palästra zu üben" (Vollmann 1145). Wrestling imagery (i.e. "palestra" [wrestling school or ring], "ludere" [to play, often used sexually]) as a metaphor for the sexual act was common throughout Latin literature and appears elsewhere in the *Carmina Burana*.[89] Here, then, the reference would seem to suggest that the speaker's beloved—denoted here by the name Clytemnestra and used as shorthand for her duplicity—is hardly a model of courtly virtue but, in fact, has been engaging in sexual relationships with other lovers.

One might contend that the speaker of the poem is operating within the paradigm of *hôhe minne*—virtuously pining for his lady love—even if his beloved is not. However, the speaker, too, appears desirous of a sexual relationship. Lines 3.3–3.4 appear to allude to the myth of Hypermnestra, who, as Vollmann notes in his commentary, was also known in the Middle Ages as Clytemnestra (1145). In this myth, Hypermnestra is the only one of the fifty daughters of Danus who does not go through with an agreed-upon pact to kill their husbands on their wedding night. Because in some versions of the myth she is said not to have killed her husband, Lynkeus,

---

[88] As a further example of ways in which this same Reinmar poem—"Sage, daz ich dirs iemer lône"—was being retextualized in the vernacular realm, we might point to Walther von der Vogelweide's contrafactured parody "Junger man, wis hôhes muotes" (L 91,17).

[89] For a discussion of wrestling metaphors for sex in (predominately classical) Greek and Latin literature, see J.N. Adams' *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary,* especially pages 157-159. For other examples of wrestling language in the *Carmina Burana*, cf. CB 167's usage of the verb *collector* [to wrestle] in the fifth strophe and CB 56's reference to "Veneris gimnasia" [Venus' gymnasium] in the second strophe.

specifically because he agreed to let her keep her virginity, this line is often pointed to as evidence of the poem's courtly tone. The speaker's suggestion, however, that tomorrow is safer suggests that he is still hoping for consummation of his love in the future even if he has been unsuccessful up to this point. The fourth stanza of CB 147, too, uses language that evokes that used in other *Carmina Burana* poems to refer to bodily pleasures and overindulgence in a life of luxury and bodily pleasures:

Cutis aret, quia caret	[My skin wrinkles,
leto pectore;	because it lacks a happy breast.
curans curo de futuro	I worry, caring and
timens tempore.	fearing for the future.]

Though the speaker does not use the phrase *cutem curare* (lit. to care for the skin) directly, nevertheless the usage of *cutis* in such close proximity to two forms of the word *curare* calls the phrase to mind. That the phrase is repeated in the *Carmina Burana*—in the Archpoet's "Confession" (CB 191)—makes this potential allusion even more likely. The phrase had been in use since classical times to mean "to care for one's self," but it often carried derogative implications of vanity or immoderate concern for one's physical appearance and desires. In Horace, as Peter Dronke points out, the phrase is used to describe the Penelope's suitors, "who are 'concerned more than is right with keeping their skin sleek' ('in cute curanda plus aequo operata') (*Sources of Inspiration* 87). In the poems of the *Carmina Burana*, moreover, even just the use of the term *cutis* seems to have been almost a shorthand for Epicurean philosophy in general, which—for medieval scholars at least—amounted to attending to the cares and desires of the body, rather than the soul.[90] At any rate, the intertextual connections between CB 147 and other poems in the *Carmina Burana* would suggest that the poem is hardly an example of *hôhe minne* ideals but, in contrast, deeply embedded in Latin literary discourse.

Despite the connection to Reinmar and the poem's sorrowful tone, then, CB 147, it seems, cannot be read productively through the lens of courtly love. As we have seen, CB 147 itself can hardly be said to exhibit the ethos of *hôhe minne*, and even the vernacular poem from which it draws does not offer unreserved support of the courtly system. Ultimately, in order to understand why the compilers brought these two poems together and how the two might be read as a single poem—as the compilers seem to have intended—we must reframe our reading of CB 147 through the thematic framework provided by Reinmar's poem, which in turn allows the Middle High German verse at the end of CB 147 to be incorporated into the narrative of CB 147 itself, rather than merely operating as the index of a particular literary key to the poem. Although the connections between the Latin strophes and Reinmar's poem are not apparent within the excerpted verse alone, some potential tie-ins can be discerned when Reinmar's poem is read in full. As we have seen, in Reinmar's poem, the theme of poetic production is at issue, particularly as it relates to the codes of proper behavior in the courtly world. In MF 177,10, this question is viewed from the perspective of the poet's beloved, that is, the subject of the poem and the object of his affections. The concern of the female speaker is largely anxiety about her reputation, not a concern for her virtue as such. The intertextual reference to MF 163,23 might to some extent implicate the poet-figure's perspective as well. If the compilers were familiar with both the Reinmar poems, they may have already thought of the topic explored by both poems—poetic creation, particularly as it relates to reputation—as a productive space for further elaboration. At

---

[90] cf. the usage of *cutis* in CB 8, 41, 191, 197, 203, 211 (*Concordantia in Carmina Burana* 132). Of the eight poems in the collection that use some form of this word, only two—CB 19 and 91—are not either explicitly or implicitly linked to Epicurean thought. In two of these poems, CB 8 and 211, the figure of Epicurus himself appears.

any rate, like the speaker in MF 163,23, the speaker in CB 147 is debating whether he should write new songs for the world ["mundo darem / nova carmina"] (1.6-1.7). The focus on poetic production and performance continues in the second stanza of CB 147 as well, where the speaker compares his own songs about Venus's unfaithfulness ["de vano statu Veneris"] (2.1-22) to those of the unspecified others ["ceteris"] who are able to sing a wide variety of different songs ["qui noverunt varia / decantare"]. CB 147 does, then, pick up on the theme of poetic production that we find in MF 177,10. Here again, as in MF 163,23, the conflict is reframed and viewed from the perspective of the male poet-figure, rather than—as in MF 177,10—from the perspective of his beloved.

In the context of the *Carmina Burana*, however, poetic production is investigated specifically through the lens of a learned Latin scholar, rather than that of a writer of courtly love poetry, as intertextual connections between the poem and other poems in the collection suggest. In the first strophe of CB 147 (lines 1-7), the speaker laments his inability to turn away from his studies and follow happier pursuits in a way that echoes and invokes a certain sub-category of love poetry within the *Carmina Burana*:

Si de more cum honore	[If by custom and with honor
lete viverem	I could live happily
nec meroris nec doloris	and did not have to read
librum legerem,	from the book of pain and sorrow,
salutarem gramina,	I would greet the grasses,
me novarem, mundo darem	renew myself, and give to the world
nova carmina.	new songs.]

Regardless of whether this verse was an original composition of the compilers or taken from some unknown source, in the context of the *Carmina Burana*, the reference to the book [librum] of sorrow [doloris] and of pain [meroris] and the speaker's later description of himself as a student [scholaris] (2.3) hearken to an already established opposition in the collection between the belabored and melancholic pursuit of knowledge and the joyous quest for romantic love. We see this dichotomy at play, for instance, in CB 56, the first love song in the collection, where the speaker introduces himself as a student of Athena ["alumnus Palladis"] who has since turned to the school of Aphrodite ["Cytharee scolam"] (3.1-3.2), declaring "Procul sint omnia tristia!" [Away with everything sad!] (2.1). Another love poem, CB 75, opens similarly with the speaker's jubilant suggestion that he and his fellow scholars abandon their studies ["Obmittamus studia"] (1.1) and seize instead onto the pleasures of youth [carpamus dulcia / iuuentis] (1.3-1.4). The reference to grass ["gramina"] in the first verse of CB 147, as well as the later reference to giving spring its pleasures [veri dare / sua gaudia] (5.6-5.7) further evokes the typical language of the many of the Latin love songs in the collection that open with a description of spring.[91] CB 147 thus seems to position itself in relation to this specific group of poems in the *Carmina Burana* that enact a turning away from the sorrowful world of academia and towards the youthful, romantic pleasures of spring. As we have already seen, moreover, the speaker's romantic ideology aligns more closely with Latin secular poetry than with the ideology of *hôhe minne*. In this sense, CB 147 shows the poet to be dreamily committed to both the ideology and

---

[91] Poems with similar use of spring imagery to introduce the topic of love in the *Carmina Burana* are too numerous to list in full. Indeed, most of the poems in the love poetry section work with some variation of this theme. For a more precise comparison of the language, see the entries for "gramina" and "ver" in the *Concordantia in Carmina Burana.*

the imagery of Latin secular poetry, not merely rehashing vernacular courtly ideology in Latin terms.

In evoking this specific background of Latin love poetry, the speaker of CB 147 denotes himself as a member of the culture from which it springs but simultaneously sets himself up in opposition to the speakers of most other such poems. CB 147 might, thus, be further linked to the two Reinmar poems in their similar awareness of and concern for the opinions of the rest of society, although CB 147 reexamines this theme, again, in the context of Latin, scholarly culture. More specifically, throughout the poem, the speaker frames his endeavors in love and poetry specifically in relation to those of his peers. Though it is customary—as his use of the phrase "de more" indicates—for the arrival of spring to inspire amatory thoughts and songs in the mind of a young scholar, our speaker in CB 147 nevertheless finds himself unable to extricate himself from his academic pursuits so as to offer new songs to the world. His peers, on the other hand, "noverunt varia / decantare, veri dare sua gaudia" [know how to sing a variety of songs and to give to spring its pleasures] (2.5-2.7). The Latin portion of the poem closes, moreover, not with a typical courtly love poem's praise of the beloved's beauty or virtue but with a final expression of the speaker's self-doubt: "Nequeo cum talibus / accubare vel durare / sub rivalibus" [I cannot sit at the table with such people, nor can I hold up among such rivals] (4.5-4.7). Throughout the poem, the speaker's focus is almost exclusively on his rivals, rather than on the beloved, who is not even mentioned until the second verse and is named and described only via classical allusions (e.g. Veneris 2.2; Clitemestra 3.1). Romantic love, it seems, takes a secondary position in CB 147, and the poem instead centers on his rivalry with his peers and concerns about their superior poetic prowess and versatility.

In comparison to his literary rivals, who are happy to leave off their academic studies for a time, the speaker in CB 147 seems almost too embedded in the world of academia to indulge in the romantic pursuits in which his peers engage. The cryptic references in verse three have long troubled scholars with their obscurity and indeterminate allusions, but the polysemous and esoteric nature of these allusions may have been their very point. As discussed earlier, with the Clytemnestra/Hypermnestra allusion in the third verse, the speaker conflates two very different, even actively contradictory figures—a murderous wife and, as Vollmann puts it, "ein männerscheues Mädchen" (1145)—and thereby demonstrates a deep familiarity with and command of Latin literary knowledge. The exemplum the speaker choses to evidence his claim—that is, that there is hope for future success with his Clytemnestra, despite his past failures—seems an almost purposefully arcane reference:

Cras enim est tucius,	[For tomorrow is safer,
si me vocet – sane docet	if I should be called – as Quintus
Quintus Mutius. (3.5-3.7)	Mutius truly teaches.]

Here, the speaker once again uses the language of academia ("docet") and refers to a lesson he has presumably come across in his studies. Whom exactly the speaker intends to refer to in this passage remains unclear, however. Vollmann posits the "bei Cicero häufig erwähnten" Pontifex Maximus Quintus Mucius Scaevola (1344),[92] who was publicly murdered in 82 BCE, but Quintus Mucius's relevance appears tenuous at best. At any rate, even if the exact referent and intended implication of the allusion cannot be determined, the speaker's reliance on a historical

---

[92] A secondary hand in the manuscript, which provides Mucius as an interlinear correction to the original Mutius, corroborates this interpretation, but whether this refers to the Pontifex maximus Quintus Mucius or to Quintus Mucius Scaevola the Augur, an orator who had trained Cicero among others and had been featured as an interlocutor in three of his works (*De Oratore, De amicitial*, and *De republica*) remains unclear.

authority known only through the works of another author—a source perhaps as unfamiliar to most medieval readers as to readers today—seems calculated to demonstrate the depth of the speaker's knowledge of classical culture more than anything else. Ultimately, the speaker of CB 147 comes across as something of a bookish Latin student, too entrenched in the study of classical literature to integrate himself socially with his peers or with the object of his affections.

The Reinmar strophe at the end of CB 147 does serve as an index of Reinmar's poem more generally, allowing the shared thematic interests of the two poems to be discerned, but, at the same time, this final verse appears as a natural conclusion to the poem's Latin strophes. Viewed in conjunction with the speaker's continual refocusing on his own sorrows in the context of his rivals' happier exploits, however, the German strophe expresses a markedly different relationship between the speakers in CB 147 than it did at the head of MF 177,10. Rather than serving as a mere messenger or friend of the singer, the speaker in the final lines of CB 147 could arguably be one of the very rivals that the Latin speaker has spent the previous four stanzas envying. In this context, the messenger's response to the woman's inquiry about the poet's happiness comes across as the attempt of a romantic rival to dismiss the beloved's concern for the poet. The rival certainly seems to be lying about the poet's emotional status, at the very least. Since, if the speaker in the Latin portion of CB 147 is taken as the same man being discussed in the German section, then it is clear that he is anything but, as his rival claims, happy ["vro"] (CB 147:5.5). And yet, here again, the very fact that the woman is asking about the speaker would seem to suggest that she has some romantic interest in him, which might suggest that the speaker in the Latin strophes of CB 147 has been underestimating his chances with her. In some sense, then, the speaker's lack of self-awareness in CB 147 might position him as an object of parody within the poem. However, it is not so much the vernacular paradigm of *hôhe minne* that is being parodied here but rather the stilted, overly pedantic culture of academia. Unlike the main speaker in CB 147—who speaks in Latin, then as now a foreign language to all but the educated, and uses obscure literary references that would likely pass over the heads of most medieval women, even if translated into their vernacular—the rival addresses the woman directly and in German. To some extent, then, the shift from Latin to the vernacular in the poem can itself be understood as part of the poem's thematization of the speaker's inability to shift out of the academic mode, and his competitors' ability to sing varied songs ["decantare varia"] can in turn be interpreted as their ability to shift between poetic modes—that is, in and out of Latin and the vernacular—and produce poetry appropriate to any given cultural context. Beyond simply borrowing themes from Reinmar's poem, CB 147 actually integrates the opening verse from the poem into its own narrative and, in doing so, transforms the strophe's original narrative function into a new context.

The other poem in the *Carmina Burana* with a verse taken from Reinmar—CB 166, which borrows the first verse of MF 185,27 as its concluding strophe—enacts a similar transformation on its source text. Unlike MF 177,10—which maintains the same verse order in the two manuscripts where the full poem is attested (Weingartner Liederhandschrift 100v-101r; Codex Manesse 105r)—MF 185,27 exists elsewhere in two distinct versions. Apart from the verse in the *Carmina Burana*, the earliest version of the poem is found in the Kleine Heidelberger Liederhandschrift (Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cpg 357) from the late 13th century, where the poem consists of a total of four strophes.[93] In the opening strophe—that is,

---

[93] The KHL version appears as Song XXXVIb in Moser and Tervooren's edition of *Des Minnesangs Frühling*. Though I refer, throughout this section, to the KHL version of the poem as the "original" in order to distinguish it from the later version that appears in the Codex Manesse, it's worth noting that—like with most medieval texts that exist in

the one that appears in CB 166—the speaker stages a tension between his own sorrowful mindset and the attitude of those around him, asking whether he should continue to live in sorrow while everybody else is happy ["Sold aber ich mit sorgen iemer leben / swenne ander liute waeren vrô?" (1.1-2)]. The speaker soon makes clear, however, that these peers are not simply differently minded than him but also actively look down on his despondency ["si sagent mir alle, trûren stê mir jaemerlîchen an" (1.6); "…si jehent, wie wol mir fröide zeme" (2.1)], thus perhaps alluding to criticism Reinmar himself had received for the consistently sorrowful tone of his songs. Though the speaker twice suggests that he wishes to follow his peers' advice and improve his attitude ["guoten trôst wil ich mir selbem geben / und mîn gemuote tragen hô" (1.3-4)); "sît si jehent, wie wol mir fröide zeme, / sô wil ich tûon so ich béste mac" (2.1-2)], he simultaneously maintains that he would only be able to make such a change at the behest of his thus far fully unresponsive beloved. Later in the second strophe, namely, he asserts that he believes there is somebody who could alleviate his sorrows ["ich waene, iemen lebe, der mir beneme / ein trûren, daz nu menegen tac / In mînem herzen lît begraben" (2.3-5)]. In the third strophe, he again entertains the possibility that he might move on from his interest in the beloved and further suggests she might regret it, if he did:

swenn aber ich mîn klagen nu lâze sîn	But if I now let up my lament
unde ich mich des an ir erhol	and thus recovered from her,
Sô muoz sî ez vil dicke klagen,	then she would have to heartily lament
daz si éime also gevuogen man ir lîp	that she ever denied such a fitting man
moht ie versagen.	her body. (3.3-6))

The *klagen* here likely refers not just to the poet's sorrowful attitude but also to his actual writing of songs in praise of the beloved, creating Reinmar's standard depiction of the singer/beloved relationship as a mutual exchange in which the poet's singing benefits the beloved's reputation even as the beloved's favor pays credit to the man. The strophe thus introduces a slight hint of a threat to the lady: if she doesn't reciprocate in some way and the poet stops singing about her, her reputation will suffer.

The fourth and final verse opens with a similarly harsh tone in its acknowledgement that, even if the lady did finally relent, the change would simply come too late to really amount to much:

"Sô siz nû vil gerne wenden wil,	[Should she now willingly retract
diz leit, daz mir von ir geschiht,	this sorrow, that she caused to happen to me
sô ist mir lîp unmaere und ander spil;	then her body and other games would be
sô entouge ich ir vor alter niht"	worthless to me, since I was not fit for her
	before old age. (4.1-4).]

At the end of the final verse, however—immediately following this acknowledgement of the hopelessness of his situation—the speaker closes by reaffirming his ability to serve his lady well that she might finally put an end to her resistance ["nu moht ich ir gedienen wól, lieze eht sîz ein ende sîn" (4.6)]. Despite all his previous complaining, then, at the end of the poem, the speaker—in typical Reinmarian fashion—ultimately doubles down on his commitment to his

---

alternate versions—it is not necessarily possible or useful to establish conclusively which version came first or was most authentic, since it is possible that different versions were circulating simultaneously. It is likely, however, that the compilers of the Carmina Burana were familiar with something resembling the KHL version, given their general tendency to include the initial strophes of vernacular poems in their new hybrid poems. The poem, following the same verse order as in the KHL manuscript, is also attested in the early 15th century *Berliner Liederhandschrift* (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, mgf. 922).

beloved lady and thus appears to present an uncritical endorsement of such hopeless devotion, though with the veiled threat of his potentially stopping singing altogether still lingering in the background.

The alternate version of MF 185 in the Codex Manesse—as well as Walther von der Vogelweide's parodistic approach to the poem in his 'sumerlaten' song (L72,31)—sharpen the poem's critique of the beloved's callousness and play up the threat that the speaker might stop singing. In the Codex Manesse version of the poem, written in the early 15th century, the strophes appear in a different order (1, 2, 3, 4 becomes 3, 4, 1, 2), with an extra fifth verse tacked on at the end.[94] The final two lines of the first strophe are, additionally, rewritten, while the original two lines have been relegated to the closing lines of the poem at the end of the new fifth verse, such that the opening strophe of the Codex Manesse version appears as following:

Ez ist lanc, daz mir diu ougen mîn	It's been a long time now, that my
ze vröiden nie gestuonden wol.	eyes / have not looked well upon joy.
swanne ich mîne klage nu lâze sîn	/ If I were now to let go of my
und ich mich des an ir erhol,	lament / and recovered from her that,
Des ich mich her gesûmet hân,	/ which I have neglected up until
sô bin ich alt und hât ein wîp vil übel	now, / I would be old and a woman
an mir getân.	would've done me much evil.

While the MF version of the poem opened with a moment of the speaker's indecision about whether or not to persist in his sorrowful mode—and thus, for a few strophes at least, entertains the possibility that he might raise his spirits—the opening of this alternate version instead sets the speaker in a state of long-standing suffering and dismisses the possibility of his emotional recovery almost as soon as it is raised. The rework of the penultimate line of the strophe changes the syntactic value of "des" in the fourth line from its original sense as a causal adverb—*thus*—to the relative pronoun *which* and thereby changes the semantic value of the construction as well. Whereas in the MF version the *if-then* construction stages the possibility that the speaker might simply get over the woman and stop writing songs about her on his own, here in the Codex Manesse version, the possibility that the speaker might let up his lament is clearly contingent on the beloved finally acquiescing. The final line of this opening strophe explicitly stages the beloved as the cause of the speaker's sorrow and introduces the theme of becoming old before ever receiving the beloved's favor, which will be again picked up in what appears as the second strophe in this poem as well as in the new fifth strophe.

The two versions of the poem differ, moreover, in their representation of the source of the singer's suffering. Whereas the MF version suggests that there *is* a certain somebody who could alleviate the speaker's sorrow, the fourth verse of the Codex Manesse version instead suggests the opposite: that there is nobody [*nieman* (4.3)] alive who could lessen the singer's sorrow. The new fifth verse, in turn, strengthens the veiled criticism of the lady found at the end of the third verse in the original version (that is, the second verse in the Codex Manesse version):

Ê sî der werlte erzeige an mir,	daz si éime sô getriuwen man ie
wie staete si ist, sô enlebe ich niht.	mohte ir hulde versagen.
ouch geschiht ein wunder lîhte an ir,	
daz man sî danne ungerne siht.	[Before she could show to the world
Sô mac sî von schulden klagen,	through me / how constant she is, I

---

wouldn't (still) be living. / And perhaps a miracle would happen to her / that one might then look upon her begrudgingly. / Then she might guiltily lament / that she ever denied such a faithful man her favor.]

In this version of the poem, then, the speaker is not just concerned that he might be too old to fully enjoy the pleasures of love by the time his beloved finally relents but that he is instead hyperbolically worried he might literally die before it ever happens. Instead of concluding with a reaffirmation of the speaker's commitment to serve the lady, this version ends with the lines that criticize the lady for holding out so long. Also, by adding in lines that focus on how the lady's behavior might negatively reflect on her in society, this version even intensifies the critique. The Codex Manesse version of Reinmar's poem thus resonates, moreover, with Walther von der Vogelweide's 'sumerlaten' song (L72.31),[95] a parodistic contrafacture of the same Reinmar song that similarly transforms what was originally a plea for the lady's sympathy into an even harsher critique of the lady herself. In Walther's parody—which picks up the situation of a long-standing, yet fully unreciprocated devotion and expands on the same theme of growing old before the beloved ever shows any interest—the speaker stresses the mutual dependency of poet and beloved, noting that the beloved depends on the poet for her honor ("ir leben hat mines lebennes ere: stirb ab ich, so ist si tot" [73,16]) and famously advises any younger suitors that might come after him to "avenge [him] and go at her old skin with summer saplings" ("rechet mich und get ir alten hut mit sumerlaten an" [73,22]). The existence of this different version of Reinmar's poem as well as Walther's parody of the same material might thus be taken as evidence suggesting that audiences were perhaps not entirely satisfied with Reinmar's depiction of such selfless (and, indeed, self-abasing) love. At the very least, the two later reinterpretations of the Reinmar poem reveal that the poem was a common target of retextualization and reinterpretation throughout its medieval existence.

The Reinmar strophe that appears in the *Carmina Burana* invites us to understand it similarly: that is, as yet another retextualization of the same material. More precisely, the Latin portion of the *Carmina Burana* poem replicates much of the subject matter and themes of the original poem, and it adapts this material using the language and imagery of the learned Latinate world. Whether the Latin strophes of CB 166 were directly inspired by the German poem or the compilers simply recognized a similarity between two extant poems and united them in a single text, the Latin strophes do not function as a simple translation that merely seeks to replicate the original text in a new language. Instead, the same initial premise presents itself in a slightly different context and perspective, allowing the compilers to investigate the phenomenon of courtly love across vernacular and Latin depictions. Scholars, in general, have largely agreed that the poem is courtly in tone, at least superficially. Vollmann, for instance, emphasizes the courtly nature of the poem in his description of it as "verrittert" (1173) and notes that it draws heavily from *Minnesang*, pointing specifically to the pervasive *militia Veneris* metaphors, the tension between the speaker's continuous devotion and the lack of reciprocation or reward from the woman, and even to the image of the man in the tree[96] as evidence for this assertion. However, although the influence of representations of courtly love is thus readily apparent in the linguistic surface of the poem, the poem's underlying attitude toward courtly love is less agreed upon and

---

[95] For references to Walther's poetry, I have relied on Carl von Kraus's updated edition of Lachmann's original edition of the poem in *Die Gedichte Walthers*. Kraus's edition maintains the original page and line numbering of the original edition, which I have cited in the in-text citations.

[96] The image has a vernacular parallel in MF 80,5, as Vollmann notes in his commentary (1173).

perhaps more complex.[97] The CB poem, then—via its relocation of a verse of vernacular *Minnesang* into a Latin context and its transformation of the themes and subject matter of the original poem into a Latin idiom—ultimately does not distinguish between the depictions of courtly love in the two spheres. Rather, by recreating the situation and themes of the original Reinmar poem using the language of courtly love in the Latinate sphere, the poem essentially equates vernacular and Latin depictions of courtly love. From this vantage, then, the CB poem's depiction of courtly love appears not as a critique of vernacular *Minnesang* altogether or even of a particular depiction of romantic love within the world of *Minnesang* but rather—at most—as a wholesale critique of the notion of courtly love, whether Latinate or vernacular in origin, and even this reading of the poem is not entirely convincing. Instead, the object of parody and perhaps gentle critique in the poem—as in CB 147—is far more the speaker himself, due to his faulty self-assessment and his pathetic application of what is shown to be a literary construct to his actual life.

In its retextualization of Reinmar's poem, CB 166 does recreate the same fundamental situation and also matches, at least superficially, the courtly tone of the original, but, through the mixing of Latin and the vernacular, it presents the phenomenon of courtly love as one that spans linguistic boundaries, not solely as a product of the vernacular. CB 166—like Reinmar's original poem, particularly the Codex Manesse version thereof—opens by establishing the situation of the speaker's long-standing love for a particular woman:

IAM Dudum Amoris militem	For a long time now I've shown
deuotum me exhibui,	myself as a devoted soldier of Love,
cuius nutu me precipitem	by whose command I committed
stulto commisi ausui,	myself
amans in periculo	headlong to a foolish act of daring,
unam, que numquam	loving at great risk
me pio respexit oculo.	a woman, who never
	looked on me with a kind eye.

Here, the Latin "IAM Dudum" recreates the "Ez ist lanc" that begins Reinmar's poem. In both poems, moreover, the speaker makes clear that the beloved does not reciprocate his interest.[98]

---

[97] While, for Walsh, the poem fully embodies the ethos of courtly love without critique, for Ashcroft, the poem courtly surface ultimately serves only to poke fun at the notion of courtly love and, with it, the entirety of vernacular Minnesang and literary culture. Neither of these readings are fully convincing, Walsh's because it overlooks the obvious deconstruction of the idea of courtly love enacted within the poem and Ashcroft's because it presents courtly love as an exclusively vernacular product, when, in fact—as the works of Andreas Capellanus and [who] well demonstrate—the notion of courtly love was present and popular in the Latinate literary world, as well. For Walsh's discussion of the poem, see "Courtly Love in the Carmina Burana" (8-9) as well as his edition, translation, and notes on the poem in *Love Lyrics in the Carmina Burana* (186-188).

[98] The use of the adjective *pius*—which can be translated as 'loyal' as well as 'kind' or 'friendly'—in the final line of the strophe perhaps might be taken to suggest that—in this poem—the speaker's love is not entirely unreciprocated but instead that the lady has perhaps not been entirely faithful. Such a reading might be corroborated by the speaker's stated wish in the third strophe that his beloved might decide to single him out for continuous love ("diligere / amore me continuo"), perhaps implying that she has been loving him up to this point, but only in discrete bursts. At any rate, though the speaker may have previously had some sort of romantic or sexual engagement with the beloved, he still—like the speaker in Reinmar's poem—has been unable to entirely win her affections and continues to suffer the pains of unrequited love. As P.G. Walsh argues in "Courtly Love in the *Carmina Burana*," courtly love—particularly as depicted in the Latinate sphere—was not inherently non-sexual

The motif of the *militia amoris*—which Ovid had employed in his *Ars Amatoria* as well as throughout much of his own love poetry and which had been used more recently in Andreas Capellanus's own treatise on love, *De amore*[99]—is introduced in the opening line and reappears throughout the CB poem, thus reforging Reinmar's vernacular depiction of love using the language of Latin literature. Particularly when combined with the other, more traditionally vernacular elements of courtly love in the Latin strophes that follow, the Ovidian language works to equate Reinmar's depiction of a typical courtly relationship with the Latin discourses on love found in Ovid, similar to what Andreas Capellanus had done in his work.

In addition to the Latin strophes' recreation of the original vernacular poem's initial premise, CB 166, like Reinmar's original, bears a similar structure in its staging of speaker's consideration of different courses of action and their possible outcomes. In the second strophe, namely, the speaker considers the possibility of giving up on his pursuit:

Si adhuc cessarem penitus,	If I now completely desisted,
michi forte consulerem,	I would perhaps be taking care of
sed non fugat belli strepitus	myself,
nisi uirum degenerem." (2.1-4)	but one does not flee the din of war,
	lest he be an inferior man.

In the Latin poem, the idea that the speaker should simply give up is not actual advice given by other individuals around him, as it is in the Reinmar poem, but instead is simply staged as an alternate course of action that the speaker hastily dismisses. Though he acknowledges giving up would be a wiser choice, the speaker—extending the metaphor of the *militia amoris*—reveals that his primary reason for not doing so is maintaining own his reputation as a properly bold and masculine soldier of Love. In this sense, the Latin strophes, as compared to Reinmar's poem, address a similar theme of reputation, but from a different perspective. Here, the speaker is concerned about his own reputation; in Reinmar, the speaker threatens the lady's reputation but does not really discuss his own. The third strophe, in turn, suggests a second possible outcome— that the beloved might actually reciprocate his affections:

Si adhuc uellet diligere	If she now wished to single
amore me continuo,	me out with continuous love,
et michi deberet uiuere	so she would have to live for me
dolore nimis feruido;	with excessive burning anguish,
sed cum hanc respicio,	but when I look at her,
michi uidetur,	it seems to me
quod feriat me Veneris iaculo. (3.1-7)	that she is striking at me with Venus' arrows.

The repetition of the adverb "adhuc" at the start of the second and third strophes—often used in the context of debates to introduce new points in arguments—adds a logical structure to the speakers' thoughts and perhaps gives his approach an academic flavor. Like the speaker in Reinmar's poem, then, the speaker in the Latin verses, too, considers the outcomes both if the

---

and unconsummated (15-17). Alternatively, the possible suggestion that the beloved has not been faithful may be part of the poem's contrastive juxtapositioning of the speaker's use of the language of courtly love to describe his predicament and and his actual situation.

[99] In *De amore,* this Ovidian imagery appears in the very preface—when the speaker writes that he has heard his young correspondent is a "new soldier of love and newly wounded with an arrow of his" ("novum amoris militem novaque ipsius sauciatum sagitta" [Praefatio 2, Walsh's edition and translation])—thus setting a tone for the imagery throughout the work.

singer were to give up on his singing and if the beloved were ever to acquiesce and reciprocate his affections. In both versions of the Reinmar poem, the speakers consider the latter possibility as coming too late to matter, but for the speaker in the Latin verses, the notion of the speaker changing her mind appears simply impossible, as is made clear by his abrupt reiteration in the final two lines of the stanza that she has never previously shown him any favor.

Although the *Carmina Burana*'s retextualization of Reinmar's poem does replicate, in a Latin idiom, much of the subject matter and themes and even, to a large degree, recreates the courtly tone of the original poem, it—unlike Walther's parody or the Codex Manesse version of the poem—does not transform the poem into a critique of the beloved but of the lover himself, and it does so on grounds that the speaker is misrepresenting himself and misgauging his chances of success. Unlike in Reimar's original, the theme of aging and not receiving the fruits of one's devotion in a timely manner is missing in the *Carmina Burana*'s reinterpretation of the material; instead, the central tension within the CB version of the poem hinges on the speaker's faulty self-estimation. A clear contrast exists within the poem between the speaker's stylization of himself as a soldier or knight of love and his admission at the start of the fourth strophe that he wishes to impress his beloved with the power of his mind, which he himself admits is greater than that of his body, saying "Me sciat ipsa magnanimum, / maiorem meo corpore" (4.1).[100] The speaker, in part, must be playing with the original Classical sense of *courageous*, but in the context of this strophe, where the word is placed in opposition to "corpore," the term—literally translated as "great mind or spirit"— would seem to suggest a contrast between the rational mind and the physical body, revealing that the speaker believes himself to be more a man of brains than brawn. Either way, the speaker's admission that his mind or his courage outdoes his physical body shifts the perspective to reveal the disconnect between the tenor and vehicle of the military metaphor that the speaker has been using. The shift makes clear that the metaphor is just that, a literary conceit, and the speaker is really just a poet, perhaps a scholar, and not a soldier or knight at all. Moreover, a careful reader of the poem would be hesitant to trust even the speaker's portrayal of himself as particularly intelligent. He did, after all, admit in the very first strophe that love has made him foolish and risky, and yet he nevertheless continues his pursuit rather than giving up—which, again, he admits would probably be the better course of action. The speaker's remark, too, that he is giving up the whole affair to the will of Fortuna—"fiat, quod desidero: / uitam Fortune / casibus securus offero" (2.5-7)—might also signal his foolishness. After all, in the context of the *Carmina Burana* at least, the notion of safely ("securus") giving anything up to slippery ("labilis" [CB 14.3.1]) and inconstant ("lubricum" [CB 14.1.1]) Fortune is entirely laughable, since, as CB 14 notes, "omnis qui se exaltat hodie / humilabitur cras misere" (4.7-8).[101] The poem, thus, enacts a thorough internal deconstruction of the speaker's portrayal of himself in the language of courtly literature. The poem, in this sense, does not appear to be criticizing courtly love as a literary convention, and, given the poem's equating of Latin and vernacular depictions of courtly love, certainly does not appear to critical of vernacularity as such. Instead, the humor of the poem lies in the disjunction between the

---

[100] In English: "May she know me by my great mind, which is greater than my body." The original Classical sense of 'courageous' might be partially evoked here, but in the Middle Ages the notion of magnanimity as a virtue was, for various reasons, difficult to reconcile with Christian morality, and the sense of the term, in turn, evolved. Abelard, in the early 12th century, took particular care to distinguish magnanimity from blind, unreasoning boldness, consistently emphasizing the rational aspects of magnanimity. For more on Abelard's definition of magnanimity, see Marenbon's "Magnanimity, Christian Ethics, and Paganism" (90-92).

[101] Translation: "Everybody who she [Fortuna] raises will tomorrow be humbled miserably."

speaker's stylization of himself in the image of the courtly knight-lover and his actual lived existence characterized in the poem as a whole.

In the final vernacular strophe taken from Reinmar's poem, the speaker again returns to his internal debate about whether to persist in his sorrowful pursuit of the beloved, but in the context of CB 166, the vernacular strophe seems to have a slightly altered semantic function. In Reinmar's poem, the strophe staged the voices of others recommending the speaker give up on his pursuit of this unavailable beloved and thus get rid of his sorrows. In the CB poem, in contrast, the same strophe follows the speaker's optimistic commitment of himself to his pursuit of the beloved in the fourth strophe, and, in this context, the initial question—"Solde auer ich mit sorgen iemmer leben, / swenne andere leute weren fro?" (5.1-2)—that had set up the central debate in Reinmar's original poem appears here almost as a rhetorical question, ironically dismissing the possibility that the beloved might never reciprocate his devotion. Instead, the speaker appears to be suggesting that he has persisted in his devotion long enough without success that surely eventually, perhaps soon, his luck must turn. His following mention of giving himself comfort ("gvoten trost wil ih mir selbeme geben" [5.3]) resonates with his discussion of taking care of himself by giving up in the second strophe. Similarly, his commitment to carrying his spirits high ("vnde min gemuote tragen hô" (5.4) perhaps also hearkens to his claim of magnanimity in the third strophe. In the context of the *Carmina Burana*, then, the verse from Reinmar appears to show the speaker rejecting his sorrowful attitude and instead committing himself to optimism, even though—as the poem has made clear—he has no evidence that such optimism is realistic. Both Reinmar's poem and the CB version thus close with the speaker's recommitting himself to his approach. For Reinmar's speaker, that means committing to his sorrowful pursuit, while for the speaker in the CB poem, it means persisting in his false optimism.

Ultimately, then, CB 166—drawing on both Latin and vernacular representations of courtly love—gently pokes fun at the lovelorn speaker in a way very much in line with the tone and stance of the rest of the *Carmina Burana*. Compare, for example, CB 166 with CB 63 ("Olim sudor Herculis"), a poem transmitted anonymously like all the poems in the *Carmina Burana* but widely attributed by modern scholars to Peter of Blois. For six strophes—drawing on Fulgentius's discussion of Hercules in his *Mythologiae*—the speaker of CB 63 describes how even Hercules—a man greater than the gods who carried the sky on his shoulders ("uir, qui maior superis celum tulit humeris" [1b.8-9])—was nevertheless ultimately overcome by Venus and his love for a girl. The final stanza shifts suddenly from third person to first, and the speaker brashly proclaims himself to be braver than Hercules and vows to take up the fight against Venus (Alcide fortior / aggredior / pugnam contra Venerem" [4a.1-3]) by following the standard advice that only via fleeing is love put to flight ("ut superem, hanc fugio; / in hoc enim prelio / fugiendo fortius / et leuius pugnatur, / sicque Venus uincitur: / dum fugitur fugatur." [4a.4-9]). Though the speaker, thus, superficially commits to fleeing Venus, the final strophe deconstructs the effectiveness of such an approach in that the speaker's own description of his supposed victory over Venus is itself replete with sexual innuendo. The speaker's description of undoing the sweet knots of Venus and the pleasant bars of her prison ("Dulces nodos Veneris / et carceris / blandi seras resero" [4b.1-3]) metaphorically refer as much to the speaker's undressing of his beloved as to his freeing himself from Venus's influence. In the same way, if we accept the "ab amore" in the penultimate line as an ablative of separation, the phrase can be read as the speaker claiming to have removed his troubled spirit from love; however, "ab amore" might just as well be read as an ablative of means, which would offer a second interpretation of the phrase as meaning "By

love"—that is, via sexual intercourse—"I dispelled my troubled spirit".[102] Both CB 166 and CB 63, then, allude to the same stock of moral discourse (i.e. advising that fleeing temptation is the most effective way to avoid sin), both describe love in terms of fighting, and, in both, the humor of the poem hinges on the speaker's accidental deconstruction of his virtuous, courtly persona via unchaste imagery.. In CB 166, the speaker rejects the standard advice to flee temptation and misjudges his chances of success in his pursuit of his beloved; in CB 63, in contrast, the speaker attempts to follow the standard advice but, again, misjudges his power to evade the snares of love. The target of critique in both poems, then, mainly appears to be the recklessness and hubris of their respective speakers.

Viewed together, both Reinmar poems from which the *Carmina Burana* borrows are, then, already ensconced in a rich tradition of commentary and reinterpretation via different forms of retextualization in the vernacular. In the case of Reinmar's "Sage, daz ich dirs iemer lone" (MF 177,10), the retextualization takes the form of direct quotes from a different poem of the same author placed into a new context that works to bind the two separate poems into a single conversation about poetic production and its social effect on the peot's reputation. In the case of "Sold aber ich mit sorgen iemer leben," the alternate version of the poem housed in the Codex Manesse offers a different interpretation of the same material, one that heightens the criticism directed at the speaker's beloved. In both cases—as Ashcroft points out ("Crabbed Age and Youth" 187-197)—further examples of fully vernacular retextualization can be found in Walther von der Vogelweide's counterfactured parodies of the same poems. The compilers of the *Carmina Burana*, by relocating the initial Gerrman strophes into a new semantic context, can thus be seen as participating in the same discursive system of retextualization as the vernacular poets themselves, but in an interlingual context, one informed specifically by their own education and institutional context as university scholars and young clerics. While the macaronic poems in the love poetry section of the *Carmina Burana* do often include elements of parody and satire, the target of this largely affectionate critique is not vernacular love song as a whole or even a particular romantic ethos within that literary world. Instead, in these hybrid love poems, the language, tropes, and themes of the popular vernacular discourse on love at the time—that is, of *Minnesang*—are juxtaposed and ultimately equated with the discourses on love that the students would have encountered in their study of Classical literature (e.g. Ovid) and Medieval Latin (e.g. Andreas Capellanus) literature. At times—as in both CB 147 and CB 166—the literary surface of courtly love does appear to stand in opposition to the world of scholarship out of which the authors of these verse were likely operating, but this apparent tension by no means entails a dismissal of vernacular poetry or conceptions of love. Rather, the juxtaposition of Latin and vernacular depictions of love work as much to equate as to contrast the two systems and to assess the validity and practicality of such literary systems in governing the lived existence of university scholars and young clerics, who were the *Carmina Burana*'s most likely audience.

---

[102] A very similar construction, moreover, appears in a different poem also attributed to Peter of Blois (i.e. "Predantur oculos"), where it more clearly refers to the completion of an act of coitus. There, too, the phrase appears in conjunction with a description of opening the doors of a woman's chastity, supporting the notion that similar a similar entendre is at play in the *Carmina Burana* poem as well). For more on Peter of Blois and this poem, see Dronke's *Medieval Poet and His World* (281-339) as well as his edition and translation of "Predantur oculos" in *Medieval Latin And The Rise Of European Love Lyric* (vol. 2, page 403-406).

3.3: Working on Two Levels: The Recontextualization of Religious Vernacular Lyric in CB 48 and 211

Though most of the macaronic poems of the *Carmina Burana* occur in the love poetry section of the codex, generally in close proximity to one another, a handful of mixed-language poems do within the moral-satirical poetry and drinking song subsections. Out of these ten macaronic poems in these two sections combined, only three (CB 48, 203, and 211) include a complete verse of Middle High German lyric, with the others instead often including other languages entirely (e.g., Old French refrains and exclamations in CB 42, 195 204, 205, 218 and the partially Greek refrain of CB 51) or only a single word of Middle High German (CB 225). However, the German verses of CB 48, 203, and 211 are fortunately attested elsewhere, and, though the poems in which they are included (particularly CB 48 and 211) are often pointed to as illustrations of how thematically unrelated the concluding German verses of poems in the Carmina Burana are to the Latin verses that precede them, nevertheless these three language hybrids, too, can—and, indeed, should—be read as complete and integral poems. Unlike in the love poetry section, however, in which the inclusion of vernacular love poetry contributes to the larger discourse on the same general topic (i.e. love), in the rest of the *Carmina Burana*'s macaronic poems, the compilers recontextualize the vernacular strophes to a much greater degree. Far from merely signaling a melody or serving as an out-of-the-blue reference to another text on an only vaguely related topic, the inclusion of the vernacular strophes allows the compilers to use the vernacular poems to engage in discourse on topics entirely different from the vernacular poems' original focus.

CB 48 combines a call to Crusade with a verse from a dawn-song, written by Otto von Botenlauben, attested in both the Codex Manesse as well as the Kleine Heidelberger Liederhandschrift.[103] The two sections of the hybrid poem in the *Carmina Burana* bear one strikingly obvious formal similarity: while the Latin refrain exhorts God to rise up ("Exurgat Deus!"), in the concluding line of the German strophe, a woman—having heard the waking call of the guard on the wall—similarly commands her beloved knight to rise up out of bed ("stand uof, riter!" [48.6.11]).[104] The opening Latin strophe of CB 48 is reminiscent, as Vollmann points out, of "eine versifizierte Predigt zu Beginn einer Kreuzfahrt," though he clarifies that the song is not so much "ein Aufruf, das Kreuz zu nehmen" as it is "ein Appell, jetzt im rechten Geiste aufzubrechen" (986). The opening lines (48.1.1-6), more specifically, position the need for Crusade as a fulfillment of an Old Testament prophecy:

"QVOD Spiritu Dauid precinuit,   "What the spirit of David foretold
nunc exposuit   God now
nobis Deus et sic innotuit: reveals to us:
Sarracenus sepulchrum polluit,   The Saracen defiles the tomb
quo recubuit,   in which He rests,
qui pro nobis crucifixus fuit."   who for us was crucified."

Here, the speaker's language describing the soiling of Christ's tomb in Jerusalem echoes the language David uses in Psalm 73.7 (Vulgate) to describe the destruction of the tabernacle ("in terra polluerunt / tabernculum nominis tui"). Like the CB poem, moreover, the same Psalm itself

---

[103] In the KHL, the song is attributed to Niune, a different *Minnesänger.*
[104] The refrain does not appear, notably, within the Codex Manesse's version of the text, though it is included in the KHL version.

closes with a double "rising up" of sorts.[105] The speaker, namely, calls on God himself to rise up ("Exsurge Deus" [73.22]) in response to his enemies' arrogance, which is also always rising (Ne obliviscaris voces inimicorum tuorum: superbia eorum qui te oderunt ascendit semper" [73.23]). In the CB poem, the repeated use of the first-person plural pronoun ("nobis" [1.3, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8]) in the opening strophe imparts a homiletic tone, evoking the pathos of a priest addressing his congregants. The subsequent two strophes retell the story of Elijah the Widow of Zarephath (1 Kings 17), with the second strophe metaphorically equating the Widow with the Church itself and the sticks that the Widow is collecting when Elijah first encounters her to the wooden beams of the Cross ("duo ligna diu non habuit / Sarreptina; quibus ut caruit, / semper doluit / et dolebit, dum rehabuerit" [48.2.4-7]).] The third verse, in turn, recounts Elijah's raising of the Widow's son from the dead and, following the previously established anagogical reading linking the Widow to the Church, asserts the need for the intervention of a present-day Elijah and, thus, also builds a thematic connection to the CB song's refrain, which calls upon the Lord to similarly "rise up" (*exurgat*).

The focus in the poem shifts in the fourth strophe from this allegorical reading of the Old Testament to a more direct commentary on the current era. The strophe notes that "iam tempus uenie aduenerit, / quo poterit / se saluare, qui crucem ceperit" (4.4-6), referring directly to the commonly accepted practice of granting indulgences to those who participated in the Crusades.[106] However, as the fourth strophe itself makes clear, although an indulgence absolved an individual from having to undergo the traditional temporal punishment or penance for a given sin (such as, for example, a prescribed fast or pilgrimage to a holy site), nevertheless, in order for that sin to be truly remitted and forgiven from God's perspective, contrition and confession were still necessary. In accordance with this line of thinking, the final lines of the fourth strophe further instruct the Crusaders to reflect on their actions that they might receive true absolution. Indulgences, the poem reminds its readers, are not meaningful or effective unless they are coupled with genuine self-reflection and remorse. The fifth verse, in turn, hammers home this point that the indulgences granted to Crusaders is not simply the right not to perform penance but rather the exchange of the more standard types of penance for another: "Hierusalem uoluit perdere, ut hoc opera sic possemus culpas diluere" (5.4-6). The need to return the Holy City to Christian rule is thus presented by the speaker as an intentional strategy on God's part to provide an opportunity for individual sinners to atone for their moral failings.

In Otto von Botenlauben's original *Minnesang* (Poem XIII in Kraus's *Deutsche Liederdichter des 13. Jahrhunderts*), the verse included in the *Carmina Burana* is not the initial strophe but rather a subsequent one.[107] The original song falls within the genre of dawn song (*Tagelied*), which traditionally recounts the parting of two lovers at daybreak. More specifically,

---

[105] Though Vollman, in his notes on the poem, does suggest that the opening strophe evokes Psalm 73, he ultimately points to Psalm 67, which also opens with a call on God to rise up ("Exsurgat Deus [67.2]), as well as to the opening lines of the Ash Wednesday mass as the inspiration for the CB poems call to "rise up" (987). However, since the CB poem does specifically allude to Psalm 73, it seems more likely that the poem's refrain is intended to echo the closing of this same Psalm, not Psalm 67.

[106] Translation: "Now the time of indulgences has arrived, in which all who take up the cross can save themselves." Vollman, in his commentary to the poem, notes as well that this phrase likely refers to the practice of granting indulgences to Crusaders (988).

[107] In both manuscripts, the strophe included in the *Carmina Burana* appears as the third of three total strophes; however, scholarship (notably, Bartsch and, following his lead, Kraus) has generally amended this order in editions of the poem such that the "Hoerstu, friunt, den Wahter" of the lady follows directly on the watchman's opening song without interruption from the man.

the poem stands as an example of a subset within this genre—the *Wächterlied*—in which a faithful night-watchman alerts the couple to the impending dawn and advises the knight to depart, after which the lover and his beloved exchange tearful laments before the knight receives his final permission from the lady allowing him to leave. Though the poem in question includes, essentially, all of these standard elements, it is unique in certain ways. The watchman, namely, in his warning call to the lovers uncharacteristically remarks that "moderation is good in all things" ("mâze ist zallen dingen guot" [XIII.1.7]). Kraus notes in his commentary on his edition of the poem that this theme of moderation "erscheint hier zuerst" (*Deutsche Liederdichter* 379) and thus is not commonly attested in other examples of the *Wächterruf* genre. An element of moral critique is thus also present in the original poem, which resonates with that of the speaker in the *Carmina Burana*'s instruction that the Crusaders must reflect internally on their individual sins in order to truly be absolved from them, even when they have received a blanket indulgence for their sins. In the context of the *Carmina Burana* poem, the lady's lament follows up on the Latin speaker's admonition that the Crusaders reflect on their sins. Semantically, then, by relocating the second verse of von Botenlauben's *Wächterlied* to just after the Latin speaker's exhortation that Crusaders maintain an appropriate mindset during their campaign, the compilers of the *Carmina Burana* effectively position the Latin speaker as a sort of moral watchman—that is, not one who is literally waking up the lovers and alerting them to the coming day but rather one who is spiritually waking up sinners that they might properly atone from their sins before the arrival of Judgement Day. Moreover, the choice of a dawn-song from Otto von Botenlauben, specifically, might partially be informed by the fact that Otto himself had participated in the Crusades. The inclusion of the vernacular strophe, then, transforms the sense of the original *Minnesang* by placing it in a new semantic context and, in doing so, amplifies the message of the Latin strophes bidding Crusaders to view their endeavors self-critically.

CB 211 ("Alte clamat Epicurus"), in turn, enacts a similar transformation of its source material, also placing a vernacular strophe in a new, entirely different context in order to offer a subtle moral critique. In the Latin strophes of the poem, the speaker—the ancient Greek philosopher Epicurus—celebrates immoderate drinking and feasting, proclaiming his stomach as god ("uenter deus meus erit" [1.3]). The following four strophes describe this figurative god of gluttony—his temple is the kitchen (1.5), he is never sober before breakfast (2.3-4), he virtually never leaves the table (3.3-4)—and the "cult of his religion" (cultus religionis [4.1]). The sixth strophe, in turn, enacts an apparent about-face, turning suddenly to the initial verse of Walther von der Vogelweide's Palastinalied (L14,38-15,5)

Nu lebe ich mir alrest werde,	Now for the first time I live a worthy life,
sit min suendeg vge sihet	ever since my sinful eye saw
daz schoene lant unde ovch div erde,	the beautiful land and also the earth,
der man vil der eren gihet.	to which one pays much honor.
nu ist geschehen, des ih da bat,	Now it's happened, what I prayed for:
ich pin chomen an die stat,	I have arrived at the city,
da got mennischlichen trat.	where God walked as man.

The shift is abrupt, but the thematic connections between the two sections are readily apparent. While the Latin verses function via a personification of the stomach as a god, the German strophe—with its allusion to the transformation of the Christian god into a human—echoes this same imagery in reverse, albeit synecdochally. However, in the scholarship on CB 211, the effect of this shift from celebrating drunken revelry to Walther's song describing his arrival as a Crusader to the Holy Land has been perceived in different ways. Müller, on the one hand, reads

the final verse as being spoken by the personified stomach and thus as a natural extension of the Latin strophes ("Beobachtungen zu den 'Carmina Burana'" 108-111). Read together, he sees the resulting poem as a parodistic contrafacture of the more serious themes of Walther's original poem. Vollmann—who sees the vernacular and Latin strophes as semantically separate poems—takes a different tack, arguing that the Walther verse depicts the "correct" ("'*richtige*'" [1239]) way of living, in contrast to the Epicurean worldview described in the Latin strophes. The inclusion of the Walther strophe, in his view, thus does not function to parody the vernacular strophe but instead to morally critique it.

Ultimately, a reading that unifies these two approaches probably has the most to offer. Müller is wise to read the two portions together as a single poem, but the object of parody here is not the vernacular *Minnesang* but rather the Epicurean worldview expressed in the Latin portion of the poem. Vollmann, though his reading does not view the two halves of the poem as a unified whole, does astutely note that even the Latin strophes themselves do not present an entirely positive, uncritical portrayal of the Epicurean lifestyle. More specifically, although Epicurus is initially staged as a sort of prophet at the beginning of the poem—with the opening line "ALTE Clamat Epicurus" echoing the language with which Biblical prophets often herald their prophetic announcements in Scripture[108]—the subsequent strophes subtly deconstruct this image via allusions to biblical passages that specifically criticize the type of behavior and lifestyle Epicurus is lauding. When, in the second line, the figure of Epicurus proclaims that a full stomach (*uenter satus*) is safe (*securus*), the language echoes—as Vollmann points out—Scripture's warnings against false prophets who promise peace ("Pax et securitas" [1 Thessalonians 5:3 Vulgate]) just as destruction befalls them,[109] thereby revealing the poem's ironic approach. Similarly, Epicurus's proclamation of the stomach as god draws on Philippians 3:19, which describes the "enemies of the cross of Christ" (*inimicos crucis Christi*) as considering their belly God (*deus venter*), while the second and third strophes perhaps allude to Isaiah 5:11, which specifically criticizes those who drink, as the poem's personified stomach does, early in the morning.[110] In the fifth strophe, too, when the stomach himself speaks, he quotes Psalm 4:9 ("In pace in idipsum dormiam, et requiescam"), saying he seeks to rest and sleep in peace ("in pace…dormiam et requiescam" [5.3-6]). This direct allusion to the Psalms and variations of it, had, since as early as the 5th century, found use in epitaphs on Christian graves (Northcote 187-188) and, later, in Roman Catholic prayers for the dead. On the surface, then, the speaker intones his desires for simple earthly pleasures—peaceful relaxation and sleep after a long day of sinful pleasures—but the allusion reminds the reader of where such a focus on earthly pleasures, not to mention a corruption of the words of Scripture, will eventually lead: the grave. The Latin strophes themselves, in other words, already commence a subtle moral critique of the speaker, much in the vein of the moral-satirical poetry in the first section of the manuscript. The poem itself, moreover, presages a *versus* (i.e. the term used in the CB to refer to the collections of unrhymed, metered verse on a particular topic found at various points throughout the text) that advises moderation in eating and drinking (CB 212), further helping to make clear that the target

---

[108] Vollmann points to Jeremiah 2.2, Habakkuk 1.1, Zachariah 1.14 and Matthew 3.3 as examples (1237).

[109] In his commentary, Vollmann notes two particular moments in Scripture (1 Thessalonians 5:3 and Jeremiah 6:13) in which promises of peace are specifically labeled as warning signs of a false prophet and followingly argues that with the allusions "entlarvt sich Epikur als Lügenprophet und der Gedicht als Ironie" (1237).

[110] In the Vulgate: "Vae qui consurgitis mane ad ebrietatem sectandam, et potandum usque ad vesperam, ut vino aestuetis!"

of parody is not the religious songs themselves, but instead the viewpoint portrayed in the Latin strophes that precede the vernacular conclusion.

The final German strophe continues this vein of criticism of the Epicurean lifestyle via the recontextualization and resignification of Scripture but now using a piece of vernacular religious poetry rather than the language of the Bible. Müller, as previously noted, reads this verse as a semantically integrated conclusion to the Latin strophes but also sees it as being spoken by the personified stomach who speaks in the fifth strophe. However, the Walther strophe perhaps makes the most sense when it is attributed to Epicurus, who has undeniably already spoken in the first strophe and possibly goes on to speak in the subsequent three strophes.[111] The final three lines of the Walther strophe—"nu ist geschehen, des ih da bat, / ich pin chomen an die stat, / da got mennischlichen trat"—appear, in the context of this poem, to refer back to Epicurus's opening proclamation that his God will be his stomach ("uenter deus meus erit" [1.3]). That is to say, what he has prophesized in the beginning of the poem—using the future tense—has by the end of the poem now happened ("nu ist geschehen"). The personified stomach's direct speech in the intervening fifth strophe might be understood as a sort of reverse incarnation of the poem's stomach-as-God dictum—not God made into flesh, but flesh made into God—that Epicurus had initially foretold. With his opening prophecy thus fulfilled, Epicurus has arrived in the final strophe in a metaphorical Promised Land, where God reigns in the particularly human form of a stomach, a grotesque reinterpretation of the original sense of Walther's poem. Vollmann's argument that the concluding Walther strophe appears only to contrast a properly Christian worldview with the Epicurean lifestyle described in the poem but not as a part of the actual poem—spoken by a character in the poem—thus feels somewhat reductive. Certainly, the concluding verse from Walther does work to contrast a religious lifestyle with the hedonist lifestyle being depicted in the Latin strophes, but it ultimately does so not via simple juxtaposition but as an integrated conclusion to CB 211, using the very same technique of recontextualization and critique employed within the Latin strophes themselves.

In both CB 48 and CB 211, then, there are elements of parody and satire at play, but, crucially, it is not the vernacular poetry being quoted that is the subject of parody or satire, though it is being employed in the service of some sort of satirical-moral critique. Rather, unlike in the love poetry section, where the juxtaposition of vernacular and Latin strophes allows the compilers space to engage in the same discourse as the original poems did—that is, about the nature of romantic love—here, outside the love poetry section, the vernacular strophes are appended to poems on entirely different subjects and the compilers thus use the vernacular strophes to engage in the discourse surrounding entirely different topics. In both poems' case, the formal similarity between the vernacular and Latin strophes is greater than in many of the macaronic poems in the love poetry section of the collection. In CB 48, the Latin and German strophes share the refrain-based structure and are composed of ten lines, though the rhythmic structure is not identical. In CB 211, as previously mentioned, though the formal structure of the two halves is not entirely identical, various scholars have argued that both portions were perhaps sung to the same melody. The similarities in form, perhaps, help bridge the semantic gap

---

[111] In his edition, Vollmann attributes only lines 2-6 of the first strophe to Epicurus directly, while strophes 2-4 are not presented as direct speech at all but are instead interpreted simply as descriptions by the poem's unidentified speaker of Epicurus himself. I, instead, would suggest we read strophes 1-4 all as direct speech from the mouth of Epicurus. At the very least, strophes 2-4—which continue with the description of the personified stomach as God and, like the initial strophe, frequently allude to Scripture—are not specifically demarcated in the poem as not being spoken by Epicurus.

between the two thematically different strophes, encouraging them to be read as two parts of a single poem.

This approach employed in this chapter to the macaronic poetry of the *Carmina Burana*—i.e., one that takes the material evidence at face value and treats the final, vernacular strophes as syntactically integrated conclusions to the Latin verses that precede them—might also be productively applied to many of the poems in the *Carmina Burana* with concluding vernacular verses, even to those poems whose concluding verses are not attested elsewhere. [112] While some of these anonymously transmitted vernacular verses, as various scholars suggest, were potentially written in response to the Latin, others were likely written independently and taken from pre-existing poems, even if those poems have since been lost to history. To be sure, in such cases, a scholar's analysis of the poem—even if the final, vernacular strophe is treated as an integral part of the poem—will almost inevitably be incomplete, since the precise discursive context in which the original poem and the subsequent Latin-German hybrid poem are situated is unavailable. As we have seen in the poems examined across the course of this essay, the interpretation of codex's macaronic poems depends on—or, at least, greatly benefits from—a reader's thorough knowledge of the original poem.

Nevertheless, across the entire love poetry section—when one approaches the macaronic poems as complete and unified poetic productions—a general argumentative thrust appears via the compilers' careful juxtaposition of Latin and German verses as well as their organization of poems within the section. The very first macaronic poem in the love poetry section (CB 112) can, when read as a complete poem, be understood as equating the Latin speakers' more open sexual desires with those of the vernacular Minnesängern, in whose poems such desires are more likely to be sublimated. Rather than simply seeing the two sections as exhibiting contrasting models of romantic desire—"Gegensätzlichkeit im Inhaltlichen," as Vollmann would put it (1096), in which the Latin speaker clearly desires a sexual relationship, while the speaker in the German portion seeks only the lady's more ambiguous favor—the poem can be read as the expression of a single speaker, who first describes his experience of love-sickness using the standard language of Latin discourse on the topic, before beginning his actual verbal pursuit of his beloved using the language of vernacular *Minnesang*. [113] Read in this way, the poem thus presents the depiction of sublimated love in vernacular *Minnesang* as an elaborate literary conceit that conceals the underlying, sexual motivations behind the prototypical Minnesingers' profuse expressions of devotion to a lady on account of her honor and virtue. The next poem in the love poetry section—CB 113, which takes its concluding verse from a poem of Dietmar von Aist—expands further upon this initial point. Via its juxtaposition of a Latin lyric in which a man laments the hot and cold behavior of his beloved with a vernacular strophe in which a woman laments her separation from her beloved, the poem emphasizes that it is not just men, but women, too, who are subject to sexual desire and that what looks like reticence or even callousness on the part of the lady is often a product social constraints rather than a reflection of her genuine desires. Here, of course, the two portions of the poem cannot be attributed to a single speaker, but the *Wechsel*-structure—that is, featuring monologues from both a male and female

---

[112] I would particularly point to CB poems 112, 135, 152, 153, 163, 164, 165, 175, 178, 179, and 182 as potentially meriting from a reading that integrates the German and Latin sections into a single poem. Many of the poems with vernacular stanzas attested elsewhere would, of course, also benefit from such an approach.

[113] The final Latin strophe, moreover, opens with the speaker's description of himself as bidding his beloved be agreeable or courteous— "Sed iam postulo, / quod sis facilis / uirgo" (3.1-3)—which is, after all, exactly what we see the speaker doing in the following strophe as well.

speaker who are not directly addressing each other—is precedented already within *Minnesang* and was, in fact, employed by Dietmar von Aist.

In this context—that is, one in which declarations of romantic love in *Minnesang* are consistently equated with expressions of sexual desires in Latin clerical poetry and the distinction between the two approaches to love is thereby deconstructed—the codex's inclusion of Reinmar's poetry does more than simply signal him as a particular target of poetic parody. Indeed, we see the compilers of the *Carmina Burana* engaging in dialogue with Reinmar on precisely the same themes. In CB 147, the hybrid-Latin-German poem picks up on the themes of poetic production and the concern about the effect of said poetry on one's reputation in society, but, via the incorporation of the poem in a new context, tackles these same issues from an alternative perspective (i.e., that of the poet—and specifically, a young university student— versus that of the beloved). CB 166 likewise juxtaposes vernacular and Latin models of courtly love and, via this juxtaposition, questions the applicability of the lessons learned from courtly love poetry to an individual's actual, lived experience with love. Similarly, rather than reading the codex's inclusion of the two verses from Walther's *Sumerlaten* song in CB 151 and 169 simply as an endorsement of reciprocated, consummated love as Ashcroft would presumably have us do, we might instead understand these two poems as arguing that—even in cases where love is portrayed as natural (as in CB 151) or specifically as mutually reciprocated (as in CB 169)—still there is ample room for discord and suffering.

The *Carmina Burana*'s collection of secular Latin poetry, which is the largest of its kind, certainly testifies to the competing literary systems and their corresponding traditions— Classical, Christian, and vernacular lyric—that were all at play in the world of a medieval scholar in the early 13th century, but the collection also functions as a space for the compilers to juxtapose, compare, and, indeed, sometimes even critique the various claims of these differing literary contexts. Although, both inside and outside of the *Carmina Burana*'s love poetry section, the inclusion of the vernacular lyrics often does work to comedic effect, the target of parody is never specifically the vernacular, as such. Instead, even in the most frivolous and inappropriate-seeming portions of the collection, the compilers turn their sardonic humor and sharply critical eyes on themselves and the moral shortcomings of their own community, and it is often precisely in the interplay between Latin and vernacular where these subtle critiques are enacted.

4: Fidelity in Absentia: Mechthild's *Fliessende Licht* and Its Medieval Translations

"Eya herre got, wer hat dis bůch gemachte?" „Ich han es gemachet an miner unmaht, wan ich mich an miner gabe nút erhalten mag." „Eya herre, wie sol dis bůch heissen alleine ze dinen eren?" „Es sol heissen ein vliessende lieht miner gotheit in allú dú herzen, dú da lebent ane valscheit." (*Fliessende Licht der Gottheit*, Prologue 2)[114]

In the above passage—the second of two brief introductory chapters preceding the first book of Mechthild von Magdeburg's *Fliessende Licht der Gottheit*, a thirteenth century work of Christian mysticism that recounts the author's visions of her soul's mystical union with God—Mechthild appears to be trying to head off some potential concerns surrounding the production of her text. Her book, she reassures us, is not the product of a fallible human author but rather of God himself, created and designed by him down to its very title. And yet, at the same time as the passage thus clearly speaks to a certain perceived anxiety of authorship surrounding Mechthild von Magdeburg's text, it also emblematizes many of the stylistic elements characteristic of her text as well as some of the tensions within the text that might have generated such anxiety. More specifically, the lack of a narrative context for the dialogue presents the conversation as an unmediated, dramatic event, unfolding in front of the reader, perhaps even as it happens, while at the same time God's claim to have made the book completely repudiates any human role in the construction of the text. Still, the unnamed speaker's interviewer-like questions remind the reader that the words attributed to God in the text are, in fact, being mediated by his anonymous interlocutor, often taken a representation of the author herself, although the text itself does not make that assumption explicit. At the same time, then, the passage both stages the mystical experiences depicted in the text as direct and unmediated encounters with God even as it calls attention to the inevitable mediation introduced when a mystic's visions are transformed into text. Other possible sources of controversy, too, lie simmering under the surface of Mechthild's justification here—the possibility of controversial or theologically problematic statements being put into the mouth of God; the fact that the entire conversation is occurring in the vernacular, rather than Latin, the standard language of religious discourse at the time; the audacity of Mechthild's positioning of herself, a woman, as a vessel through whom God sees fit to speak not simply to other women but to "all" ("allú") people—go unmentioned here, though these concerns do arrive in other sections of the text as well as in the introduction to the Latin translation.

A similar anxiety concerning the legitimacy and authorship of Mechthild's text persists into present-day scholarship, though for somewhat different reasons. Namely, the details of her own biography and the exact circumstances surrounding the production of her text remain veiled in mystery. Most of the biographical information known about Mechthild—that she was born approximately 1207, likely to a noble family, about whom further details are unknown, joined a semi-monastic Beguine community at the age of 12 (i.e. around 1220), and, in her later years, sought sanctuary, and perhaps shelter from critics, as a nun at the monastery of Helfta,—is gleaned from autobiographical statements both within her own text and within the translators' prologue that precedes the Latin edition of the text. Even the broader spiritual allegiances of the

---

[114] In English: "Oh Lord God, who made this book?" "I made it in my powerlessness, because I cannot hold myself back from my gifts." "Oh Lord, what should this book be called such that it honors only you?" "It should be called 'A Flowing Light of My Godhood in All of the Hearts That Live without Falsehood." For the Middle High German text, I have relied on Gisela Vollmann-Profe's edition of the text. The English translations of MHG passages are my own, except where otherwise noted, but are informed by Frank Tobin's translation.

Helfta monastery remain a subject of much debate in scholarship.[115] However, as various scholars have discussed, the depiction of Mechthild, particularly that in the Latin prologue, draws heavily on certain tropes of hagiographic writings and is thus perhaps not an entirely accurate source of historical information. Similarly, her own writings—far more literary than they are archival—can hardly be taken as a reliable historical source about the author herself.[116] The circumstances surrounding the production of Mechthild's text are equally enigmatic. In her text, she claims she was bidden to write down her visions by her confessor,[117] but—as Gisela Vollmann-Profe points out in her notes on the passage in her edition of the text (767)—this claim might be primarily a preemptive defense against potential accusations of arrogance for presuming to think her visions valuable enough to preserve and distribute as it is a genuine description of the process by which her mystical visions became text. In a similar way, Mechthild's claims not to know Latin might actually be intended as a justification for writing in the vernacular, rather than as a legitimate assessment of her actual linguistic abilities.

Beyond these uncertainties, moreover, Mechthild's text also poses something of a problem to modern readers and scholars in that, regardless of which version of the text one might undertake to read, the work can only be encountered as a translation. Although Mechthild supposedly composed the text in her native language—judging from the remarks of Heinrich von Nördlingen, apparently a dialect of Middle Low German—no manuscripts remain extant today that contain her original text.[118] Fortunately, however, Mechthild's *Fliessende Licht* is preserved in two major translations: the Latin *Lux Divinitatis* (*LD*) and the Middle High German *Fliessende Licht der Gottheit* (*FL*).

The earlier of the two translations, entitled the *Lux Divinitatis* (*LD*), contains only the first six books of Mechthild's seven volume work and was likely compiled and translated during Mechthild's own lifetime, perhaps, in part, by her spiritual advisor and confessor Heinrich von

---

[115] Namely, although today the monastery of Helfta is Cistercian, the monastery's spiritual allegiances in the Middle Ages are harder to place. The monastery, formed in the mid-thirteenth century, could not have been formally included in the Cistercian order, which stopped accepting new monasteries of nuns into its order at the beginning of the thirteenth century (Marnau, "Introduction" to *Gertrude of Helfta: The Herald of Divine* Love 10), but the nuns there were nevertheless heavily influenced by Cistercian practice and the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux. The spiritual advisors of the nuns at Helfta were Dominicans, adding a further complication to the question. Ultimately, as Caroline Walker Bynum notes in *Holy Food, Holy Fast*, "the earlier controversy over whether Helfta was Benedictine or Cistercian is a meaningless question given the nature of thirteenth-century monasticism for women" (174, Footnote 13).

[116] Though the veracity of the autobiographical specifics in Mechthild's text long went unquestioned in scholarship, and the *FL* was read by scholars (such as Herbert Grundmann) as a legitimate source of information about both the author's life as well as about the nature of women's religious movements and practices in the Middle Ages, later scholars—Ursula Peters, Siegfried Ringler, and others—have criticized these autobiographical and historical approaches to Mechthild's work and have elected instead to approach the text as a literary text. Christa Ortmann in "Buch der Minne" provides an excellent overview of these three major waves of scholarly interest (i.e. biographical, mystical, literary) in Mechthild's writings (163-169).

[117] See *FL* IV.2; *LD* Pro. 4

[118] A back-translation of the Latin *Lux Divinitatis* into Middle Low German—extant in a single manuscript dated to 1517 (Cod. Nr. 175 [Zentralbibliothek Luzern]) does, however, exist, but it follows the text of the Latin translation extremely strictly, and thus does not offer any better approximation of Mechthild's original Middle Low German text.

Halle.[119] The absence of the seventh book in the *LD* is generally taken in scholarship as evidence that the manuscript was prepared in the mid- to late-13th century—that is, likely while Mechthild was still alive[120] —even if the translator's introduction to the text, likely added sometime after the translation project had been completed, figures Mechthild as an already dead saint (*LD* Prologue 1.45-47). The Latin text of the *Lux Divinitatis* is attested in full in only a single manuscript (Basel, Universitaetsbibliothek Cod. B IX 11, fol. 51r-91va), which dates to the first half of the 14th century,[121] though the fragmentary transmission suggests a wider readership than might otherwise be assumed.[122] The exact provenance of the Basel codex is unclear. Though it belonged to the Dominican monastery in Basel, there is some debate in scholarship as to whether the manuscript was originally penned in Basel or simply sent from further north. What is clear, however, from the version of the *LD* that appears in Cod. B IX 11—annotated throughout with marginalia from a number of different hands, most of which date to the third quarter of the 14th century (Nemes, "Additional Description")—is the great interest with which contemporaneous readers approached Mechthild's text as well as their familiarity with the German version of Mechthild's text, which the redactors often use to correct and clarify difficult passages in the *LD*.

A somewhat later translation of the work—this time into Middle High German and including all seven books, the last of which was likely composed after the Latin translation of the initial six books—was prepared in the mid-fourteenth century by Heinrich von Nördlingen,[123] a priest and spiritual advisor of a group of nuns, including the mystic Margarete Ebner. In Heinrich's description of the translation project in a letter sent in 1345 to Ebner, apparently alongside a now lost copy of the translation itself, he does not provide much detail about Mechthild's specific dialect,[124] though he does praise the linguistic surface and the expressive power of the original, describing the text as the "lustigistz tützsch…und das innerlichst rürend minenschosz, das ich in tüttzscher sprach ie gelas" (Strauch, *Margaretha Ebner und Heinrich von Nördlingen,* Letter XLIII).[125] Heinrich is equally vague about his own strategy in translating the text, commenting only that the original text "ward uns gar in fremdem tützsch gelichen, das

---

[119] There exists in scholarship considerable debate about the whether Halle was involved with simply Mechthild's original vernacular text or also the Latin translation and whether he can be equated with various figures in Mechthild's text named Heinrich. For more on these debates, see Ursula Peter's discussion in *Religiöse Erfahrung als literarisches Faktum*, pages 116-129.

[120] Nemes gives a detailed summary of the state of scholarship on the early history of Mechthild's text in *Von der Schrift zum Buch – vom Ich zum Autor* (246-307).

[121] The Basel codex is thus approximately contemporaneous with Heinrich von Nördlingen's Middle High German translation.

[122] For a thorough discussion of the transmission history of the text, including an exhaustive list of the fragmentary versions of the text, see Nemes, Senne, and Hellgardt's discussion in their introduction to their edition of the *LD* (XXXII-LIV).

[123] There does exist a fair amount of debate in scholarship surrounding the degree of Nördlingen's actual involvement with the translation project. See "Mechthild amongst the friends of God – The friends of God in Mechthild" by Balsazs J Nemes (34-35).

[124] For more on Mechthild's dialect and the current state of scholarship on this question, see Sara S. Poor's "Transmission and Impact: Mechthild of Magdeburg's *Das fliessende Licht der Gottheit"* in *A Companion to Mysticism and Devotion in Northern Germany in the Late Middle Ages*, which also discusses in depth the evidence—both within Mechthild's text as well as what can be gleaned from the transmission history—for an active, contemporaneous readership of Mechthild's text, which might have been published piece-wise as it was written and which perhaps existed as an intermediate, unattested form including only the first five books (76-87).

[125] In English: "…the most delightful German…and the most deeply stirring shot of love that I have ever read in the German language."

wir wol zwai jar flisz und arbeit hetint, ee wirs ain wenig in unser tützsch brachtint."[126]
Heinrich's description of the project here, at the very least, suggests a collaborative translation project, involving the work of multiple individuals and requiring a considerable amount of time and effort, and perhaps, by extent, signaling the perceived value of Mechthild's original text. Today, Heinrich von Nördlingen's translation—like the *Lux Divinitatis*—is attested in its entirety in only a single manuscript, the Einsiedler Codex (Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek 277). This manuscript, hailing from the third quarter of the fourteenth century, was gifted—according to a note on the inner binding—by the Basel priest Heinrich von Rumerscheim to the "Waldschwestern" ("forest-sisters) near Einsiedeln whom he advised spiritually, alongside specific instructions for the circulation of the text around their informal religious community.[127] The note further indicates that the manuscript had formerly belonged to "der zum Guldin Ring," whom Hans Neumann later identified as Margareta zum Goldenen Ring and who also became a Beguine in later life. In other words, the Einsiedler manuscript—though it eventually ends up in the possession of the Benedictine abbey for which it is named—ultimately evidences that the text had found, by the late fourteenth century at least, a lively readership among believers outside formal orders.

While neither the Latin *Lux Divinitatis* nor the Middle High German *Fliessende Licht* can be said to unproblematically offer access to Mechthild's original, the two translations have nevertheless received markedly different treatment in scholarship. Heinrich von Nördlingen's Middle High German translation, on the one hand, is generally treated among scholars as a faithful reproduction of Mechthild's original text, in that it is believed to maintain the original order and, given the close linguistic relationship between Middle Low and Middle High German often even to recreate what are assumed to be the original rhyme schemes of the source text. Just as the human figures involved in the construction of Mechthild's text —that is, Mechthild herself as well as whatever other confessors and scribes who worked on the text—are conveniently elided in her opening description concerning the authorship of her book, so too do the interventions of the translators often fall out of sight in modern discussions of Mechthild's text, and the nature of the Middle High German *FL* as a translation thus frequently goes overlooked in scholarly discussions of the text. The Latin translation, on the other hand, although it generally provides a fairly literal translation of Mechthild's words and even attempts to mimic Mechthild's lyrical, rhyming prose at points, does make a number of fairly conspicuous changes to the source text. The most obvious modifications are structural: reordering the various sub-divisions of the work, dividing longer chapters into smaller sub-sections, and splicing separate chapters together. The Latin version also makes changes as the sentence-level, frequently rephrasing Mechthild's own words in more obviously Biblical imagery and sometimes condensing long or repetitive passages. As a result of these conspicuous changes, the *Lux Divinitatis* is widely considered to be a less faithful translation of the source text, despite being oldest extant manuscript version of

---

[126] In English: "...came to us in such foreign German that we needed almost two years of effort and labor before we were able to bring it a little closer to our German."

[127] The message reads in full: "Den swesteren in der vorderen ovwe / Ir soent wissen / das das buoch / das úch wart / von der zem Guldin Ringe / das do heist / das liecht der Gotheit / des soent ir wol war nemen / also das es sol dienen in alle húser des waldes / und sol us dem walde niemer kommen / und sol ie ein monat in eim huse sin / also das es umb sol gan / von eim in das ander / wenne man sin bedarf und soent ir sin sunderlich behuot sin / wand si sunderlich trúwe zuo úch hatte / bittent ovch fúr mich / der ir bichter was / leider unwirdig / Von mir Heinrich von Rumershein von Basel ze sant Peter (Einsiedeln codex f. 1ʳ, printed in Mechthild von Magdeburg, *Das fließende Licht,* vol. 2, 176).

Mechthild's text, and is generally understudied and much maligned in what scholarship there is on it. Frequently, the Latin translation is judged primarily in terms of the damage it does to the source text, an approach which anachronistically applies a modern understanding of fidelity in translation in a medieval context in which the theory and practice of translation often varied markedly from modern approaches. Such studies, moreover, often fall prey to cliché assumptions about the relationship of the vernacular to Latin or about the limits on women as writers in the Middle Ages.

Ultimately, then, the current state of criticism on the Latin version of Mechthild's text evidences the need to rethink the both the Middle High German translation and the Latin translation—that is, their construction, purpose, and function—apart from the traditional narratives of gendered or cultural hierarchy that are so often brought into play when discussing the writing of women or vernacular writing in the Middle Ages. The *Lux Divinitatis* in particular, having been prepared during or very close to Mechthild's own lifetime, offers an unparalleled view of the contemporary reception of her work in religious communities. A close, discourse-analytic investigation of the *Lux Divinitatis* reveals it to be the attempt of the Latin translators to adapt Mechthild's work in the service of two main projects: increasing the clarity and internal logic of the text and cementing Mechthild's text in a specific discursive network of Latin literary and theological thought. These projects can, in turn, be understood as an argument advocating the value of Mechthild's work itself by revealing, via the translation of her words for more Biblical language, the coherence of her visions with the Holy Scriptures. In this sense, the *Lux Divinitatis* is therefore best understood not as a rhetorical rewriting of the text according to a certain theological agenda but as a negotiation of cultural discourses and debates circulating at the time about the appropriateness of theological material being produced in the vernacular, often by religious individuals outside of formal religious orders.

Given that the *Lux Divinitatis* and *Fliessendes Licht* exist on equal footing—that is, both as translations of the same original text, to which modern researchers no longer have access—it is clear that the Middle High German translation demands to be read on similar terms as its Latin counterpart: through the lens of translation, in comparison to the Latin translation, and as part of a larger conversation about what role the writing might play in an individual's religious practice. Ultimately, like the Latin translation, Heinrich von Nördlingen's Middle High German translation also constructs a specific image of divinely inspired authorship, using Mechthild's text as an example. However, while the Latin translators focused more simply on validating theological compositions in the vernacular and outside of the church, Heinrich goes one step further and sets up Mechthild as a model for religious women. Crucially, his letters suggest that Mechthild is to be emulated not simply in her mystical experiences but further in her composition of these visions. Such approaches to the two major translations of Mechthild's texts ultimately make clear the extent to which Mechthild's text was always—not only in its initial composition but also its contemporary and subsequent reception—a text that straddles the cultural divide between the Latinate and Germanic literary and religious spheres. As such, it is important to read the extant translations of Mechthild's texts both in terms of the specific context for which they were individually produce and in dialogue with each other as part of a larger conversation about the role of vernacular theology and the role of mystical experiences in religious practice in the Middle Ages.

4.1: Previous Scholarship on the Latin *Lux Divinitatis* and the Middle High German *Fliessende Licht*

In general, the scholarship on Mechthild's text has—due to material challenges as well as pre-existing biases within scholarship—focused unequally on the Latin and Middle High German translations of Mechthild's original text, that is, with far less attention paid to the Latin version. Moreover, while, in scholarship on the MHG translation, the figure of the translator frequently disappears from the discussion altogether and the translation is presented almost as a direct product of the author's own hand, in scholarly discussions of the *Lux Divinitatis,* in contrast, the figure of translator looms over conversations about the text, inspecting the text for any theologically problematic content and constantly threatening to destroy or corrupt whatever is considered innovative or interesting in Mechthild's "original," or rather of whatever it is that the scholars imagine Mechthild's original to have been. Overall, a review of the past scholarship on the *Lux Divinitatis* not only reveals the challenges of studying a text like Mechthild's—that is, one that exists only in translation—but further evidences the need to approach both the *Lux Divinitatis* as well as Nördlingen's *Fliessende Licht* simultaneously individually, on their own terms, and yet also in dialogue with each other.

Overall, scholarship on the Latin translation of Mechthild's text remains fairly limited in comparison to the abundance of scholarly interest the German *FL* has received. Scholarly work on the *Lux Divinitatis* was*,* to be sure, long hampered in part by the lack of a modern critical edition of the text. Indeed—prior to the publication of Hellgardt, Nemes, and Senne's new edition of the *Lux Divinitatis* in 2019[128]—the only version of the Latin text available to scholars was an edition prepared in 1877, which itself exists in only a handful of extant copies, all housed in non-circulating library collections due to their age and rarity.[129] Although a digital version of this 19th century edition was fortunately made available on Google Books in 2014, prior to that point, the only studies of Latin translation that might be considered truly comprehensive were two much-dated dissertations that sought to use the *Lux Divinitatis* as a means by which to fix the flaws of Heinrich von Nördlingen's Middle High German translation and to explain ambiguities in the work.[130] Both of these studies thus employ the Latin work in the construction of a critical edition of the vernacular text, a project whose goals and agendas often differ and are sometimes even at odds with those of modern literary scholarship on medieval texts.

Apart from these two studies, most of the scholars who have engaged at all with the *Lux Divinitatis* in their discussions of the *Fliessende Licht* have been able to do so only via second-hand descriptions of and excerpts from the text in other scholarship, causing a bias in scholarship to develop. Such more recent studies have in large part moved away from using the Latin translation as a means to access the lost Middle Low German original, but they do rely almost

---

[128]I will be relying on Hellgardt, Nemes, and Senne's edition, entitled ‚*Lux divinitatis' – ‚Das liecht der gotheit': Der lateinisch-frühneuhochdeutsche Überlieferungszweig des ‚Fließenden Lichts der Gottheit'. Synoptische Ausgabe,*when quoting from the *LD* throughout this chapter.

[129] Apart from this edition—published in 1877 by Oudin and entitled *Lux Divinitatis Fluens in Corda Veritatis. Revelationes Gertrudianae ac Mechtildianae. II.*—being difficult to access, the editorial decision to italicize the portions of the text unique to the *LD* reveals that, even at this early point in scholarship, the Latin translation was being read largely in comparison to the MHG version, with a particular eye towards using the Latin text to better approximate Mechthild's original in the construction of a critical edition of the text.

[130] More specifically: Hubert Stierling's 1907 dissertation from the University of Göttingen, entitled *Studien zu Mechthild von Magdeburg*, and Ernst Becker's 1951 disstertation *Beiträge zur lateinischen und deutschen Überlieferung des Fliessenden Lichts der Gottheit,* also from Göttingen.

exclusively on excerpts and observations included in Hans Neumann's *Beiträge zur Textgeschichte.*[131] Scholars' inability to engage with the actual text of the Latin apart from the portions singled out in Neumann's discussion is, of course, understandable, given the relative inaccessibility of editions of the Latin text until recently. Nevertheless, Neumann's argument[132] that the Latin translation effectively censors some of the more questionable theological material and softens erotic imagery by couching it in Biblical language—along with the passages he selects to support this argument—have worked to skew subsequent scholarship such that it frequently merely rehashes this same argument that the *Lux Divinitatis* enacts a significant ideological rewriting of Mechthild's text. In her discussion of the Latin translation, for example, Sara Poor—largely in deference to Neumann's analysis—similarly argues that one of the main motivations of the Latin translators was "clearly the desire to keep Mechthild's language from exceeding the erotic tone of the biblical books that inspired her" (*Mechthild of Magdeburg and Her Book* 88). In contrast, the few scholars who were fortunate enough to work more closely with the Latin original—notably, Ernst Becker and Gisela Vollmann-Profe—tend not to view the Latin translation as a censored version.[133] Ultimately, the portions of the text that Neumann and Poor point to in support of their argument make up only a tiny fraction of the entire work, and scholars of the *Lux Divinitatis* overall give little consideration to the extent to which the same stylistic devices used in these passages are also used in other, less problematic passages throughout the work.

Most—if not all—of the studies of the Latin translation are further underpinned by a narrative of antagonism and binary opposition between Latin and vernacular literary and spiritual cultures that presents the Latin translation as a reaction against vernacular innovation in itself. This dynamic is, perhaps, already evident in Neumann's and Poor's analyses of the *Lux Divinitatis,* but it is also visible in studies that do not focus specifically on the sexual aspects of Mechthild's work in translation. In her essay "Mechthild von Magdeburg – deutsch und lateinisch," Gisela Vollmann-Profe, for example, interprets the *Lux Divinitatis* translators' universalizing approach to the text—in which Mechthild's first-person statements, for instance, are sometimes attributed to a generalized, unspecified "Soul" (*anima*)—as a backlash against the supposedly "modern" aspects of the work ("was aus literarhistorischer Sicht als Verzicht auf die 'modernen' Elemente des Werkes erscheint" [154]): namely, the subjective, individualized, dramatic nature of Mechthild's original account. Vollmann-Profe's argument that such elements "dürfte aus der Sicht des Theologen ein Heimholen ins Traditionelle in einer noch tieferen Weise bedeutet haben, ein Zurückdrängen dessen, was im FL als bedenklich, ja gefährlich angesehen

---

[131] See Frank Tobin's *Mechthild von Magdeburg* (4), Odo Egres' "Mechthild von Magdeburg: *The Flowing Light of God* (29-31), and John Margetts' "Latein und Volkssprache bei Mechtild von Magdeburg" (125).

[132] According to Neumann, the Latin translator "hat dem Text stark zugesetzt und ihn an zahlreichen Stellen abgeändert; vor allem, wenn die leidenschaftliche Minnesprache der Christusbraut ihm zu kühn erschien, wenn dogmatische Bedenken gegen gewisse Aussagen der Visionärin wach wurden oder wenn ein Anschluß an inhaltlich naheliegende Vulgatastellen zu erreichen war" (176). Neumann is certainly correct with respect to the last reason he lists, the connection between Mechthild's vision and the Bible, but, in fact, this reason alone accounts for most of the changes made in the Latin version.

[133] Ernst Becker was of the opinion that "dem Übersetzer offenbar nicht darum zu tun war, einen gereinigten Text vorzulegen" ["…the translator clearly was not concerned with presenting a purified text"] (Becker, Anmerkung 11 [39]). Vollmann-Profe concurred, writing, "Wohl gibt es Korrekturen, doch erfolgen diese weder - bezogen auf den Einzelfall - besonders gründlich, noch - im Blick auf das Gesamtwerk - sehr consequent" ["There are, of course, corrections, but these are neither—with respect to individual cases—particularly exacting, nor—in view of the entire work—very consistent"] (153).

werden konnte" (154).[134] Like Poor, then, Vollmann-Profe also presents the changes made in the *Lux Divinitatis* as a reaction against some perceived threat from literary and theological developments in the vernacular to Latin's cultural hegemony. Susanne Köbele makes this relationship of aggression and rivalry between Latin and the vernacular even more explicit, claiming, "Die Argumentation aus der Feder des Klerikers ist nicht zuletzt gegen die Volksprachlichkeit des Werkes gerichtet."[135] The Latin translation, according to her, is an attempt to restore ("zurückholen") Mechthild's work to the hermetic exclusivity of the Latin ("die hermetische Exklusivität des Lateinischen") that does away with the innovative aspects of Mechthild's thought and language ("löste…das Innovative der Denk- und Sprachgestalt des 'Fließenden Lichts' auf"). Although not all scholars assume a narrative of antagonism as explicitly as Köbele does, essentially all do represent the Latin translation of Mechthild's writings as an attempt to control or limit vernacular literary expression via the displacement of the source text with a Latin rewriting of it.

Perhaps as a result of the narratives of cultural violence that underlie most analyses of it, the Latin translation has gotten a rather unfair treatment in scholarship in that it is inevitably read in terms of the damage it does to Mechthild's original text. In this sense, such studies might also be said to apply a modern understanding of either what is interesting about Mechthild's text or what is valuable in a literary translation to a medieval text. This tendency to view medieval translations in modern terms is illustrated, in part, by Vollmann-Profe's and Köbele's reliance on such critical categories as "modern" and "innovativ" in their analysis of the *Lux Divinitatis*, especially when these categories are explicitly or implicitly associated with the vernacular. Viewed in such terms, a translation into Latin will always appear as a negation of innovation. After all, perhaps the most "innovative" aspect of Mechthild's work was her very decision to write in her native language, rather than to dictate to a scribe who knew Latin. At any rate, the use of these critical categories results in the translations being read in terms of how they fail to live up to the literary standards set by Mechthild's (imagined) original. Vollmann-Profe laments—in reference to what she perceives as the almost dictionary-like reorganization of the Latin translation according to subject matter, for example—that "Das FL ist kein Werk zum Nachschlagen, sondern zum Nachleben" (153),[136] implying that her main concern is how, at least from her perspective, the translation appears to have misrepresented the original. The scholarship on the *Lux Divinitatis* thus often amounts more to the passing of a value judgment on the literary quality of a work in translation—here always to the disadvantage of the resulting text—than to a genuine investigation of how that work relates to and engages with the cultural and literary context out of which it emerges.

Although the Middle High German translation has received considerably more scholarly interest over the years as compared to its Latin counterpart, here, too, scholarship has been plagued by problematic assumptions. Even approaching the text as a work of literature rather than as a historical source remains a relatively new trend in scholarship, as Christa Ortmann discusses in her summary of past approaches to Mechthild's text (163-169). The earliest studies of Mechthild's writings—beginning with the studies of Neumann—tended to approach the *FL*

---

[134] In English: …what appears from a literary-historical perspective as the abandonment of the "modern" elements of the work, from the view of the theologians might in a still deeper way have meant a homecoming into the traditional, a pushing back against whatever in the *FL* could be seen as questionable or even dangerous."

[135] In English: The argumentation from the quill of the cleric is directed not least against the vernacularity of the work.

[136] Translation: "The FL is not a work to look things up in but to live by."

primarily as a source of biographical information about the author herself. A second wave of scholarship—here, Herbert Grundmann's work is a good example—had a similarly historical bent but focused more on what the *FL* could reveal about the actual religious practices and beliefs of medieval mystics. Although this second strain of scholarship does see the text's literary form as being structured around the mystical experience—and, to that extent, does approach the text as a literary one instead of as a historical document—nevertheless both the autobiographical and mystical approaches to the text, as Ortmann puts it in her discussion of previous scholarship on the text, "[halten] also fest an der Realität der außerliterarischen Erfahrung" (165). In other words, these studies assume that Mechthild's first-person descriptions of her mystical visions report her authentic, lived experience and, in their reliance on this assumption, shift the focus away from the literary and textual aspects of Mechthild's text. Although more modern scholarship has moved away from this historical focus on the world outside the text, nevertheless the differing approaches to the Latin and vernacular versions of the text ultimately reveal certain myopic spots that still remain within the scholarship. Beginning in the 1980s with the work of Ursula Peters and Siegfired Ringler,[137] a third strain of Mechthild scholarship, which does specifically approach the text as a literary text, has largely taken precedence in the scholarly community. These studies lay an increasing focus on the literary surface of the text and the ways in which Mechthild's expression of her mystical experiences are themselves structured around the tropes and norms of extant literary genres, such as hagiography, love lyrics, and even Scripture itself. Nevertheless, although this literarily-minded approach has largely dominated scholarship on the FL, as frequently happens, the study of the Latin translation has remained more deeply mired in philological disputes.

However, if scholarship on the Latin translation lags in its consideration of the literary, while incessantly reminding its audience of the *LD*'s status as a translation, studies of Heinrich von Nördlingen's *FL*, on the other hand, have often tended to downplay or even ignore the text's status as a translation. More specifically, though the problematic material history of the text is inevitably mentioned, nevertheless in many studies of the *FL,* the figure of the Heinrich von Nördlingen—after his letters have been mined for what little historical information about the translation they have to offer—often fades swiftly into the background, and his translation is treated almost as an exact, perfectly faithful transcription of the original. Poor, for example, comments that "In the absence of evidence suggesting that Heinrich drastically rewrote… *The Flowing Light* himself, we are therefore justified in naming Mechthild as primarily responsible for the poetic qualities that make her book so singular" (*Mechthild of Magdeburg and Her Book* 50). Here, as is commonly the case in discussion of the Middle High German translation of the text, the image of the translator is effectively glossed over. In part, this elision of the translator might be justified, in that Nördlingen's translation is widely considered to follow Mechthild's text quite faithfully. However, although Heinrich von Nördlingen might in this sense be legitimately described, in the language of Lawrence Venuti, as a sort of "invisible translator," whose translative interventions in the text are not obviously signaled as such—particularly given our inability to compare the translation to the original—still yet it remains a translation, motivated by a particular understanding and strategy of translation, one that carries with it its own set of interpretive implications.

---

[137] See Peters' *Religiöse Erfahrung als literarisches Faktum* (1988) and Ringler's *Viten- und Offenbarungsliteratur in Frauenklöstern des Mittelalters* (1980).

Similarly, although, as we have seen, studies of the *LD* almost always consider the Latin translation in close comparison to Nördlingen's translation, the same cannot be said for studies of Nördlingen's translation, which often approach the Middle High German translation independently, as a stand-alone text, without bringing the Latin translation into meaningful dialogue with its vernacular counterpart. Although the existence of the Latin translation is usually at least noted in studies of the *FL*, historically the Latin translation has often served an ancillary role in scholarship, as a source of additional historical information, due to the Latin translator's prologue, or as a correction for corrupted or difficult passages in the vernacular. More recently, as scholars' interest in the literary aspects of Mechthild's texts grew, a larger interest in comparing the Latin to the German has developed as well, but even here such comparisons often rehash the same view of the Latin translation as simply a less good version of Mechthild's original. Here, we might take Christa Ortmann's "Das Buch der Minne" as an example. Ortmann, to her credit, insists that Mechthild's text—both in its initial composition and its subsequent reception—existed as a "Werk im deutsch-lateinischen Grenzland (159), a description that precisely captures the complex relationship of Latin and vernacular in the text's history. While Ortmann's characterization of the text is compelling, her further remarks are more problematic. According to Ortmann, within Nördlingen's translation, the acts of reading and writing that are depicted so centrally "bezeichnen die literarischen Akte des Horens und Sprechens und ihren Anspruch auf den litteraten Rang der Volkssprache dem Latein gegenüber und über die Moglichkeiten des Lateins hinaus" (181). If, as Ortmann suggests, the conversational nature of the text in essence lays claim to the literary status of the vernacular as compared to Latin, then the comparison of the FL and the LD boils down to a competition between Latin and vernacular, with Latin losing out. From Ortmann's perspective, this supposed superior capability of the vernacular is enabled via the *FL*'s use of the language and tropes of *Minnesang*. Ortmann may be correct that the *FL* offers a distinct conception both of the book and of authorship than does the Latin *LD*; however, in her study, the *LD* serves primarily as a comparison point against which to view the *FL*, rather than as a text to be approached on its own terms.

Ultimately, then, the state of scholarship on the *FL* and *LD* reveals the need to study, in particular, the *LD* in its own discursive context, rather than attempt to compare it to Mechthild's original *ex negativo*. Viewed apart from such totalizing narratives that read medieval translations in terms of how they do or do not live up to the original or exclusively in terms of the general cultural and linguistic power dynamics at play, the Latin translation reveals itself to be a sincere attempt to promote an image of Mechthild as a legitimate theologian in her own right, not simply a project of censoring problematic ideas or imagery from her writing. At the same time, in the case of *Fliessende Licht* scholarship, it remains important to remember that the *FL* is itself a translation, just as the *Lux Divinitatis* is. Seen from this vantage, it is clear that both retextualizations of Mechthild's text work together on the same fundamental project—promoting religious expression among those outside the church proper—though they do so at slightly different times and among slightly different audiences. The *LD*—written earlier and produced for a primarily monastic audience—works to justify the existence of such extra-church religious expression by lending the cultural power of Latin, showing connections between Mechthild's words and Scripture as well as the wider world of secular Latin literature. The *FL*—written later and produced for a largely extra-monastic audience—builds further upon this project, presenting Mechthild's writing not simply as a legitimate theological source but, beyond that, as a model for

individual religious practice, one that specifically includes the written expression of one's religious experiences as a key part of proper religious practice.

4.2: The Sanctification of Mechthild and the Case for Vernacular Theology in the *Lux Divinitatis*

In general, the *Lux Divinitatis* should not be viewed as an attempt to alter Mechthild's work in order to make it appropriate for a monastic context; rather, the translation should be understood as an argument for the authenticity, validity, and value of Mechthild's original text, one that presents her writing as both relevant to the larger ideological community in which the translator operated and appropriate for use in vernacular spiritual contexts, as well. In this sense, the translation enters into larger cultural debates about the place and appropriateness of informal religious communities, like the Beguines of which Mechthild herself had been a member and to which the Dominican Heinrich von Halle is presumed to have ministered, as well as about the type and extent of spiritual education religious individuals outside formal orders should receive.[138] Throughout the translators' prologue to the *Lux Divinitatis*, they stress that knowledge of God received via direct experience is equally as valid as other more traditional, institutionally-sanctioned means of spiritual education.. In this sense, then, the *Lux Divinitatis* undertakes to coopt the institutional power of the Church via the use of Latin and the association with a formalized religious order, precisely in order to subvert this power and promote the writings of believers outside the Church's formal orders.

It is important to keep in mind, first of all, that the translator's discussion in the prologue does not problematize translation as such but rather focuses on justifying the importance and relevance of the original text in and of itself. In this sense, the prologue can be considered more as an introduction to the Mechthild's text itself than as a translator's preface as such. The only explicit mention of translation comes, in fact, in the final paragraph of the prologue, where the translator describes Mechthild's book as being written in a foreign—literally a barbarian—tongue ("barbara lingua conscriptum" [*LD* Pro. 2.7]).[139] The translators's justification of translating this text in the first place is not phrased as a question of whether Mechthild's work is

---

[138] For more on the tensions and divisions that developed, particularly in the Dominican order, around the issue of using the vernacular to educate lay people, often but not exclusively women, see Herbert Grundmann's *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*. The Dominican order was founded in the early 13th century as a mendicant order, whose friars were tasked with traveling around, teaching lay-people about Christianity. The order was known for both preaching in the vernacular and simultaneously emphasizing for its own members the need for rigorous theological training and study. The stress on theological study and contemplation as an aspect of proper Christianity—and the corresponding need for objects of such study, that is, theological texts readable to a lay-person who likely does not know Latin—trickled down to the religious women under the care of Dominican friars. At the same time, however, the Dominican order, from an official dogmatic standpoint, became increasingly concerned with lay people encountering heretical views in theological texts not in Latin. That these frictions in the order were still present around the time Mechthild's text was translated into Latin (ca. 1250) is evidenced by a 1242 decree issued by the Dominican general chapter that "forbade all friars to translate sermons, collations, or other writings with religious content from Latin into the vernacular" (196, trans. Steven Rowan).

[139] Here, admittedly, the translator might be seen as betraying a hint of disdain for the vernacular; however, referring to the Germanic languages as "barbarian" was a near ubiquitous practice within Latin textual culture and thus should not really be taken as evidence of the translator's particular contempt for the vernacular. The translator's high esteem for the content of Mechthild's work, at least, is readily apparent and repeatedly asserted, as when he asks, "quis nobis expressius electorum enarrabit perfectionem quam ipsi, in quibus et per quos Deus sua perfecit opera?" ("who of the elect will explain to us more expressively the completed works than those in and through whom God completes his works?" (*LD* Pro. 2.10-12))

an appropriate text to choose for translation into Latin; instead, the prologue addresses the more general question as to whether the original text is of any value *at all*.

More specifically, as we see in the prologue's opening comparison of Mechthild's text to two Biblical examples, the translator's concern centers on the problem of divine revelations coming from sources outside the traditional power structure of religious institutions:

> Legimus in libro Judicum quod Debbora mulier sancta uxor Lapidoth, spiritu prophetiæ plena, in monte Effraim collocato sub arbore palmæ tentorio, ut soli Deo vaccaret, solitaria residebat, ad quam populus Dei Israel ad quærendum omne judicium ascendebat. Sed et liber Regum quartus narrat quod Olda prophetissa in Jerusalem habitans regem sanctum Josiam, de arcano Dei judicio edocta a Spiritu Sancto, defuturis instruxit flagellis quæ populo imminebant. … Erant certe tunc Pontifices de semine Aaron sacerdotesque et alii levitici generis in lege eruditi, et vita probati; quibus tamen Spiritus Sanctus consiliorum suorum secreta non aperuit; quae his sacris infirmi sexus mulieribus pro illis temporibus sicut ei complacuit revelavit.[140]

In their analyses of the Biblical references in the prologue, scholars have often focused on the translator's decision to include two examples of specifically female prophets from Scripture.[141] Although it is obvious from the translator's comments about the "infirm sex" that gender is clearly at issue in this passage, it is not the only aspect of Mechthild's text and authorial persona being problematized. Rather, the passage stresses not only that were Deborah and Hulda women but also that they received their knowledge of God via divine revelation. While Deborah, we are told, is "filled by the spirit of the prophets" ("spiritu prophetiae plena"), Hulda is described as spreading word of God's judgments which she has "learned from the Holy Spirit" ("edocta a Spiritu Sancto"). Hulda's divinely received wisdom is, moreover, explicitly contrasted to more formal types of educations ("in lege eruditi") that are, in turn, associated with individuals holding positions in more formal religious institutions ("Pontifices"; "sacerdotes"). The women, in contrast, are not involved with such organizations, and the description of Deborah as living in solitude ("solitaria residebat") and Hulda as living in Jerusalem ("in Jerusalem habitans") might, here, evoke two increasingly common types of spiritual life in the twelfth and thirteenth century: either living a life of total worldly reclusion as a hermit or anchoress or living a religious life out in the world as did the Beguines and other semi-monastic communities. Neither option, however, amounted to taking formal orders. Ultimately, then, the translator positions Mechthild's text as part of a larger conversation concerning the legitimacy and validity of extra-institutional theological teachings. The Latin prologue, in this sense, does not stage in terms of whether theology should be practiced by women or speakers of the vernacular but instead focuses more narrowly on women practicing theology outside Church and monastic control.

The translator, moreover, comes down firmly in support of individuals like Deborah and Hulda, who received their knowledge of God via direct experience. Both of the women in the

---

[140] English trans.: We read in the book of Judges that the holy woman Deborah, wife of Lapidoth, filled by the spirit of the prophets, resided in solitude on a mountain located in Ephraim in a tent under an arbor of palms, so she would be free for God alone, to whom the people of the God of Israel would ascend to seek all judgment. But the fourth book of Kings also narrates that the Prophetess Hulda, living in Jerusalem, instructed the holy king Josias about the mysterious judgment of God taught by the Holy Spirit, about future scourges which threatened the people. … There were then certain Priests from the tribe of Aaron and priests from other types of Levites, wise in laws and upright in their life, to whom nevertheless the Holy Spirit did not open the secrets of his counsel, which he did reveal, just as he pleased, to holy women of the infirm sex on behalf of their times.

[141] See, for example, Poor, *Mechthild and her Book,* 88.

exempla are specifically depicted not as merely receiving divine prophecies but, more specifically, as transmitting these divine teachings and judgments to others. Deborah, the translator notes, was treated by the Israelites as a source of divine judgment on all matters ("ad quærendum omne judicium"), while Hulda is characterized specifically as "teaching" or "instructing" the King ("instruxit"), who—we are told—specifically wrote to her requesting her judgment. The legitimacy of these women as sources of divine revelation is further evidenced by the usefulness of their advice: "Et quia populus Israel Debborae vaticinio credidit, liberationem ab oppressione et de hostibus victoriam est adeptus. Rex quoque cultor Dei, per orationem et consilium Oldæ prophetissæ, consolationem et misericordiam meruit invenire."[142] The legitimacy of the Debborah's and Hulda's prophecies and advice, then, validated by the positive outcomes associated with them, and the text thus further asserts that these women's experiences of God were relevant not simply to themselves or to other religious women but also to the general population and even to the religious and political leaders.

However, because the value of prophecies from those outside traditional religious institutions hinges on their having been received from God, the translator of the *Lux Divinitatis* must argue—if he wishes to make the case for Mechthild's text as a valuable work—that her text is likewise a divine creation. And indeed, the translator begins to make this claim already in the prologue, via a subtle variation on the classic 'Aristotelian prologue':[143]

> Auctor quippe ejus Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus est, materia ejus Christus et Ecclesia est, et Satanas cum corpore suo. Modus agendi, historicus et mysticus; finis vero, præsentis vitæ ordinatio, et præteritorum utilis recordatio, et prophetica insinuatio futurorum.[144]

The prologue thus provides all four parts—*auctor, materia, modus agenda, finis*—that such an introduction typically includes, but, interestingly, although scholars in the Middle Ages often distinguished conceptually between different levels of human and divine agency in the creation of a given text,[145] the translator equates the *causa efficiens* of the work with the Trinity itself, seemingly glossing over Mechthild's role in the text's production entirely. After this introduction to the text itself, the Latin prologue closes by giving brief biography of Mechthild that notes that, after a life—described as one "a puericia innocentem et immaculatam" (*LD* Pro. 1.36)—of voluntary reclusion and poverty, Mechthild formally joined the abbey at Helfta and resided there

---

[142] In English: And because the populace of Israel believed in prophetic Deborah, it obtained freedom from oppression and victory over its enemies. The king also, a follower of God, merited by finding consolation and compassion through the prayers of the Prophetess Hulda.

[143] I am drawing here on A.J. Minnis's discussion in *Medieval Theory of Authorship* on the various types of introductions to medieval texts, particularly pages 28-29, where he describes the rise in popularity in the thirteenth century of a type of introduction, which explained literary works in relation to Aristotle's four causes: the *causa efficiens* (the *auctor* [author] who wrote the text down)*, causa materialis* (the literary sources and subject [*materia*])*, causa formalis* (the author's treatment of the material)*,* and the *causa finalis* (the author's end goal in producing the text).

[144] In English: The author of it is, in fact, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit; the subject is Christ and the Church and Satan with his body; the treatment, historical and mystical; the objective, in truth, the regulation of the present life, the useful recollection of past events, and the prophetic revelation of future events.

[145] Here again, Minnis's discussion in Chapter 3 of *Medieval Theory* on distinctions between authorial roles and responsibilities and the tension between representations of divine and human efficient causes is instructive.

for the last twelve years of her life.[146] The Latin introduction, then, does admittedly position Mechthild as ending up a formal member of the Church, Mechthild's ultimate acceptance by the Abbey positioned as culminative evidence of the doctrinal holiness of the life she has led previously, not as some sort of antidote to it. Overall, then, the main focus of the prologue appears to be justifying the legitimacy of religious writings by individuals outside the Church proper.

Having made this initial claim of divine authorship, the translators then collect all of the passages from Mechthild's text in which she herself discusses the text's divine origin and place these passages after the translator's prologue but prior to the start of the first book proper. The five chapters that the Latin translators elect to include in this introductory section are compiled from eight different chapters taken from across Mechthild's text, and many of the chapters included appear to be chosen specifically to back up claims made in the translators' prologue as well as to justify the existence and the translation of Mechthild's text. In the first of the chapters (*LD* Pro. 3; *FL* VI.5), Mechthild gives the most clear version of her own biography, elements of which are repeated in the Latin prologue, while the following chapter, *(FL* IV.2), in which Mechthild recounts her confessor's endorsement of her recording her spiritual experiences in writing ("Iussit que me…ex corde et ore diuino conscribere librum istum" [*LD* Prologue, 4.34-35]), works to corroborate the translator's endorsement of the text's spiritual value.

To some extent, then, as Poor asserts, the translators—in basing their defense of Mechthild's work on the claim of its fundamentally divine authorship—do undercut Mechthild's agency and her role as an active participant in the creation of the text.[147] However, although the translators' introduction does diminish Mechthild's active participation in the text to a certain extent, their decision to precede the text proper with all of the passages from the *FL* in which Mechthild herself discusses the composition of her text allow Mechthild the opportunity to justify her text herself to her new Latinate readership. Moreover, since Mechthild herself makes the same assertion of divine authorship and maintains it at various points, the Latin translation does little more to destabilize her claim to authorship than either she does herself or than Nördlingen does in the MHG translation. Overall, then, the translators' introductory letter as well as the passages from Mechthild's text they include as prologues to the text proper work primarily to legitimize Mechthild's writings. As we will see in the following section, beyond these opening prolegomena, the translators' actual strategies of translation within the text proper—both at the macrotextual level of organization and at the microtextual level of vocabulary—reinforce this stance by emphasizing the Scriptural origins of Mechthild's ideas and by juxtaposing these concepts with models of romantic love in Latin literature. The Latin translators, moreover, impart a macrotextual structure to Mechthild's chapters that presents the Soul's decision to reject the secular as the outcome of a process of spiritual enlightenment, itself enabled only via an individual soul's experience of mystical union with the divine.

Amor* or *Caritas*: The Transformation of the Conception of *Minne* in the *Lux Divinitatis

---

[146] Que a puericia innocentem et immaculatam ducens uitam et in iuuentute a domino premonita, omnia que habere potuit, reliquit, exul in terra aliena degens in uoluntaria paupertate. Tandem post multas tribulaciones in senectute uita sanctimontalium in Helpede assumpta et per annos xii commorata omnium uirtutum perfecccione floruit.

[147] Even in the case of the Holy Scriptures, moreover, human authors were often ascribed a very secondary role in the production of the text. Consider, for example, St. Gregory's discussion of the authorship of the Book of Job, in which—as Minnis summarizes—the "human writer of the Book of Job is…, rather disparagingly, compared to the pen with which a great man has written a letter" (37).

One of the most obvious changes made in the Latin translation is the macrotextual reorganization of the chapters of Mechthild's original books into six thematically focused books. As many scholars have noted,[148] the new thematic organization imparts a hierarchical structure on the text that moves from the highest subjects (i.e. Mechthild's visions of God, Christ, and the virgin Mary in Book I and of the other denizens of heaven—angels and saints, namely—in Book II) down to more earthly concerns in the middle books (i.e. the Church and clergy in Book III, depictions of the Soul's relationship with God in Book IV, practical advice on virtue and sin in Book V), and finally down to the very lowest topics in Book VI's discussion of Hell and its residents. In scholarship, the *LD*'s thematic restructuring of the text has often been seen as a move towards an encyclopedia/dictionary type approach, allowing for rapid research on specific topics, and is frequently contrasted with the flowing, stream-of-consciousness style of Mechthild's original.[149] Such readings rely, too, on an assumption that the various editorial features of the *LD*—e.g., the index of chapters before text proper and the consistent indexing of Mechthild's original chapterization[150] within chapter subtitles—are provided simply as tools for research. The sub-books of the *LD*, at least in the traditional view of scholarship, are pointedly not geared at any sort of linear reading experience. If easy indexing were the sole intention of the reorganization, however, it would be reasonable to assume that the order of the chapters within a single *LD* book would simply be organized in the same order we encounter them within Mechthild's own text (that is, presumably in the order they were written down). In fact, though, the Latin editors jump around, inserting chapters from later books amongst otherwise chronological sequences, condensing multiple passages into one, or expanding a single chapter into multiple.

Although this seemingly chaotic ordering of the chapters within the *LD* sub-books might be taken as evidence that the compilers simply had no concern for order and haphazardly shoveled the books into thematic categories with no concern for the sequence of chapters within the books, in fact, a closer examination of one of the *LD*'s sub-books—the present study will focus on Book IV, which contains chapters depicting the Soul's relationship with God[151] — reveals that the translators' macrotextual machinations penetrate down past simply the organization of chapters within a single book and the decisions about when to join or divide chapters to the very vocabulary used to translate key terminology from the vernacular. The macrotextual and microtextual translation strategies employed in Book IV of the *LD* reveal the care the translators took in terms of juxtaposing the chapters in order to build, if not quite a

---

[148] For more on the *LD*'s thematic reorganization, see Hellgardt's summary in "Latin and the Vernacular" in *A Companion to Mysticism and Devotion in Northern Germany in the Late Middle Ages* (135).

[149] Here, we might recall Vollmann-Profe's criticism in "Mechthild von Magdeburg—Deutsch und Lateinisch" of the Latin translation on the grounds that Mechthild's text is "kein Werk zum Nachschlagen" (153).

[150] To be clear, the Latin editors' inclusion of this alternate numbering system, which I here and elsewhere refer to as the original, within their chapter titles closely aligns with the ordering of chapters in Nördlingen's translation. Since the Latin edition was prepared prior to Nördlingen's translation, the Latin editors inclusion of these book and chapter numbers despite their own reorganization of the chapters makes clear that this division of chapters pre-dates Heinrich von Nördlingen's translation and, thus, perhaps stems from Mechthild herself or at least from a very early edition of the text. In terms of the order of chapters, then, it is fairly safe to speak about Mechthild's "original" organization of the text.

[151] I have chosen to focus on a single book of the *Lux Divinitatis* for the purposes of this study. Book IV stood out as the best book to focus on, not merely because of its clear macrotextual arc but also because much of the material that has been perceived as possibly troublesome for medieval readers—the scenes, that is, in which the relationship between God and the soul is depicted in romantic terms—is largely related in this book.

narrative arc, then at least a conceptual progression, in which the Soul moves from an initial state of pseudo-romantic love for her heavenly bridegroom, represented in both Biblical language and that of more secular depictions of romantic love in Latin literature, to what the text positions as a more enlightened understanding of God's love. At a linguistic level, the Latin translation further enables this escalation via its usage of two different terms—*amor* and *caritas*—to translate the concept of *minne,* the default Middle High German word for *love*, which encompassed a wide semantic field ranging from romantic to divine love. By separating the concept of *minne* into two distinct conceptual realms—one concerning the more romantic, human experience of love and the other concerning love from the perspective of the Divine—the Latin translation hearkens to pre-existing discourses on love in both secular literature and Scripture and performs a progression from an initial state of innocent devotion to an enlightened understanding of the nature of God's love.

    Lux Divinitatis Book IV commences with a sequence of three chapters that set up two resonances of God's love that coexist within Mechthild's writings and that the Latin translation will proceed to negotiate. More specifically, the Latin translators elect to translate Mechthild's term "minne" in two separate ways. In the opening pair of chapters (*LD* IV.1-2), which originally existed as a single chapter—in *FL* II.23 entitled "Wie dú minne vraget und leret die stumpfen selen un brehte si gerne zuo irme liebe und sprichet aller-erst, und dú stumpfe sele antwúrt"—*minne* is translated as *amor*, the default Latin word for love, which could as easily connote erotic or romantic love as it could brotherly love. The joint title of these two chapters in the Latin is thus rendered as "Excitat amor animam pigram" (*LD* IV.1.1).[152] In the subsequent chapter (*LD* IV.3), which appears as the opening chapter of Book 1 in Mechthild's original ("Wie dú minne und dú kúneginne zesamene sprachen"), the same term is translated instead as *karitas*, with the title of the chapter rendered as "De colloquio anime et caritatis." The term *karitas* carried with it an explicitly religious association and would essentially never have been used in an erotic context, and the shift between the two terms is abrupt. Taken together, the three chapters raise various exemplary questions about the Latin translator's strategy and decisions. Besides the question of why the translators have decided to translate *minne* differently in the third chapter, a reader might further wonder why the translators elected to split the opening chapter into two chapters, and why they inserted these newly divided chapters ahead of the original opening chapter of Mechthild's *FL*. Surely, that is, if it was the first chapter of Mechthild's entire text, it was also the first thing she had to say about the relationship of the soul and God, right?

    Although the two opening chapters are similar in that they both depict conversations between the Soul and the figure of a personified Love—a similarity which might help explain why the translators have paired these chapters—ultimately the sequence of chapters presents two very different images of love. More specifically, the first two chapters depict, respectively, two halves of a conversation between the Soul (*anima*) and *Amor* at what is clearly a very early stage their familiarity with each other. In the first chapter, namely, *Amor* awakens the sleeping Soul and inquires as to the location of her residence on the behalf of her beloved, while in the following chapter, the Soul—now fully awake—returns the question, asking where her beloved resides ("vbi sit habitacio eius?"). The separation of the single chapter into two—as is often the case in the *LD*—works to highlight the parallel structure of the two halves of the chapter and thus also highlights the connection and similarity between them. More importantly, in terms of narrative chronology, *LD* IV.1-2, though taken from a later place in Mechthild's original text,

---

[152] Translation: "Love awakens the indolent soul." *LD* IV.2 is merely titled "De eodem" ("Continued").

appears to come from a very early point in the relationship between the Soul and her divine beloved. At this point, the Soul admits she has never even seen this potential beloved (IV.1.16-17) and generally seems quite resistant to Love's attempts to awaken her.

In contrast, the third chapter of *LD* IV—though it similarly depicts a conversation between the *anima* and a personified Love, translated here as *caritas* ("De colloquio anime et caritatis")—clearly occurs at a later stage of the Soul's relationship with God. Here, the Soul first greets *caritas* as "mi sancta caritas" ("my holy *Caritas*"), which would seem to indicate the Soul is now much more familiar with Love. After *Caritas* reciprocates the greeting, the Soul unleashes a litany of accusations against *Caritas*, accusing her of stealing the Soul's youth ("tu michi florem iuuentuis abstulit" [3.16]) and her family ("Tu michi parentes et amicos et bona temporalia rapuisti" [3.18]) and of depriving her of her worldly goods and esteem ("Tu tulisti a me seculum et honores eius et diuicias eius omnes" [3.20-21]). The Soul, at this point, is clearly no longer a stranger to love but instead has been suffering under the torments of love for some time now. Even so, despite her recognition of love's seemingly deleterious effects on her, she appears to hold no hostility towards love at this point. Initially, at least, the Soul greets *Caritas* with respect (*reuerenter* [3.1]), and, prior to her complaints, acknowledges Love's perfection ("tu es ualde perfecta" [3.5]). Given the clear temporal distance between the opening chapters, the juxtaposition of these two different stages in Soul's relationship with Love at the start of this book effectively establishes the question of how the Soul proceeds from this initial state of unfamiliarity and even reluctance to an understanding of God's love that allows her to recognize, without any resentment, its negative effects on her earthly existence.

Beyond establishing this central question that the rest of the book will spend untangling, at a more microtextual level, the translators' decision to translate *minne* in different ways allows them to connect Mechthild's discussion to pre-existing discourses on the topic of love within Latin literature, both secular and religious. To be sure, the decision about how to translate the term *minne* in these three chapters is almost certainly motivated, in part, by the extent to which gender was specified in Mechthild's original. In *FL* I.1, at least, the conversation is very clearly presented as a dialogue between two noblewomen specifically, with the two participants constantly addressing each other as "Vro minne" ("Lady Love") and "Vro kúneginne" ("Lady Queen") throughout the conversation. In other words, the gender of the participants is made extremely clear in Heinrich von Nördlingen's translation of the original chapter, and the Latin translation of this passage similarly chooses to translate *minne* as *caritas,* a feminine noun. In *FL* II.23, in contrast, the gender of *minne* does not seem particularly important to the chapter, as—unlike in *FL* I.1—the figure of *minne* is not ascribed any gendered traits apart from the word being grammatically feminine. Here, then, the Latin translators appear to have a bit more freedom to explore the resonances of Mechthild's writing with the existing world of Latin literature, and their decision to render *minne* as *amor* in this chapter can thus be seen as evoking the Classical image of a personified *Amor*, arousing love in the hearts of the innocent and unaware with his arrows.[153] Similarly, and perhaps more importantly, when the Soul at first resists the attempts of Love to awaken her, in the German translation, the Soul questions how she could love somebody she does not know—"Wie mŏchte ich den lustlich minnen, den ich nit

---

[153] Here, we might, for comparison, imagine the opening of Ovid's *Amores* or—the much later and vernacular—*La Vita Nuova* of Dante, which similarly depicts a personified Love literally waking up a sleeping Dante. Though Dante's text is, of course, written in the vernacular, the figure of the personified Love, who speaks in Latin, clearly hearkens to a background of Latin literature.

erkenne" (II.23.5-6)—whereas the same line is translated in Latin to "Et quomodo possum uoluptuose diligere, cuius speciem non ualeo uidere?" (IV.1.16-17). The Latin translation's emphasis on seeing (*uidere*) versus simply recognizing evokes Andreas Capellanus's insistence that the sight of the beloved was a necessary prerequisite for love to develop. Capellanus famously defined love as "that innate suffering proceeding from the sight of and immoderate reflection on the form of the other sex" ("passio quaedam innata procedens ex visione et immoderata cogitatione formae alterius sexus") and, from this starting premise, further argued that "blindness impedes love" ("caecitas impedit amorem") to the extent that a person born blind would not be able to experience love at all. Structurally, too, the Latin translators' tendency to add in clear speaker roles (e.g. "Anima dixit," "Amor dixit") recall the frequent use of speaker roles (e.g. "Homo ait," "Mulier ait") in Capellanus's text, much of which is presented as model dialogues between men and women. The Latin translators' decision to translate *minne* as *amor* in the context of their other translative decisions in the opening chapter thus calls to mind a specific understanding of love that would likely be familiar to readers of the Latin text.

At the same time, however, the reference to sight in *LD* IV.1 resonates with Mechthild's later references to blindness in the chapter's continuation in IV.2 (*FL* II.23.33-56) and allows the *LD* translators to situate Mechthild's ideas in relation to Scriptural models of love as well. Towards the end of *LD* IV.2, Love first instructs the Soul to "sich dich umb und umbe und tuo uf din blinden ovgen" (II.2.19), and shortly thereafter the Soul describes herself in the same terms as an "unselige blinde" (II.2.25). The language of blindness, of course, evokes the frequent discussions in Scripture of both literal and spiritual blindness, and the Latin translators are able to make this association more explicit in their translation of Love's command: "circumspice hic infima et leua oculos tuos ad illa tam sublima! Vnge oculos tuos collirio, ut uideas eum, cum quo semper maneas!" (IV.2.18-21). Variations of the phrase "leua oculos tuos" occur frequently throughout the Vulgate,[154] and the second sentence—almost certainly an addition of the Latin translators, since there exists no equivalent line in the MHG translation—draws on the language of Revelations 3.18 and adds in two more explicit references to eyes ("oculos") and vision ("uideas"). In scholarship, the translators' frequent allusions to seemingly random verses of Scripture have often been seen as a means of papering over dogmatically problematic passages in the original or simply of adding Biblical flavor to the text. In fact, however, when read in context, the care and intentionality with which the passages were selected becomes more apparent, amplifying resonances already present in Mechthild's text. In its original context, the Revelations passage addresses the Church of Laodicea, which is described as being "tepidus…et nec frigidus, nec calidus" ("tepid…and neither cold nor hot"). The characterization of the Church as lukewarm resonates with the Soul's earlier description of herself in *LD* IV.1: "Ego ordinem sanctum porto. Ieiunio, sine crimine uiuo, satis ligata sum regulis et conclusa" (10-11).[155] Thus, despite presenting herself as being already part of a Holy Order and further as living a fairly holy life, the Soul is at this point still "blind," lukewarm in her devotion to God. Though superficially the Scriptural references might seem only loosely related, in fact, to a readership presumed to be quite familiar with the Biblical texts from which they emerge, the selected passages resonate

---

[154] See, for example, Genesis 13.14, 31.10; Isaiah 49.18, 60.4; and Jeremiah 3.2. Isaiah 49.18 stands out as a particularly relevant passage for comparison: "Leva in circuitu oculos tuos, et vide: omnes isti congregati sunt, venerunt tibi. Vivo ego, dicit Dominus, quia omnibus his velut ornamento vestieris, et circumdabis tibi eos quasi sponsa." The "in circuitu" might be evoked in the *LD* by the command that the soul look around ("circumspice"), and the imagery of the bride, of course, resonates with much of Mechthild's text.

[155] Translation: "I bear a holy order. I fast, I live without sin, I am sufficiently bound with rules and am shut up."

with Mechthild's writings in particularly relevant-seeming ways.[156] In this particular instance, the translators' specific choice of Biblical allusions thus works to amplify the sight imagery in this pair of chapters.

In this sense, moreover, in the context of the translators' decision to translate *minne* as *amor,* the translators appear to be applying Capellanus's claim that sight of the beloved is necessary for the development of genuine love to a religious context: without the visionary experience of the divine, a genuine understanding of the nature of divine love as *caritas* would be unavailable to the individual believer, so the claim would follow. The Latin text thus stages Mechthild's enlightened understanding—represented via the shift towards discussing *caritas*—as being achieved only via her visionary experience of a divine union with God, which, in turn, allows her to fully understand her separation from God after the experience of union has passed. This same logic is not fully absent in Mechthild's original version of the text, we can safely assume, since they are equally present in the MHG translation, but the Latin translation's reordering of chapters alongside the decisions about when to translate *love* as *amor* or *caritas* makes the causal relationship between the experience of divine union and the subsequent realization of one's separation from God more distinct and obvious. The decision to translate *minne* as *amor* in the first two chapters but then as *caritas* in the following chapter, thus, intensifies the difference between the two different depictions of love but simultaneously highlights the connection between them. Moreover, the decision to front the book depicting the Soul's relationship with God with the juxtaposition of these chapters—two taken from almost prior to the relationship and one much later on in it, two depicting *amor* and one depicting *karitas*—effectively asks the question, How can a believer move from one understanding of God's love to the other?

And indeed, as we might expect, the rest of the fourth book—via its arrangement of the chapters it selects for inclusion—spends its time resolving precisely this question. Macrotextually, the fourth book of the *LD* might be further divided into three, loose sections: the first, from the opening chapters to approximately *LD* IV.25, the second until approximately *LD* IV.54, and the third encompassing the last five chapters at the end of the book (*LD* IV.55-59). The opening sub-section depicts the initial development of the Soul's relationship with her beloved and their spiritual union. In general—not including chapters 1, 2, and 4, which are all taken from *FL* II—the book moves chronologically through the first book of the *FL*, with the chapters apparently deemed less relevant from the original first book relegated to other books of the *LD*. As a result, it is here that we find most of the traditionally Mechthildian material that mixes the language and imagery of *Minnesang* with its divine subject matter, which in the Latin version is transformed into the language of Latin love poetry. Consider, for example, the Soul's praise for God in LD IV.4.6-10: ''Quero te meditacionibus, sicut dilectum iuuencula modis occuloribus. Fioque multum fragilis ligata tuis uincuilis. Forcius me est hoc uinculum, vnde non

---

156 The Revelations passage, moreover, also bids that the Church "buy… gold refined in the fire" ("emere…aurum ignitum probatum) as a metaphor for attaining spiritual richness. In Mechthild's original, the soul similarly laments her former unwillingness to exchange her copper for God's obviously more valuable gold: "so moechte ich mich iemer me von sinen ougen schemmen, das ich min ungeneme kupfer nie gentzlich umb sin túres golt wolte geben" (II.23.22-24). The Latin translators, in turn, have rendered this line as "perpetua michi foret verecundia, quod mea turpia et uilia non dedi precia, ut acciperem aurea et preciosa premia" (*LD* IV.2.22-23). The choice of the Latin translators to reference this specific Revelations verse earlier might thus be intended to also evoke this monetary metaphor as well, further revealing the precision and intentionality of the Latin translators' choice of Scriptural allusions.

habeo cor amore liberum. Clamo ad te cum desiderio in uoce exuli. Expecto te cum cordis merore nescia requiei. Ardeo inextinquibiliter in tui amoris calore."[157] The language used here to translate Mechthild's own words—themselves clearly inspired by Minnesang—would fit as smoothly into the mouth of a speaker of a love song in the *Carmina Burana* as it does in, here, in the Soul's mouth. Here again, with the invocation of meditation, we hear echoes of Capellanus and his insistence that love emerged from immoderate meditation (in his words, *cogitatio*) of the sight of the beloved. At the same time, the discussion of meditation as well as that of being bound (*ligata*)—a term the Soul had previously used to describe her membership within the Church ("Ego ordinem sanctum porto…ligata sum regulis et conclusa" [LD IV.1.10-11])—create an alternate, spiritual interpretation of the passage, as well. Crucially, in these first sections, the text almost exclusively translates the term *minne* as *amor,* and the concept of *caritas* is mentioned only rarely. In other words, initially the text depicts the Soul's relationship with the divine almost entirely through the human perspective, in which love is presented as *amor*.

Following what are perhaps the most concrete scenes of mystical union in *LD* IV.21-24, the second section of the book commences, and the text suddenly begins to translate *minne* more consistently as *caritas*, although the text's discussion of the relationship of the Soul and God in terms of *amor* is never fully excised from the text. Some chapters whose titles indicate they will discuss *caritas,* in fact speak only of *amor* in the body of the passage. For example, *LD* IV.26, which presents itself as an "Oratio ad caritatem, que deus est" (*LD* 26.1), references *caritas* only a single time in the body of the chapter (*LD* 26.2) and otherwise directs its address only to *amor*. Similarly, even in the midst of these *caritas* chapters, a few have titles that indicate the focus will be explicitly on *amor*, not on *caritas* at all. The title of *LD* IV.37, for instance, reads "De multiplici amore," and, as one might expect, the body of the chapter discusses various different types of love (e.g. "humilis amor" [IV.37.5], "stabilis amor" [IV 37.7], "amor audax" [IV.37.8]). In other words, the depiction of the Soul's relationship with God in terms of romantic love (*amor*) is not staged by the text as only an initial, unenlightened first stage that is intended to be entirely surmounted and left behind after the Soul accesses a more complete understanding of God's love via her experience of mystical union with the divine. Instead, this initial understanding remains be a crucial component of the Soul's relationship with God, even after a deeper understanding of his love has been achieved.

This enlightened understanding of God's love in terms of *caritas*, in turn, enables the Soul to better understand her temporary separation from God and, in that sense, ultimately encourages her retreat from the secular, though not necessarily only in the form of a retreat into the Church, since, again, the Soul informs us at the start that she is already in the Church. The third section of the book, encompassing the final five chapters, again re-stages the Soul's experience of enlightenment in miniature: being with God makes the Soul realize the extent of her separation from God and causes her to begin to question the necessity of her suffering on Earth (*LD* IV.55-56). Her further experiences of the divine, in turn, help the Soul put her earthly suffering in perspective as a mirror of Jesus's experience as a human on earth (*LD* IV.57), which ultimately encourages her rejection of the earthly. This rejection of the earthly is staged in the following chapter, which describes the Soul, who has rejected everything earthly ("Eieci ergo de corde meo omnem mee carnis culpabiliem affectum" [*LD* IV.58.4-5]), encountering Jesus—

---

[157] Translation: "I seek you in meditation, just as a young woman seeks her beloved in a secretive manner. I, too, am made very weak being bound with your chains. This chain is stronger than me, whence I do not have a heart free from love. I call for you with desire in the voice of an exile. I await you with the sorrow of my heart, not knowing any rest. I burn inextinguishably in the fire of your love."

disguised as a pilgrim—and eagerly accepting his pain and suffering. The chapter concludes with Jesus crowning the Soul. Book IV, then, closes with a prayer from the Soul to God and God's response, promising that her earthly suffering will be rewarded in heaven. Throughout these chapters, the focus remains on the outcome of the mystical experience: the spiritual experience leads the Soul to a genuine rejection of the earthly in favor of the divine. She is no longer the lukewarm Soul we saw in IV.1-2, who declares herself to be "satis ligata," but instead has morphed into the more enlightened anima we see in IV.3, who—having experienced both divine union and separation—is able to view her earthly suffering in a new light as an important component of true religious devotion.

Far from an attempt to censor the erotic or romantic imagery in Mechthild's writings, the Latin translation actually stages the earthly understanding of love—represented by *amor*—as a necessary first stage in believers' spiritual development as they move towards a deeper understanding of the nature of divine love, *caritas*. The *LD* translators' rearrangement of the chapters, their translation strategies surrounding the key concept of *minne*, as well as their intricate use of allusions to both Scripture and secular Latin writings allow for this conceptual development to be established across the course of Book IV. The Latin text, thus, presents Mechthild as a model for spiritual practice, for individuals both in and out of the church proper, and further presents the mystical experience itself as an important, even necessary stage in the spiritual growth of individual believers. From a wider perspective, then, it becomes clear that the translators' project in the body of Mechthild's text matches their professed goals as gleaned from their introduction to the translation: that is, to legitimize the conscription of vernacular theological texts. Finally, the development of this conceptual trajectory within Book IV of the *LD* and the translators' careful and intentional use of Scriptural references throughout disrupts the common scholarly portrayals of the Latin translation's reorganization as one motivated by strictly Scholastic concerns (i.e. the construction of an encyclopedia-like text) or by narratives of cultural dominance and control (i.e. the censoring of vernacular theology).

4.3: Writing and Reading as Worship in the Middle High German *Fliessende Licht*

While the Latin *Lux Divinitatis* works to legitimize the composition of theological texts by non-traditional theologians (e.g., those outside formal orders), Heinrich von Nördlingen's Middle High German *Fliessende Licht* takes this project one step further in that it incorporates the act of writing as an integral part of the spiritual, mystical experience itself. In other words, in Heinrich von Nördlingen's translation, God's command that Mechthild write is elevated from simple justification of the existence of Mechthild's text to an expected component of the mystical experience itself. The mystical experience, as it appears in the Middle High German translation, is only as valuable as its textual expression, which, in turn, strives to structurally mimic the immediate, individual, and intense nature of the mystical experience in order to engender similar mystical experiences in its readers. This coupling of a notion of the immediacy of the mystical experience with a sense of its authenticity or legitimacy first becomes apparent in Heinrich von Nördlingen's letters to one of his spiritual advisees.

Though the letter which Heinrich von Nördlingen sends to his spiritual advisee Margaret Ebner alongside his translation of Mechthild's text (XLIII) does not provide much in the way of detail about his intentions or strategy in translating, the context of the specific letter within the years-long epistolary dialogue between the two does help, perhaps, to shed some light on the function of the translation in practice—or, at least, of his personal conception of it. Within the larger context of his collected letters, Heinrich's inclusion of the Mechthild translation follows

soon after his initial request that Ebner write down the visions she is experiencing. In an earlier letter dated "Fastnacht 8 Feb 1345," Heinrich—evidently referring to a previous, unpreserved discussion—instructs Ebner, "ich beger auch, als ich dich gebeten han, das du mir in dem willen gotz die wandlung, die got mit dir gethan hat, ordentlichen scribest, und wolt uns got ichtz mer durch dich geben, des beraub uns nit" (XL.57-61).[158] This letter, then, apparently marks the start of a distinct exchange between Ebner and Heinrich, not simply of letters but more specifically of her mystical writings. Heinrich, moreover, presents both Ebner's visions, which he describes as "die wandlung, die got mit dir gethan hat") as well as her writing down of them as part of God's own will ("in dem willen gotz"). The notion that Ebner should not "rob" ("raub") an unspecified "us" ("uns") of any further visions she receives from God further emphasizes her responsibility to write down her visions and thus stages the written expression of one's vision as an expected component of the mystical experience. Within a years' time of this initial discussion of Ebner's responsibility to record her visionary experiences, Heinrich will elect to send her a copy of his Mechthild translation. In the letter accompanying the translation (XLIII), moreover, he both thanks her for the writings she has already sent and instructs her to continue recording any further visions she receives from God.[159] The Mecthild translation is thus coupled with a plea from Heinrich that Ebner continue with her own project of recording her visionary experiences, and although he does not explicitly position the translation as such in the letter, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the translation was intended to serve as a model for precisely the type of visionary lifestyle and writing that Ebner was at work recording.

Beyond simply presenting the written recording of one's spiritual experiences as a responsibility of individual believers to their wider community, Heinrich von Nördlingen's letters further create a connection between the immediacy of a text and its divine legitimacy. In the immediately subsequent letter to letter XL, after noting that he has received some initial writings from Ebner, Heinrich provides additional encouragement and guidance to the visionary:

> "was sol ich dir schreiben? dein got redender munt machet mich redenlosz. dar umb…bitt ich dich in gott, als ich vor geton hab, was dir got ze sprechen geb, das du vileicht vor vergeszen habest oder on das noch nit geschriben habest, das du es mit fleisz schreibest und zesamen samnest bisz an das end, und halt es alles haimlich als du an gefangen hast, wann das will ich auch mit dir thain. ich getar auch weder dar zu oder dar von gelegen weder in latein noch in tüchtz bis das ich es mit dir überlesz und es ausz dinem mund und ausz dinem hertzen in newer warhait verstand. (XLI.5-18)[160]

Heinrich's insistence that Ebner run her visions past him before granting others access to them echoes, of course, the same anxieties we see surfacing in Mechthild's writing—in, for instance,

---

[158] Translation: I also desire, as I requested, that you, by God's will, neatly write down for me the transformation that God has done with you, and if God wants to give us anything more through you, don't rob us of that either.

[159] "Ich danck dir in got und durch dich umb die geschrift die du mir gesant hast und noch furbas senden solt, als lang und als vil dirs. Got gibt, wan mein hertz sunder froud und lust dar innen nimt und noch nemen sol. dar umb beger ich mit allen den, die immer mer got dar inen loben sulent, das du nit ab laszist, die wil dirs. Dein here gibt" (Letter XLIII).

[160] Translation: "What should I write you? Your God-speaking mouth makes me speechless. Therefore…I ask you, in God's name, as I did previously, that you diligently write down whatever God gives you to say, which you perhaps previously forgot or had not yet written down, that you collect it altogether up until the end and keep it secret as you have done from the beginning, because I would also do that for you. I also dare neither to add anything nor take anything away, neither in Latin nor in German, until I read it over with you and, out of your mouth and out of your heart, I understand it in new truth."

her insistence that she wrote her book with the explicit permission of her confessor or her depiction of the book as fundamentally God's work, not her own—concerning the possible controversies that might arise from such writings. Beyond this concern, though, his eagerness to hear the revelations directly from Ebner might be seen as suggesting that the immediate expression of the mystical revelation authenticates and legitimizes it. In other words, that the revelations come "ausz [ihrem] mund" and "ausz [ihrem] hertzen" allows them to be understood "in newer warhait." Finally, in his letter to Ebner accompanying the Mechthild translation—dated only as 1345—Heinrich thanks her for the further writings she has sent and again encourages her to continue writing ("beger ich…das du nit ab laszist, die wil dirs dein here gibt" (244). Thus, just as the prologue to the Latin translation does, Heinrich von Nördlingen, in part, legitimizes the conscription of visionary experiences as the mystic's responsibility to her fellow believers.

　　　To be clear, in his letters, Heinrich does not explicitly present Mechthild's text as a model for Ebner to follow, nor would it necessarily follow that Heinrich led the translation of Mechthild's text specifically in order to create a textual model to guide religious women in wishing to receive mystical visions as well as in their textual substantiation of these mystical experiences. However, Heinrich's final note in Letter XLIII that he also hopes to lend the translation to "Engeltal"— evidently referring to the Dominican convent there, where another of his spiritual mentees, Christine Ebner, resided—provides further support, if not directly, for this assumption of his motives, or at least for viewing his translation strategies in Mechthild's text in relation to his comments about his advisee's writings. Christine, who despite a shared surname bore no relation to Margaret, was already at this point similarly engaged in writing down her own mystical visions and does eventually receive a copy of the Mechthild translation from Heinrich, suggesting that Heinrich's strategy of presenting Mechthild's writings as a model for the conscription of other individuals' mystical experiences extended beyond this single instance.

　　　Whatever Heinrich's envisioned use of the text as a model for vernacular visionaries, in terms of the actual historical usage of Mechthild's text, the evidence suggests that—beyond the two Ebners—the text was consistently presented to its readers as an almost mystical object with rituzalized instructions for its reading. The text, in other words, appears to be not simply designed as a model for would-be writers but also structured with the goal of engendering similar mystical experiences in its readers. Indeed, the translators of the *FL* included a brief Latin prologue—one entirely distinct from the Latin prologue that opens the *LD* and itself likely sourced from an even earlier edition of Mechthild's text—as well as a translation of this prologue back into German. In this tandem Latin-German introduction that precedes Heinrich von Nördlingen's translation, readers are given the rather strange instruction to read the text nine times ("novies perlegeris librum istum" [12.1]; "núnstunt úberlesen" [12.16-17]). These highly rituzalized instructions for the reading of the text, as various scholars have argued,[161] imbue the text with an almost mystical aura perhaps intended to inspire a trance-like, visionary state in its readers. The index of chapters—which mentions no chapters beyond the fifth book—that follows the Latin-German prologue indicates that the introduction itself likely was written for a previous edition of the text and thus probably not composed by Heinrich von Nördlingen himself. The instruction to read the text nine times is again repeated in the first of the two prologue chapters (*FL* Prologue 1); however, although Latin translation of this chapter does appear as the seventh

---

[161] See, for example, Patricia Zimmerman Beckman's discussion in "The Power of Books and the Practice of Mysticism" (61-83).

and final prologue chapter of the *Lux Divinitatis* (*LD* Prologue 7), the language of reading the text nine times is excluded, making it possible that Heinrich von Nördlingen himself added this cabalistic instruction. Even if this instruction was not a direct addition of Heinrich himself, he does, at least, clearly intend his mentee to approach the text in a similar manner. In his letters to Ebner, more specifically, Heinrich instructs her to read the text not nine, but three times, saying "uberlesent es dri stund, es stat dran ix" (247) and further advises her to say a series of prayers before commencing to read.[162] These sorts of instructions are not present in the Latin translation and thus make manifest the difference in function between the two translations. While the Latin translation, written earlier, works to legitimize the writing of theological texts by those outside the Church as well as to argue for mystical experiences as a valid and important component of worship and religious practice, the Middle High German translation goes even further, presenting Mechthild and her text as models to be emulated.

Overall, then, in Heinrich von Nördlingen's letters to Ebner as well as in the opening prologue to the text itself, he argues not simply for the legitimacy and authenticity of Mechthild's text but further presents her approach to writing as an example for other visionaries and believers. His letters to Ebner, more specifically, evidence a sense that those who have mystical experiences—like Mechthild and the Ebners—have a responsibility to their religious community to record and transmit these experiences, in order to inspire similar mystical encounters with the divine in those who subsequently read their writings. Mechthild's writings, in particular, appear as a sort of idealized model for such would-be—or, at least, could-be—writers, standing, on the one hand, as an example of a woman recording her visionary experiences in the vernacular but also intended to engender and inspire similar mystical and visionary experiences in the minds of her readers, as the specific rituals and instructions surrounding the text encourage.

4.4: Immediacy and Fluidity in Heinrich von Nördlingen's *Fliessende Licht*

Although the Middle High German translation of Mechthild's *Fliessende Licht* has often been treated in scholarship as a perfectly faithful rendering of Mechthild's original text to the extent that its status as a translation is frequently glossed over and mentioned only in passing in discussions of the text, it is important to remember that the decision *not* to change an element of a text in translation is still a translation strategy. In the case of the *FL*, Heinrich von Nördlingen's decision to maintain the order of Mechthild's original text rather than follow the amended ordering of the Latin edition or impart a new order entirely depicts Mechthild's text as one that has been, to a large degree, written extemporaneously almost immediately alongside the visions as they happen, whereas the Latin's hierarchical reordering gives the sense of the book as a text that has been subject to much editing and literarily constructed—although, as previously discussed, scholarship has often neglected to view the Latin translation in these terms. Heinrich on Nördlingen's translation thus develops the translative aesthetic of fluidity and fidelity *avant le lettre.* In doing so, the Middle High German translation presents the experience of both reading and writing as key elements of the mystical experience, thereby moving beyond the Latin version, which focused more—as we have seen—on legitimizing Mechthild's having written at

---

[162] He writes: "…ee irs an vahint ze lesent, so beger ich und gebuit euch in dem heligen geist, das ir im vii Veni sancte Spiritus mit vii venien vor dem altar sprechent und unserm heren und seiner megdlichen mutter Maria auch vii paternoster und Ave Maria sprechent auch mit vii venien, und der junckfroulicher himelscher orgelkunnigin, durch die got ditz himelschs gesang hat usz gesprochen, und alien heiligen mit ir auch vii paternoster und Ave Maria mit vii venien sprechint" (Letter XLIII, 246).

all as well as on representing the mystical experience as a crucial component of one's religious experience.

In contrast to the *LD*, Heinrich von Nördlingen's *FL*—or, at least, the version of it in the Einsiedler manuscript—appears to present itself almost as an untranslated text. To reiterate for comparison, in the *Lux Divinitatis*, the text itself repeatedly calls attention via various means to the translators' editorial interventions. For example, the prologue very clearly presents the text as a translation of a foreign-language text, ("Interpretaturus…barbara lingua consciptum librum istum" [*LD* Prologue 2.7]). Throughout the body of the Latin text as well, readers are repeatedly reminded of its status as a translation via the practice of frequently including the original chapter numbering as a part of the rubricated Latin chapter titles (e.g. *LD* 1.1 notes after the title that the original chapter number was "Quinta parte xx"—that is, the twentieth chapter of the fifth part of the text). The marginal notes in the Latin edition—although, of course, added by later readers— reveal that in practice, too, the text was actually being read side-by-side with its German counterpart,[163] indicating that its readers were well aware of the texts status as a translation. Heinrich von Nördlingen's *FL*, on the other hand, does not make its status as a translation particularly obvious. In its own description of the text's origin, the *FL*'s Latin/German prologue remarks only that "Anno domini MºCCºLº fere per annos XV liber iste fuit teutonice cuidam begine…per gratiam a domino inspiratus" [10.1-2].[164] The prologue, in this sense, notes only that the text was transmitted in German ("teutonice") by "a certain beguine" ("cuidam begine") but does not indicate anywhere that the text that follows this introduction is actually only a translation of that original text into a different variety of German, and not the original German text itself.

At the same time as the Latin/German prologue thus presents itself as the original text, it simultaneously downplays Mechthild's role in the construction of the text, much in the same way the *LD* has often been accused of doing. The choice of the construction "fuit…inspiratus" (10.1-3) to describe the transmission of the text to Mechthild, namely, perhaps draws on the language of II Peter 1.20-21, which clarifies that the prophets do not advance via their own interpretations but instead are "Spiritu Sancti inspirati,", an emphasis that downplays Mechthild's creative role in the text. The Middle High German translation that follows this Latin prologue provides "wurde geoffent" ("was revealed" [12.6]) as a translation of the same phrase, but, in both cases, the construction presents the text (*liber*/*Buch*) as an already completed object that is simply gifted to Mechthild in the dative (*cuidam begine*/*einer Swester*) by God, the agent of the action

---

[163] In some instances, the marginalia quotes the German text directly, as does one note alongside *LD* I.12.31, which reads, "Ich gibe mich gote nah dinen worten." The Latin translation of the same line reads, "Ecce ancilla domini, fiat michi secundum uerbum tuum" (*LD* 1.31-32). The quoted German, however, is not identical to what we find in HvN's translation of the text ("Ich gibe mich gotte ze dienste nach dinen worten" [*FL* II.23, 364.11-12]), so the marginalia is likely sourced from an alternate manuscript branch, perhaps Mechthild's original. In other cases, the marginalia instead provides a Latin translation of the original chapter title, even more clearly displaying the translators' editorial interventions to other readers. A note in the margins of *LD* 5.1, for instance, reads: "In originali habetur ista rubrica: Homo spiritualis animali paruo est similis, quod ad multa est vtile, habet autem similitude fere xxx partes – et hoc nomen eius." Here, too, the translation of the supposedly original title differs slightly from the title of the chapter provided by Heinrich von Nördlingen. Similar examples appear in *LD* V.30 and VI.13 and elsewhere.

[164] In English: "In the year of the Lord 1250 over the course of 15 years was this book instilled in a certain beguine…through grace from God." The following German translation of this introduction provides the following trot of the same line: "In dem jare von gottes gebúrte drizehendhalp hundert jar bi dar nach fúnfzehen Jaren wart dis bůch geoffent in túsche von gotte einer swester…" (*FL* Translator's Introduction, 12.5-7).

and the original composer of the text. The prologues further clarify that, though thus inspired by God, the text itself was actually written down by Mechthild's male confessor ("conscriptus autem a quodam fratre predicti oridinis" [*LD* 10.8-9]; "dis bůch samente und schreib ein brůder des selben orden" [*FL* 12.13-14]), thus continuing to deemphasize Mechthild's role in the construction of her text. At the same time as the Middle High German text neglects to explicitly acknowledge its status as a translation, it also presents Mechthild not as an authorial figure but simply as a temporary vessel and thereby develops a fantasy of unmediated connection with God that continues to be played out in the rest of the translation.

Moreover, as a part of the text's development of this façade of unmediated contact with the original text, Heinrich von Nördlingen's translation actually engages in the same process of downplaying Mechthild's authorial presence in the text as scholars often accuse the Latin translation of doing. Compare, for example, the opening prologue in the *FL* with its counterpart in the *LD*. In Heinrich von Nördlingen's translation, this chapter reads:

> Dis bůch sol man gerne enpfan, wan got sprichet selber dú wort
> Dis bůch das sende ich nu ze botten allen geistlichen lúten beidú bősen und gůten, wand wenne die súle vallent, so mag das werk nút gestan, und ez bezeichent alleine mich und meldet loblich mine heimlichkeit. Alle, die dis bůch och wellen vernemen, die sőllent es ze nún malen lesen. (*FL* Prologue 1 [18.1-7])
> [One should happily receive this book, because God himself speaks the words
> I send this book now as a messenger to all spiritual people, both the bad and the good, because if the walls fall, then the work cannot stand, and it [the book] depicts me alone and laudably reveals my secret nature. All, who would understand this book, should read it nine times.]

Whether or not the chapter was originally composed by Mechthild or is a product of subsequent editorial interventions into the text has been the subject of much debate in scholarship, but what is clear about the chapter is that it is comprised in a cento-like style of quotes—sometimes lightly edited—that are spoken by God himself in the course of Mechthild's text itself. The opening sentence, namely, couples an almost word-for-word quote from *FL* V.34 with further description from God's mouth of the book drawn from *FL* II.26. As previously mentioned, the final sentence of the chapter—often pointed to as evidence that the chapter was an editorial, not authorial addition to the text—appears to draw on language not spoken by God within the text but instead taken from the *FL*'s Latin/German prologue, which similarly instructs the reader to read the book "nine times" ("novies perlegeris librum istum" [12.1]; "nùnstunt úberlesen" [12.16-17]). Since the quotes are mainly sourced from the body of the text itself, they are of course still the words of Mechthild as much as they are the words of God, but the decision of the translators to open their text not with Mechthild's voice directly but instead with a collection of moments where God is speaking downplays her authorial role in the construction of the text.

Moreover, in comparison to the Latin translation, Heinrich's translation sometimes seems to go even further in its elision of Mechthild as author, although scholarship has not often recognized this to be the case. The Latin translation—which combines this *FL* chapter and the following into a single chapter of dialogue under the title "De nomine et perpetuitate huius libri" ("On the name and perpetuity of this book") that appears as the seventh and final prefatory chapter before the start of the first book—appears as follows:

> Deuote sucipiendus est liber iste, de quo sic loquitur deus: "Hunc librum omnibus religiosis, qui columpne sunt ecclesie, tanquam nuncium et legatum dirigo. Nam cum

columpne nutant et corruunt, non ualet subsistere supereminens hijs structura. Solum me notificat hec scriptura, proditque secreta mea abdita et obscura."

Et dixi: "Eya domine deus, quis edidit librum istum?"

Et respondit dominus: …" (*LD* Prologue 7.1-7)

Devoutly is this book to be read, about which God speaks thusly: 'I send this book as a message and an ambassador to all religious individuals, who are the columns of the church. For when the columns sway and collapse, the structure above them is not able to remain standing. This composition depicts me alone, and it reveals my occult and obscure secrets.'

And I said: 'Oh Lord God, who produced this book?'

And the Lord responded: …."

Here in the *LD*, the opening line—a translation of the chapter's title in the *FL*—makes very clear that only the subsequent quote is being attributed to God: "Deuote sucipiendus est liber iste, de quo sic loquitur deus" (Devoutly is this book to be read, about which God speaks thusly: …). In Heinrich von Nördlingen's version, in contrast, the phrasing of the title is more ambiguous: "Dis bůch sol man gerne enpfan, wan got sprichet selber dú wort." In this case, "dú wort" could refer to the immediately following quotation spoken by God, just as it does in the Latin, but the same phrase could also refer to the contents of the entire subsequent text. The Latin translation of the following quote, moreover, does not maintain the cento-like structure. In other words, in the body of *LD*, the passages that serve as the source material for this chapter are translated differently than they appear here,[165] indicating that the Latin translators were perhaps not even aware of the connection between these passages. The chapter was grouped with the other prefatory chapters likely because it, like the others, clearly discusses the text itself, but, having been situated as the last of these prefatory chapters and having had its connection to the other chapters from which it quotes made less apparent, the comparative importance and programmatic status of the chapter ends up being downplayed and Mechthild's own voice is able to shine through more clearly at the start of the Latin translation.

Beyond these prefatory chapters, the body of Heinrich von Nördlingen's translation, too, engages in the creation of a sense of immediacy and faithfulness in translation, both in its macro textual organization as well as at a more minute level of style. In terms of organization, the decision to maintain the original chapter order provides a sense that the text has been constructed in a rather ad-hoc manner, giving readers the impression that the chapters have been written down immediately as the events themselves happen—that is, in the order in which the visionary experiences themselves occurred. Similarly—in contrast to the Latin, which often joins chapters together in order to make the connections between passages more clear (i.e., making more clear that one passage is God's response to a comment of the Soul in the previous passage or vice versa by joining the two passages into one under a single title) —the German translation often uses only juxtaposition of the passages to suggest the connection between them. At a more microtextual level, too, the specifics of Heinrich's translation—in the chapter titles, for instance, as well as the decision not to clearly identify speakers—contribute to the dramatic, extemporaneous character of Mechthild's text and the sense that it exists as an object designed to encourage meditation and similar visionary experiences in its readers.

LD IV.8, for example, combines *FL* chapter I.5 with chapters I.7-10 into a single conversation between God and the Soul concerning the necessity and value of bodily suffering.

---

[165] See *LD* II.16-18 and Prologue, for comparison.

The chapter opens with the speaker discussing her physical suffering ("Corpus meum longo languor torquetur" [*LD* IV.8.5]). Her subsequent prayer for release from this suffering—which concludes the chapter in the *FL*—is immediately followed in the Latin by the translation of *FL* I.7, in which God curses the body ("Sic maledixit michi dominus dicens: "Corpus tuum moriatur" [*LD* IV.8.19]). After a song of praise from the Soul [*LD* IV.8.23-28] that draws on *FL* I.8-9, the *LD* chapter concludes with a translation of *FL* I.10, which ultimately affirms the spiritual value of "triumphing over the sinful desires of the flesh" ("triumphans…carnisque illecebrosam uoluntatem" [*LD* IV.8.29-30]). Throughout the chapter, too, the speaker roles are made very clear, which each section of dialogue—separate chapters in the *FL*—being clearly attributed to either God or the Soul (e.g. "Sic maledixit michi dominus dicens" [*LD* IV.8.19], "Respondet anima laudans" [*LD* IV.8.23]). In other words, in the Latin translation, thematically related but distinct chapters are often recontextualized as part of a longer dialogue on a single topic.

In contrast, in the *FL*, this same sequence of chapters is presented as brief, discrete fragments that are not clearly part of a larger conversation or embedded in an overarching narrative structure. Mechthild's initial lamentation of her bodily suffering in *FL* I.5 and God's subsequent cursing of the body in *FL* I.7 is interrupted by a seemingly unrelated chapter entitled "Von den nún ko̊ren, wie si singent" (30.1).[166] Similarly, *FL* I.9 stands as an aside about the Seraphim ("úber Seraphin" [32.16-17]) —that is, about a completely different topic; in the Latin, by contrast, this same chapter is recontextualized as not referring to the Seraphim at all—all mention of them is entirely omitted—but instead is incorporated as the conclusion to the Soul's song of praise (*LD* IV.8.23-28) in response to God's own song of malediction (*LD* IV.19-22). Throughout the sequence of chapters in Heinrich von Nördlingen's *FL*, the identity of individual speakers of the different chapters is generally not noted or is noted only in the title of the chapter. Unlike in the *LD*, that is, where each speaking role is clearly labeled within the text and positioned in dialogue with the other, here each chapter stands on its own and is not clearly positioned or designated as a response to a previous chapter. The apparent goal, in other words, is not to provide any sort of coherent dialogue or narrative or to explore and develop the thematic connections between distinct passages as the Latin does but, rather, to provide a series of discrete images or moments to serve as fodder for the readers' meditation and to create the effect for the readers of direct, unmediated transcription of the visionary experiences as they originally appeared to Mechthild.

The titles of the chapters in Heinrich von Nördlingen's translation contribute to this episodic, contemplation-inspiring effect, moreover, especially when considered in relation to those in the Latin edition. The Latin translators, namely, group all of these chapters minus *FL* I.6 (positioned instead as the opening chapter of Book II) under a single heading—"De collacione anime et corporis" (*LD* IV.8.1)[167]—that establishes the thematic focus of the chapters included, as the Latin translators understood it. In the *FL*, contrastingly, the sequence of chapters, with the exception of *FL* I.5, all have names that focus on the number of items discussed (i.e., "Von den nún ko̊ren, wie si singent" [*FL* I.6], "Von gottes vlůch in ahte dingen" [*FL* I.7], "Der minste lobet got an zehen dingen" [*FL* I.8], "Mit drin dingen wonest du in der ho̊hin" [*FL* I.9], and "Der got minnet, der angesiget drin dingen" [*FL* I.X]). The numerically focused language of these titles is both extremely common throughout the Middle High German translation and also quite

---

166 Translation: "On the Nine Choirs, How They Sing"
167 Translation: "On the Union of the Soul and Body"

reminiscent of the language in the prologue and in Heinrich von Nördlingen's letter instructing the reader to read the text a certain number of times. While, as previously mentioned, the evidence suggests that the titles in Heinrich von Nördlingen's translation are not necessarily his own addition but likely sourced from an earlier version of the text,[168] perhaps even originating with Mecthild herself, nevertheless his decision to further transmit these same chapter titles remains significant. The titles signal the function of the text potentially envisioned by the translators—that is, inviting the audience to reflect and meditate on the metaphoric sense and spiritual meaning of the images in each small fragment—rather than suggest they should be viewed as part of a larger, connected whole.

Overall, as compared to the Latin translation, Heinrich von Nördlingen's Middle High German translation does make less obvious and far-reaching interventions into the text, electing instead to follow Mechthild's assumed original text more closely. However, the differences between the Latin and Middle High German translations—both within the translators' own words about their work as well as in their specific editorial decisions within the text—reflect the differences between the literary cultures that produced the text as well as the differences between how religious works in the vernacular were perceived by Latin and vernacular literary cultures. Heinrich von Nördlingen's text, though it does likely remain more subservient to Mechthild's authorial choices, nevertheless might be seen as working harder to undercut Mechthild's active role in the text's construction, presenting her to a greater degree as a simple vessel for transmitting the words of God. At the same time, however, in the Middle High German translation, Mechthild is held up as a voice in her own right: not just as a source of legitimate, theological information but also as a model to be actively emulated by readers, both in the reception of visionary experiences as well as in their own vernacular writings.

Throughout its history, Mechthild's text straddles the border between Latin and vernacular, and yet the double retextualization of Mechthild's text should not be understood as a tug-of-war between Latin and vernacular as such but as a more specific struggle that seeks to negotiate the legitimacy of theological teachings and writings composed by those outside the Church. Though the Latin translation has often been presented in scholarship as an attempt to regain monastic control over the dissemination and interpretation of Mechthild's writings, in fact, a closer examination of the Latin translation suggests precisely the opposite: that the translators' project functioned both to legitimize the theological compositions of those outside the Church, who almost certainly would have been writing in the vernacular, as well as to present the visionary and mystical experiences of individual believers as a legitimate element of proper religious devotion.

Heinrich von Nördlingen's translation, composed some decades after the Latin translation, can be seen as building on and extending the work of the Latin translation. As such, in addition to simply legitimizing theological writings created by individuals outside the Church itself, the translation goes even further to present the writing down one's mystical experiences as a necessary component of proper religious practice. The translation itself, in turn, links the notion of the immediacy of the mystical experience with a sense of its divine legitimacy and thus develops an aesthetics of faithfulness. Heinrich von Nördlingen's organizational and stylistic choices, though they closely follow Mechthild's original, highlight the dramatic aspects of the visionary experience. In this sense, the Middle High German translation—in both its organization of chapters as well as its specific, microtextual stylistic decisions—presents itself as

---

[168] See note 41.

an example for believers, both providing specific images for meditation to encourage similar visionary experiences in its readers while also standing as a model for the written transmission of one's own visionary experiences.

Viewed in relation to each other, the two translations have as much to reveal about the biases and problematic assumptions of modern approaches to Mechthild's writing as they do about Mechthild's writings themselves. The extensive organizational interventions of the Latin translation, on the one hand, have been viewed primarily in terms of how they have disrupted the style of Mechthild's text and censored her more problematic theological assertions, while, on the other hand, the Middle High German translation has often been treated as an almost flawless recreation of Mecthild's original text, so much so that its status as a translation is often largely overlooked or mentioned only in passing. In fact, a more comprehensive understanding of Mecthild's text necessitates a more holistic view of the two texts that reckons more specifically with the particular contexts for which each translation was produced as well as with the function of each translation within its specific discursive context.

5: Conclusion

The preceding study examines three particular instances of translation and retextualization during the Middle Ages: Notker's 10th-11th century Old High German translation of traditional Latin school texts (including of the Latin translation of Boethius and Aristotle), the 13th century macaronic Latin-Middle High German compositions within the Carmina Burana, and finally, the 13th century Latin and 14th century Middle High German translations of Mechthild's originally Low German *Fliessendes Licht der Gottheit*. Each of these moments represents a distinct approach to and conception of translation during the Medieval period and thus illustrates both the diversity of translative strategies and theories within the Middle Ages while also shining light on some of the ways in which modern scholarship has often struggled to meaningfully discuss translation and retextualization in the Medieval era. The particular choice of texts, in this sense, tackles certain blind-spots within scholarship, particularly in its eschewing of the traditional focus on translations of texts that move from the vernacular into Latin. Instead, the present study examines instead on somewhat less traditional translation, whether that be those—like Notker's—whose translative movement goes against the grain, that is, moving Latin texts into the vernacular, or those who fall at the margins of what is traditionally seen as translation proper, either because they are too different from or alternatively too similar to their source material. At the former end of this spectrum, we might place the CB's loose retextualizations of pre-existing poems, while at the latter, we might place Heinrich von Nördlingen's ultra-"faithful" translation of Mechthild's writings.

Because these three moments of retextualization are so distinct, it is difficult to draw overarching conclusions about the nature of translation within the Middle Ages, but that is, indeed, precisely the point. In other words, rather than seeking to present an overarching theory of Medieval translation as such, the current study instead focuses on precisely the diversity of different approaches and attempts to see each translation in relation to its specific discursive context. Moreover, this diversity of approaches reveals the resultant need for scholarship both to expand its definition of translation to encompass instances of retextualization that diverge significantly from both modern and Classical models, as well as to consider specific instances of translation in the Middle Ages outside the traditional narratives of cultural hierarchy and dominance that have long structured discussions about Medieval translation.

Notker's translations of the traditional Latin academic texts provide an opportunity to push back against the almost exclusive focus on the role of rhetoric within studies of medieval translation. Although rhetorical concerns do often play an important role in medieval discussions of translation, the emphasis on the role of rhetoric in scholarship on the subject carries with it problematic assumptions about the relationship between Latinate and vernacular cultures in the Middle Ages. More specifically, portraying medieval translation solely in terms of rhetoric positions it as a tool within a larger cultural struggle between two opposing cultures. A study of Notker's translations helps to counteract this view. In Notker's translations, it is not rhetoric that plays the determining role in the strategy and ultimately outcome of the translations, but rather a different branch of the *trivium* entirely: dialectics. Notker's translations, moreover, move texts from Latin into the vernacular and, in so doing, further contradict the notion of medieval translation as simply a means of literary appropriation. Here, the intention is clearly not to appropriate Latin texts for the vernacular. Notker's translations—with their mixture of Old High German and Latin, their discussion of the grammatical intricacies of the Latin language, and their lengthy asides on relevant subject matter necessary to understand certain passages— consistently make clear their status as translations and do not seek to standalone as texts that could be read

exclusively in the vernacular, thus supplanting the original text. Instead, the strategies Notker employs make clear that his works are always meant to be used a pedagogical tools, read in conjunction with the original texts, with the ultimate goal of providing students with a deeper understanding of the subject matter discussed in the original as well as of the Latin language itself.

A study of the macaronic poetry of the *Carmina Burana* allows for a critique of the way in which these poems have traditionally been approached in scholarship and thereby opens up the question of what should or should not be counted as a translation within discussions of medieval translation. Though the vernacular verses at the ends of these poems have often been seen as indicating the melody for the preceding Latin strophes or as showing some sort of loose, thematic inspiration for the Latin strophes, these closing verses can and indeed should be read as actual conclusions to the strophes to which they are appended. Here, the focus is not on literal word-for-word translation but rather a looser type of retextualization, in which the vernacular strophes are moved from their original context so that they can instead be incorporated into a different discussion. Within the love poetry section of the *Carmina Burana*, this retextualization often brings two different conceptions of romantic love into dialogue with each other, with the intention of revealing either the similarities (as in the case of CB 147) or the differences (as in the case of CB 166) between understandings of love within the Latin and vernacular spheres. Together the love poetry of the *Carmina Burana* offers neither a wholesale critique nor indiscriminate praise of either the Latin or the vernacular conceptions of romantic love, but instead focus on comparing the two and bringing them into dialogue with each other. Within the other sections of the *Carmina Burana*—that is, in the section of moral poetry or in the section of drinking songs—the retextualizations behaves somewhat differently, but here too the effect of these poetic couplings does not simply work to parody or critique vernacular literary culture, as it has often been seen. In fact, in the case of CB 48, when the appended vernacular verse is read as an integral part of the Latin verses, it becomes clear that both the Latin strophes and the vernacular strophes are working together to comment on the need for Crusaders to practice their endeavors in the correct, Christian mindset. Similarly, in the case of CB 211, the appended verse of Walter's *Palastinalied* again does not function simply to parody the vernacular lyric but rather works to evidence precisely the sort of hypocrisy that the Latin strophes themselves are criticizing. Overall, the examination of the macaronic poetry in the *Carmina Burana* reveals how reductive a reading of this material that only sees the poems in terms of linguistic struggle between Latin and the vernacular can be. In fact, the translinguistic retextualization of strophes of vernacular lyric allows the compilers of the codex to negotiate complex issues that transcend linguistic boundaries.

Finally, the examination of Mechthild's text works to reveal both the biases present in scholarship on the two different translations, while also examining some of the ways in which these biases are rooted in the differing strategies employed in the two different translations. In general, scholarship on Mechthild's writings has historically focused to a greater degree on the Middle High German translation from Heinrich von Nördlingen with far less interest being paid to the Latin translation. To some degree, this bias in scholarship appears to depend on assumptions about the degree of fidelity of the two translations. Scholarship has often positioned the MHG translation almost as an identical equivalent to Mechthild's original, with discussions of the role of translation often being skipped over or deemphasized, while in discussions of the Latin translations, the focus has consistently been laid on the ways in which the Latin translation disrupts and misrepresents Mechthild's original text and ideas. The Latin translators do make

rather more obvious changes to the text (in terms of organization as well as the titles of chapters, for example, and, in turn, the faithfulness of the Latin translation has often been a sticking point for scholarly discussions of the text. While the Latin translation, in this sense, does make certain conspicuous changes to Mechthild's texts, these changes reveal the extent of the Latin translators respect for Mechthild's ideas and the extent to which they were engaging with her writings as legitimate theological knowledge. Such translative strategies further emphasize the way in which the Latin translation was being used in its medieval context: that is, in close conjunction with Mechthild's German text, not as an independent text designed to supplant or replace the original. In contrast to the Latin translation, which often makes its status as a translation obvious, the translative strategies employed in the Middle High German translation of the text ultimately work to deemphasize the figure of the translator and thus might be said to contribute to the similar elision of the translator in scholarly discussion of the text.

Though the present study has restricted its focus to moments of retextualization between Latin and Medieval Germanic languages, such a discrete approach to translation in terms of retextualization might also be worth applying in studies of translation between Latin and other vernaculars during the Middle Ages, as well as potentially studies of translation between different medieval vernacular languages. Outside of the Middle Ages proper, a discussion of translation in similar terms could prove productive as a means of discussing moments of translation within the Early Modern period, as well. Here, although the development of the printing press certainly expands the range and audience of many translations, nevertheless many translations within this period are still produced for a fairly specific reading community and are designed to serve a particular role within that context. Jakob Locher's late fifteenth-century Latin translation of Sebastian Brant's *Narrenschiff*, for instance, might stand as a good example of such a translation pair within the Germanic Early Modern sphere. Brant's text, published in 1494, rose quickly to popularity in the German world, and Locher's translation—produced only 3 years later in 1497—found an even wider audience for itself and was even subsequently translated into other European languages (for example, French, Flemish, English) over the course of the next two decades. Interestingly, it was the Latin translation that served as the source text for most of the subsequent translations. As Edwin H. Zeydel notes in his introduction to his English translation of the Narrenschiff, "practically all the other translations of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, except the Low German version, rely wholly or partially upon" Locher's Latin translation of the text, and not Brant's original.

Though this comparatively immense readership distinguishes the translation from translations in the Middle Ages, nevertheless the textual pair bears many similarities to medieval translations, suggesting it might be productively studied through a similar lens. Namely, Locher, as Brant's student, produced his Latin translation of the *Narrenschiff, Stultifera navis,* in close consultation with the original author, that is, in a fairly local context. Brant even wrote a pair of introductory poems for Locher's text—one addressing his pupil and one directed to his foolish audience[169]—a sort of authorization of the translation indicating the original author's knowledge and approval of the translation. Nevertheless, the Latin translation—much like many of the medieval translations already discussed—is often described in scholarship as being more of a "Nachdichtung" than a genuine translation,[170] due to its reorganization of the chapters and liberal recreation of the original text at the sentence-level. Oftentimes, the translation's independence

---

[169] Sections IX and X (pages 32-35) in Nina Hartl's critical edition of Locher's Latin translation of the text.

[170] Rupp, Michael. "Narrenschiff*" und "*Stultifera Navis*": Deutsche und lateinische Moralsatire von Sebastian Brant und Jakob Locher in Basel 1494-1498*. Münster, Waxmann, 2002.

from the original text results in a negative bias in scholarship, as in, for example, Aurelius Pompen's *The English Versions of the Ship of Fools,* which argues—following Zeydel's summary in his introduction to his own English translation—that "Locher scarely reproduces more than one-third of the ideas and one-tenth of the with and irony of Brant's original poem" (26). Nevertheless, as previously mentioned, it is ultimately the Latin translation that receives the widest readership. That the original illustrative woodcuts included in Brant's edition of the text are reproduced—and often recontextualized and reinterpreted—provides an extra level of translation and recontextualization for analysis beyond the text itself. Besides the translations, Brant's text also inspired a number of "unauthorized" reprintings of the text within German, which often reorganize, expand on, and subtract from Brant's original text (Zeydel 22). These unauthorized versions further reveal the usefulness of the concept of retextualization, rather than restricting oneself to a discussion of translation proper, in that such a lens allows for the intra-lingual, unauthorized reprintings to be included in a discussion of the translations of Brant's work.

Far from a monolith, medieval translations—even within the restricted subfield of Latin and Germanic literatures—encompass many different approaches to translation, each rooted in a particular discursive moment and context, each designed to fulfill a specific purpose for the audiences for which it was originally produced. The present study, as a result of the non-homogeneous nature of translation in the Middle Ages, offers a survey of a few different approaches to Medieval translation but paves the way for other studies that seek to examine translation not via overarching narratives but within their own specific context. At the same time, however, the notion of *translation* specifically is too restrictive to encompass the variety of different types of retextualization utilized within the Medieval period, and, as such, both a wider and a narrower lens is required in order to adequately discuss the topic. Translation within the Middle Ages exists only as a narrow subset of the wider phenomenon of retextualization, that itself operates within a wide, often interlingual discursive network. These processes of retextualization, indeed, are crucial to the ways in which ideas and arguments are exchanged and revised within the Medieval period. Though the view of studies of Medieval literature might therefore do well to broaden its focus from translation to retextualization and, perhaps, to even broader categories of discursive reproduction, at the same time, studies of specific instances of retextualization within the period must remain aware that, because medieval translations are often created within close contact with the source text and designed to be read in conjunction with the original text, any adequate scholarly discussion of the translated text must likewise be intricately intertwined with a discussion of the source text and the intended audience thereof.

6: Bibliography

Adams, J. N. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1982.

Ashcroft, Jeffrey. "Crabbed Age and Youth: the Self-stylisations of Reinmar and
    Walther." *German Life and Letters,* vol. 28 (3), 1975. 187-197.

---. "'Venus Clerk': Reinmar in the 'Carmina Burana'" *The Modern Language Review* 77.3
    (1982): 618-28.

Basel, Universitaetsbibliothek, Cod. B IX 11.

Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere (editors). *Translation, History and Culture.* Bloomsbury,
    1995.

Becker, Ernst. *Beiträge zur lateinischen und deutschen Überlieferung des Fliessenden Lichts der
    Gottheit.* 1951. Göttingen U, PhD Dissertation.

Beckman, P. Z. "The Power of Books and the Practice of Mysticism in the Fourteenth Century:
    Heinrich of Nördlingen and Margaret Ebner on Mechthild's *Flowing Light of the
    Godhead." Church History,* vol. 96.1, Mar. 2007, 61-83.

Benjamin, Walther. "The Translator's Task." *The Translation Studies Reader,* trans. Steven
    Rendall, 3rd edition, Routledge, 2012.

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, mgf. 922

Bezner, Frank. "Zwischen 'Sinnlosigkeit und 'Sinnhaftigkeit': Figurationen der
    Retextualisierung in der mittellateinischen Literatur." *Retextualisierungen in der
    mittelalterlichen Literatur*, special edition of *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie*. 124
    (2005): 205-237.

Bischoff, Bernhard. Introduction. *Carmina Burana: Faksimile-Ausgabe Der Handschrift Der
    Carmina Burana Und Der Fragmenta Burana (Clm. 4660 Und 4660a) Der Bayerischen
    Staatsbibliothek in München*, edited by Bernhard Bischoff, Prestel, 1967. 5-17.

Boethius. "An. Manl. Sev. Boetii in Categorias Aristotelis Libri Quatour." *Patrologia Latina*,
    edited by Jacques-Paul Migne, vol. 64 (Boetii Opera Omnia), Paris 1847.

---. *The Theological Tractates / The Consolation of Philosophy*, translated by S. J. Tester, Loeb
    Classical Library, no. 74, Harvard UP, 1973.

Brant, Sebastian. *The Ship of Fools*. Edited and translated by Edwin H. Zeydel, Dover, 1962.

---. *The English Version of the Ship of Fools.* Edited by Aurelius Pompen. Longmans, Green, and
    Co., 1925.

Bumke, Joachim. "Retextualisierungen in der mittelalterlichen Literatur, besonders in der
    höfischen Epik." *Retextualisierungen in der mittelalterlichen Literatur*, special edition of
    Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie. 124 (2005): 6-46.

Bumke, Joachim and Ursula Peters. "Einleitung." *Retextualisierungen in der mittelalterlichen
    Literatur*, special edition of *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie*. 124 (2005): 1-5.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to
    Medieval Women*. University of California Press, 1987.

Cerquiglini, Bernard. *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology*. John Hopkins
    UP, 2004.

Charlemagne. "Karoli Magni De Litteris Collendi." *Monumenta Germaniae Historica /
    Capitularia Regum Francorum,* edited by Alfredus Boretius, vol. 1, Hannover, Hahniani,
    1883, p. 79.

Cicero, *De Inventione, De optimo genere oratorum, Topica,* edited and translated by H. M.
    Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1949.

Concilium Turonese 813. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica,* Concilia 2.1 (*Concilia aevi Karolini*), Hanover, Hahniani, 1906, 286-293.

Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*. Cambridge UP, 1991.

Curtius, Ernst Robert. *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. Francke, 1993.

---. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, translated by Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990.

De Boor, Helmut. *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart.* Vol. I*: Die deutsche Literatur von Karl dem Grossen bis zum Beginn der höfischen Dichtung, 770-1170*. C. H. Beck, 1957.

Dronke, Peter. *Medieval Latin and the Rise of European Love-Lyric*. 2nd ed., vol. 2, Clarendon, 1968.

Dronke, Peter. *The Medieval Poet and his World*. Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 1984.

Dronke, Peter. *Sources of Inspiration: Studies in Literary Transformation: 400-1500*. Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 1997.

Egres, Odo. "Mechthild von Magdeburg: *The Flowing Light of God.*" *Cistercians in the Late Middle Ages,* edited by E. Rozanne Elder. Cistercian Publications, 1981. 19-37.

Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek 277.

Ekkehard IV. *Casus Sancti Galli / St. Galler Klostergeschichten*. Edited and translated by Hans F. Haefele, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980.

---. *Der Liber Benedictionum Ekkeharts IV. : nebst den kleinern Dichtungen aus dem Codex Sangallensis 393*. Edited by Johannes Egli, Fehr'sche, 1909, St. Gall.

Galvez, Marisa. *Songbook: How Lyrics Became Poetry in Medieval Europe*. Chicago UP, 2012.

Gile, Daniel. *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training.* John Benjamins, 2009.

Glauch, Sonja. *Die Martianus-Capella-Bearbeitung Notkers des Deutschen*, vol. 1 (Untersuchungen). Niemeyer, 2000.

Graff, E. G. *Althochdeutsche, dem Anfange des 11. Jahrhunderts angehörige Übersetzung und Erläuterung der von Boetius verfassten fünf Bücher „De Cconsolatione Philosophiae*. Berlin, Nicolaischen Buchhandlung, 1837.

Grotans, Anna A. *Reading in Medieval St. Gall*. Cambridge UP, 2006.

Grundmann, Herbert. *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter: Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zusammenhänge zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und der religiösen Frauenbewegung im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik*. Olms, 2013.

---. *Religious Movements in the Middles Ages: the Historical Links between Heresy, the Mendicant Orders, and the Women's Religious Movement in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Century, with the Historical Foundations of German Mysticism.* Translated by Steven Rowan, Notre Dame, IN, U Notre Dame P, 1995.

Hartl, Nina. *Stultifera Navis Jakob Lochers Übertragung von Sebastian Brants 'Narrenschiff,*' vol. 2. Waxmann, 2001.

Hehle, Christine. "Boethius's Influence on German Literature to c.1550." *A Companion to Boethius in the Middle Ages*, edited by Noel Harold Kaylor Jr. and Phillip Edward Phillips, Leiden, Brill, 2012. 255-318.

Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cpg 357

Heidelberg, Universitätsbiblithek, Cpg 848

Hellgardt, Ernst. "Latin and Vernacular." *A Companion to Mysticism and Devotion in Northern Germany in the Late Middle Ages*, edited by Henrike Lähnemann, Elizabeth Andersen, and Anne Simon, Brill, 2013.

Hellgardt, Ernst (editor). "Notkers des Deutschen Brief an Bischof Hugo von Sitten." *Befund und Deutung: zum Verhältnis von Empirie und Interpretation in Sprach- und Literturwissenschaft,* edited by Hans Fromm and Klaus Grubmüller, Niemeyer, 1979. 169-92.

Henkel, Nikolaus. *Deutsche Übersetzungen lateinischer Schultexte: ihre Verbreitung und Funktion im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit*. Artemis, 1988.

Hoffmann, Paul. *Die Mischprosa Notkers des Deutschen.* Georg-August University, Ph.D. Dissertation, 1906.

Holznagel, Franz-Josef. ",Habe ime wîs und wort mit mir gemeine...': Retextualisierungen in der deutschsprachigen Lyrik des Mittelalters. Eine Skizze." *Retextualisierungen in der mittelalterlichen Literatur*, special edition of *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie*. 124 (2005): 47-81.

Horace. *Satires, Epistles, and Ars poetica*. Edited and translated by H. Ruishton Fairclough. Loeb Classical Library, Harvard UP, 1926.

Jerome. "Epistula LVII. Ad Pammachium De Optimo Genere Interpretandi." Patrologia Latina, edited by J.P. Migne, vol. 22, 1845, 568-579.

Kasten, Ingrid, editor. *Deutsche Lyrik Des Frühen Und Hohen Mittelalters*. Translated by Margherita Kuhn, Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1995.

King, James E. "Philosophia kommt Boethius mit Rhetorik und Dispuatione entgegen." *Verborum Amor: Studien zur Geschichte und Kunst der deutschen Sprache*, edited by Harald Burger et al.. de Gruyter, 1992, 201-213.

Kelle, Johann. *Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur von der ältesten Zeit bis zur Mitte des elften Jahrhunderts*. Wilhelm Hertz, 1892.

---. *Die S. Galler deutschen Schriften und Notker Labeo*, Munich, Verlag der k. Akademie, 1888.

Kelly, Douglas. "The Fidus Interpres: Aid or Impediment to Medieval Translation and Translatio?" *Translation Theory and Practice in the Middle Ages,* edited by Jeanette Beer. Vol. 38. Western Michigan UP, 1997. 47-59.

---. "Translatio Studii: Translation, Adaptation, and Allegory in Medieval French Literature." *Philological Quarterly* 57 (1978): 287-310.

Köbele, Susanne. *Bilder der unbegriffenen Wahrheit: zur Struktur mystischer Rede in Spannungsfeld von Latein und Volkssprache*. Francke, 1993.

Kögel, Rudolf. *Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters*, vol. 1.2, Karl J. Trübner, 1894.

Kraus, Carl von, editor. *Deutsche Liederdichter des 13. Jahrhunderts.* Vol. 1-2. Niemeyer, 1952.

Kraus, Carl von, editor. *Die Gedichte Walthers von der Vogelweide: Zehnte Ausgabe mit Bezeichnung der Abweichungen von Lachmann und mit seinen Anmerkungen*. De Gruyter, 1936.

Lachmann, Karl, Moriz Haupt, and Friedrich Vogt, editors. *Des Minnesangs Frühling.* S. Hirzel, 1920.

Law, Vivien. *The History of Linguistics in Europe: From Plato to 1600.* Cambridge UP, 2003.

Luzern, Zentralbibliothek Cod. Nr. 175.

Marenbon, John. "Glosses and Commentaries on the 'Categories' and 'De Interpretatione' before Abelard." *Dialektik und Rhetorik im früheren und hohen Mittelalter: Rezeption,*

Überlieferung und gesellschaftliche Wirkung antiker Gelehrsamkeit vornehmlich im 9. und 12. Jahrhundert, edited by Johannes Fried. R. Oldenbourg, 1997, pp. 21-50.

---. "Magnanimity, Christian Ethics, and Paganism in the Latin Middle Ages." *The Measure of Greatness: Philosophers on Magnanimity,* edited by Sophia Vasalou. Oxford UP, 2019.

Margetts, John. "Latein und Volkssprache bei Mechtild von Magdeburg." *Amsterdamer Beträge zur älteren Germanistik.* vol. 12 (1977), 119-136.

Marnau, Maximillian. "Introduction." *Gertrude von Helfta: The Herald of Divine Love,* Paulist, 1993.

Mechthild of Magdeburg. *Das fliessende Licht der Gottheit*. Edited by Gisela Vollmann-Profe, Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 2003.

---. *‚Lux divinitatis' – ‚Das liecht der gotheit': Der lateinisch-frühneuhochdeutsche Überlieferungszweig des ‚Fließenden Lichts der Gottheit'. Synoptische Ausgabe*. Edited by Balázs J. Nemes, Elke Senn und Ernst Hellgardt, De Gruyter, 2019.

---. *Lux Divinitatis Fluens in Corda Veritatis. Revelationes Gertrudianae ac Mechtildianae*, vol. II, Oudin, 1877.

---. *The Flowing Light of the Godhead*. Translated by Frank Tobin, Paulist Press, 1998.

Minnis, A. J. *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages.* 2nd edition, U of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliotek CLM 4660

Müller, Ulrich, Michael North, and René Clemencic, editors. *Carmina Burana: lateinisch-deutsch. Gesamtausgabe der mittelalterlichen Melodien mit den dazugehörigen Texten.* Heimeran, 1979.

Müller, Ulrich. "Beobachtungen zu den 'Carmina Burana'. 1. Eine Melodie zur Vaganten-Strophe: 2. Walters 'Palästina-Lied' in 'versoffenem' Kontext: Eine Parodie." *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch,* vol. 15, 1980. 104-111.

---. "Mehrsprachigkeit Und Sprachmischung Als Poetische Technik: Barbarolexis in Den *Carmina Burana*." *Gesammelte Schriften Zur Literaturwissenschaft*, edited by Margarete Springeth, Gertraud Mitterauer, and Ruth Weichselbaumer, Vol. 1. Kümmerle, 2010. 217-34.

Moser, Hugo and Helmut Tervooren, editors. *Des Minnesangs Frühling*: *unter Benutzung der Ausgaben von Karl Lachmann und Moriz Haupt, Friedrich Vogt und Carl von Kraus*, 37th ed., S. Hirzel, 1982.

Neumann, Hans. "Beiträge zur Textgeschichte des 'Fliessenden Lichts der Gottheit' und zur Lebensgeschichte Mechthilds von Magdeburg." *Altdeutsche und altniederländische Mystik*, edited by Karl Ruh. Vol. 23, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964. 175-239.

Nemes, Balázs J. "Mechthild amongst the friends of God – The friends of God in Mechthild.Or: What have the friends of God got to do with." *Friends of God. Vernacular literature and religious elites in the Rhineland and the Low Countries (1300–1500*), edited by Wybren Sheepsma, Gijs van Vliet, Geert Warnar, Edizioni di sotria e letteratura, 2018.

---. *Von der Schrift zum Buch – vom Ich zum Autor: zur Text- und Autorkonstitution in Überlieferung und Rezeption des "Fliessenden Lichts der Gottheit" Mechthilds von Magdeburg*. Francke, 2010.

---. "Additional Description to Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, B IX 11." *e-codices: Virtual Manuscript Library of Switzerland.* 2013. https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/description/ubb/B-IX-0011/Nemes. Accessed 4 April 2023.

Nida, Eugene A., and Charles R. Taber. The Theory and Practice of Translation, With Special Reference to Bible Translating. Brill, 1969.

Northcote, J. Spencer*, Epitaphs of the Catacombs; or, Christian Inscriptions in Rome during the First Four Centuries*, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1878.

Notker der Deutsche. *Die Werke Notkers des Deutschen*. Edited by James C. King and Petrus W. Tax, vol. 1-10, Niemeyer, 1986.

Ortmann, Christa. "Das Buch der Minne: Methodologischer Versuch zur deutsch-lateinischen Gegebenheit des 'Fliefsenden Lichts der Gottheit' Mechtilds von Magdeburg." *Grundlagen des Verstehens mittelalterlicher Literatur: literarische Texte und ihr historischer Erkenntniswert*, Kröner, 1992.

Osterwalder, Peter. *Das althochdeutsche Galluslied Ratperts und seine lateinischen Übersetzungen durch Ekkehart IV.* Edited by Peter Osterwalder, de Gruyter, 1982.

Ovid. *The Art of Love and Other Poems.* Translated by J. H. Mozley, Loeb Classical Library, no. 232, Harvard UP, 1979.

---. *Heroides and Amores*. Translated by Grant Showerman, Loeb Classical Library, no. 41, Harvard UP, 1914.

Peters, Ursula. *Religiöse Erfahrung als literarisches Faktum: zur Vorgeschichte und Genese frauenmystischer Texte des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts*. Niemeyer, 1988.

Poor, Sara S. *Mechthild of Magdeburg and Her Book: Gender and the Making of Textual Authority*. U of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Poor, Sara S. "Transmission and Impact: Mechthild of Magdeburg's Das fliessende Licht der Gottheit." *A Companion to Mysticism and Devotion in Northern Germany in the Late Middle Ages*, edited by Elizabeth Andersen, et al., BRILL, 2013.

Prantl, Karl. *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande,* vol. 2, S. Hirzel, 1885.

Pratt, Karen. "Medieval Attitudes to Translation and Adaptation: The Rhetorical Theory and the Poetic Practice." *The Medieval Translator,* edited by Roger H. Ellis, vol. 2, D.S. Brewer, 1991. 1-27.

Rikhardsdottir, Sif. *Medieval Translations and Cultural Discourse: The Movement of Texts in England, France and Scandinavia.* D.S. Brewer, 2012.

Ringler, Siegfried. "Die Rezeption Gertruds von Helfta im Bereich süddeutscher Frauenkloster." *'Vor dir steht die leere Schale meiner Sehnsucht': die Mystik der Frauen von Helfta*, edited by Michael Bangert and Hildegund Keul, Benno-Verlag, 1999. 134-55.

---. *Viten- und Offenbarungsliteratur in Frauenklöstern des Mittelalters: Quellen und Studien.* Artemis, 1980.

Ruh, Kurt. *Geschichte der Abendlaendische Mystik*, vol. 2 (*Frauenmystik und franziskanische Mystik der Frühzeit.* Wilhelm Fink, 1993.

Rupp, Michael. "Narrenschiff*" und "*Stultifera Navis*": Deutsche und lateinische Moralsatire von Sebastian Brant und Jakob Locher in Basel 1494-1498*, Waxmann, 2002.

Sayce, Olive. *The Medieval German Lyric, 1150-1300: The Development of Its Themes and Forms in Their European Context*. Clarendon, 1982.

Schröbler, Ingeborg. "Die St. Galler Wissenschaft Um Die Jahrtausendwende Und Gerbert Von Reims." *Zeitschrift Für Deutsches Altertum Und Deutsche Literatur*, vol. 81, no. 1/2, 1944, pp. 32–43.

---. *Notker III von St. Gallen Als Übersetzer Und Kommentator von Boethius' De Consolatione Philosophiae*. Niemeyer, 1953.

Schumann, Otto, and Alfons Hilka, editors. *Carmina Burana, Mit Benutzung Der Vorarbeiten Wilhelm Meyers*. C. Winter, 1930.

Sonderegger, Stefan. "German language and literature in St. Gall." *Die Kultur der Abtei Sankt Gallen*, Belser, 1991, 9-28.

Speculum, edited by Katherine L. Jansen, vol. 65, no. 1 " edition "The New Philology," 1990 January.

St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 274.

St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 21

St. Paul im Lavanttal, Stiftsbibliothek., Cod. 905/0

Stierling, Hubert. *Studien zu Mechthild von Magdeburg*. 1907, U Göttingen, PhD Dissertation.

Stock, Brian. *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the 11th and 12th Centuries,* Princeton UP, 1983.

Strauch, Philipp. *Margaretha Ebner und Heinrich von Nördlingen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Mystik*. J.C.B. Mohr P. Siebeck, 1882.

Stuttgart, Landesbibliothek., Cod. HB XIII 1

Tobin, Frank. *Mechthild von Magdeburg: A Medieval Mystic in Modern Eyes.* Camden House, 1995.

Townsend, David. "The Current Questions and Future Prospects of Medieval Latin Studies." *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Latin Literature*, edited by Ralph J. Hexter and David Townsend, Oxford UP, 2012. 3-24.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2008.

Vogler, Werner. "Skizze der Sankt Galler Abteigeschichte." *Die Kultur der Abtei Sankt Gallen*, Belser, 1991, 9-28.

Vollmann, Benedikt Konrad, editor. *Carmina Burana: Texte Und Übersetzungen*. Deutscher Klassiker, 2011.

Vollmann-Profe, Gisela. "Mechthild von Magdeburg—Deutsch und Lateinisch." *Deutsche Mystik im abendländischen Zusammenhang: Neu erschlossene Texte, neue methodische Ansätze, neue theoretische Konzepte*, edited by Walter Haug and Wolfram Schneider-Lastin, Niemeyer, 2000. 133-56.

The Vulgate Bible. Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem. 4th ed., Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

Wachinger, Burghart. "Deutsche Und Lateinische Liebeslieder. Zu Den Deutschen Strophen Der Carmina Burana." *Lieder Und Liederbücher: Gesammelte Aufsätze Zur Mittelhochdeutschen Lyrik,* De Gruyter, 2011. 97-123.

Walsh, P. G. *Courtly Love in the Carmina Burana*. U of Edinburgh, 1971.

---. *Love Lyrics from the Carmina Burana*. U of North Carolina, 1993.

Walsh, P. G, trans. *Andreas Capellanus On Love*. Duckworth Classical, Medieval and Renaissance Editions, Duckworth, 1982.

Westra, Haijo. "New Philology and the Editing of Medieval Latin Texts." *Towards a synthesis? Essays on the new philology,* edited by Keith Busby, Amsterdam, 1993, 49-58. *Faux titre,* vol. 68.

Worstbrock, Franz Josef. "Dilatatio materiae. Zur Poetik des 'Erec' Hartmanns von Aue. *Worstbrock, Ausgewählte Schriften 1: Schriften zur Literatur des Mittelalters,* edited by Andreas Krass, S. Hirzel, 2004. 197-228.

---. "Wiedererzälen und Übersetzen." *Mittelalter und frühe Neuzeit: Übergänge, Umbrüche und Neuansätze*, edited by Walter Haug, Niemeyer, 1999. 128-142.

Zumthor, Paul. *Essai de poétique médiévale*. Le Seuil, 2000.