

## Introduction

Nothing is more commonplace than the reading experience, and yet nothing is more unknown.

Tzvetan Todorov<sup>1</sup>

In recent decades several pioneering studies have changed the way we look at literacy in the medieval West. They have provided important insights into the conditions for literacy, its extent, growth, function and social and political implications as well as discussing the transition from orality to literacy and the influences each of these had on the other.<sup>2</sup> Closely linked with the topic of literacy is the history of reading and writing.<sup>3</sup> What was read, why was it read and, important for the present study, how was it read? The history of writing, in addition to investigating the creative act of composition itself, also studies the actual act of inscription and the written culture which it produces. From the perspective of manuscript studies, it looks at what writing materials were used, how letter forms were developed, shaped and combined to form words, and how these words were organized into texts on the page and in a codex. The history of reading and writing are related, since how texts were written often influenced how they were read and, conversely, the prerequisites

<sup>1</sup> "Reading as Construction," in Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman (eds.), *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation* (Princeton: University Press, 1980), p. 67.

<sup>2</sup> For example, Bäuml (1997, 1993, 1980), Banniard (1992), Clanchy (1993, 1981), Copeland (1991), Graff (1987a, 1987b, 1981a, 1981b), Graham (1987), Green (1998, 1994, 1990), Grubmüller (1989), Haug (1983), Hellgardt (1996), Henkel (1988), Howe (1993), Illich (1990), Irvine (1994), McKitterick (1994a, 1994b, 1990, 1989, 1983), Mostert (1999a, 1999b), O'Brien-O'Keefe (1990), Ong (1982), Parkes (1999, 1993, 1987, 1973), Reynolds, (1996), Saenger (1997, 1982), Schaefer (1993, 1992), Stock (1983), H. Wenzel (1995) and the work of the "Münster School," "Der Münsterer Sonderforschungsbereich 231 'Träger, Felder, Formen pragmatischer Schriftlichkeit im Mittelalter,'" *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 24–32 (1990–1998). A concise review of recent scholarship is provided in Charles F. Briggs, "Historiographical Essay: Literacy, Reading and Writing in the Medieval West," *Journal of Medieval History* 26.4 (2000), pp. 397–420.

<sup>3</sup> See M. Mostert, "New Approaches to Medieval Communication," and the bibliography provided in M. Mostert (ed.), *New Approaches to Medieval Communication* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), pp. 15–37 and pp. 193–297.

## Reading in Medieval St. Gall

of reading directly influenced developments in writing. Moreover, both are directly related to the study of how literacy was acquired.

My study investigates classroom reading, or *lectio*, as it was practised in the Abbey of St. Gall at the turn of the second millennium. I concentrate on the teaching techniques of Notker Labeo (*ca.* 950–1022) and the Latin/Old High German translation/commentaries that he produced for instruction. My goal is to demonstrate how Notker facilitated primary access to texts by making them grammatically more straightforward, visually more legible and aurally more intelligible. Notker's texts are unique in that they demonstrate an intersection and interplay between the traditional bipolarities of literacy and orality or Latin and the vernacular. In them Notker applied semantic, syntactic and graphic techniques that optimized lexical access and understanding and at the same time aided readers in correct oral performance. Notker's approach to reading borrows from the traditional commentary practices of classical and medieval *lectio* and augments them in two significant ways. On the one hand, Notker made clear the syntax and structure of his texts by applying a code of disambiguation that may have grown out of the tenth-century curriculum of dialectic and, on the other hand, he applied a vernacular code of comprehension that met the needs of his German-speaking reading audience and the pupils he was teaching. The method seems to us today quite natural, but it was unprecedented at the turn of the millennium, for in following it, Notker made the extraordinary step of granting the vernacular a place, albeit it a small one, within the classroom linguistic hierarchy and textual culture.

How one acquired the skills of reading and writing in the early medieval West still remains a largely unexplored field. The accomplishments of medieval scholars and their ability to interpret and comment upon texts as well as to compose poems of their own have been the subject of numerous studies. That these scholars first had to learn the skills of literacy and, in the non-Romance-speaking areas, Latin too is often taken for granted. For the Carolingian period we have numerous classroom texts but know relatively little about how they were actually put to use in schools. Direct statements describing medieval pedagogic techniques are sparse, and evidence must often be gleaned from commentary and annotations made by teachers and students. In many cases these are literally tucked away between the lines and have been ignored by editors who were more interested in establishing the primary texts upon which they comment. Vernacular glosses are an exception, but these too have often been isolated from their pragmatic context by historical linguists more interested in tracing the development of the European mother tongues.

Well into the twelfth century, textual culture in Europe was primarily centered in religious institutions and directly related to activities in monastic and cathedral schools. The language of the written word – and of the Word of God – was Latin, a foreign tongue that had to be learned. In France, Italy and Spain the linguistic obstacle was perhaps not so forbidding given the similarities between the emerging

## Introduction

Romance languages and the *lingua latina*. In the eastern Frankish kingdoms (and something similar can be said for Anglo-Saxon England and Ireland) the situation was quite different. Here most pupils were German-speakers who were confronted in school by a completely foreign idiom. For them, learning to read and write meant at the same time learning a foreign language. Not only did students have to struggle with a whole new lexicon and grammar, but they had to comprehend the difficult concepts covered in the subjects of the seven liberal arts and were soon expected to unravel, penetrate and imitate the often daunting rhetorical style of classical and patristic authors whose texts made up the bulk of the curriculum after the elementary level.

The years between the Carolingian Renaissance and the beginning of the High Middle Ages had once been considered a dark, dreary and unimaginative period in Western culture. As one scholar put it, the tenth century was “a period which for sterility of every excellence may be called iron; for its luxuriance of vice, leaden; and for lack of writers, dark.”<sup>4</sup> And yet scholars working in the tenth and eleventh centuries played a crucial role in the preservation and transmission of Carolingian and ultimately classical learning to subsequent generations. But they were not only curators. Classroom texts produced at St. Gall during this time are marked by a strong interest in dialectic and concerned with its integration with the remaining arts of the trivium, grammar and rhetoric. This shift in the curriculum was facilitated by a regulation of Latin and of fundamental theological texts that had been initiated by the Carolingian reforms. Once the language of scholarship and the Scriptures had been stabilized, scholars delved more deeply into the meaning of the texts themselves. The Carolingians’ stress on correct and readable texts gave way to other methods of facilitating comprehension, which were concerned with explicating the meaning of the written words and further clarifying their graphic representation. On the one hand, we find the issue of an extensive commentary tradition as exemplified in the works of Remigius of Auxerre, Johannes Scottus and others and, on the other hand, the further refinement of graphic techniques that enhanced the ability of readers to comprehend written texts more easily and quickly.

In order to read a text correctly, one of course had to understand it. All texts, however, including introductory grammars and other classroom manuals, were written in Latin. It is unrealistic to assume that every pupil who had learned Latin as a second language had the linguistic ability of an Alcuin, Hrabanus Maurus, or Walahfrid Strabo. Not even a superficial understanding of a given text could be taken for granted. At the end of the tenth century, the practice of Latin arts

<sup>4</sup> Caesar Baronius, *Annales ecclesiastici*, ed. Augustin Theiner, 15 (Paris: Bar-le-Duc, 1868), p. 467; trans. John J. Contreni, “The Tenth Century: The Perspective from the Schools,” *Carolingian Learning, Masters and Manuscripts* (Hampshire/Brookfield, VA: Variorum, 1992), XII, p. 380.

Reading in Medieval St. Gall

commentary with its stress on comprehension was taken one step further and extended to the vernacular. In those regions where Latin was a second and acquired language for those whose native speech was more probably a Germanic dialect, the vernacular became a valid vehicle for learning. In England, Ælfric produced an Old English grammar and Byrhtferth of Ramsey translated *computus* literature into Old English, and on the Continent in St. Gall, Notker Labeo commented upon and translated into German classroom texts used to study the seven liberal arts and theology.

In Notker's school the classroom stage was shared by Latin and the vernacular Old High German (OHG). Notker translated into OHG and commented upon several standard classroom texts, among them the Psalter (*Np*), canticles, and catechetical texts, Boethius' *De consolazione Philosophiae* (*Nb*), Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* (*Nc*), and part of the new logical corpus (subsequently known as the *logica vetus*), the Boethian versions of Aristotle's *De categoriis* (*Nk*) and *De interpretatione* (*Ni*). In addition to these translation/commentaries, Notker composed several shorter treatises dealing with dialectic, rhetoric, arithmetic and music, known collectively as his "*kleinere Schriften*" (*NkS*).<sup>5</sup> Some of the dialectic treatises are in Latin, others in Latin with OHG translation and/or commentary. Notker's "De arte rhetorica" is largely in Latin with OHG example sentences and sparse OHG commentary. His "Computus" is in Latin only; his "De musica" in OHG only. He was also probably the author of *The St. Gall Tractate* discussed below in chapter four. Ekkehard IV (980–ca. 1060), Notker's pupil and successor in the school, writes that his teacher explained many books in German out of affection for his pupils ("teutonice propter caritatem discipulorum plures libros exponens").<sup>6</sup> Notker was concerned that his students acquire the basic knowledge provided by the seven liberal arts, which would eventually lead them to a better understanding of the Scriptures and would presumably lead their souls to heaven. Notker, like his contemporary Ælfric in England, was a pedagogue who realized the importance of Latin literacy in both his monastic community and the world outside of it. He also saw that his pupils, most of whom were native German-speakers, had a difficult time with the Latin texts they were reading. In order to make matters easier for them so that they might understand, Notker resorted to the vernacular and expounded Latin texts in German.

The structure of Notker's translation/commentaries clearly reveals their function as teaching texts. In each of them, Notker copied the original Latin but often

<sup>5</sup> These texts appear in Notker der Deutsche, *Die kleineren Schriften*, ed. James C. King and Petrus W. Tax (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996). They will be discussed in more detail below, chapters two and three.

<sup>6</sup> *Der Liber benedictionum Ekkeharts IV. nebst den kleineren Dichtungen aus dem Codex Sangallensis 393*, ed. Johannes Egli (St. Gallen: Fehr, 1901), p. 230.

## Introduction

transposed and simplified the Latin word order so that it was more transparent and straightforward than in the original. In a few cases this also involved adding syntactical commentary such as supplying implied subjects, objects or conjunctions. Next he punctuated the text according to easily manageable syntactic groups. The resulting Latin text/commentary could be studied in conjunction with and compared to the original text and used as a grammatical key to understanding the intricacies of classical and late classical Latin style. To this “classroom version” Notker appended an OHG translation, which in many cases is more of a free paraphrase with added commentary than a rigid, word for word rendering. On the next level Notker worked in Latin, OHG, or in a mixture of the two and added several additional layers of commentary to both the Latin text and the translations; these commentaries ranged from lexical to discursive, narrative, rhetorical and intertextual. He provided synonyms, expounded rhetorical figures and etymologies and interpreted mythological figures. The information is either his own or culled from medieval commentaries to the texts with which he was working. The entire translation/commentary was then also often punctuated rhetorically by means of verbal cues or graphic markers, which instructed the reader where to pause and modulate his voice in performance according to meaning and effect. The oral characteristics of the written text are further expanded in the OHG translation: words are provided with accent marks to help readers to identify correct word stress and vowel length and an amazingly detailed phonetic spelling of consonants, referred to as Notker’s “*Anlautgesetz*,” is applied, which helped pupils to pronounce the initial stops of words with the correct degree of energy.

Notker’s students could rely on the vernacular to unlock the meaning of what they were reading. It is important to remember, however, that Notker never intended the German portions of his texts to displace the original Latin, as is the case with modern translations. The German commentary was just one integral component of an extensive classroom apparatus, all of whose parts led back to the primary text. Latin and OHG were experienced in a dynamic relationship, and the reader was expected to move back and forth constantly between the two.<sup>7</sup> This linguistic synergy is also reflected in Notker’s frequent use of a “*Mischsprache*,” or mixed language, in which he switches back and forth between Latin and OHG, even within the same sentence or phrase. Notker’s mixed language may represent a variety of a contemporary classroom sociolect, which he himself confronted and used in school at the beginning and intermediate levels. In speech and in writing, the Latin and OHG are fused together in a dialogic interplay and create a masterful and practical tapestry of knowledge *utraque lingua*.

<sup>7</sup> Petrus W. Tax introduces the term “translation-explanations” to refer to Notker’s OHG (“Notker Teutonicus,” *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, 9 [New York: Scribner’s Sons, 1987], pp. 188–190). In my study I refer to Notker’s Latin/OHG texts as “translation/commentaries.”

### Reading in Medieval St. Gall

According to Ekkehard, Notker was the first to write in the vernacular and make it pleasing (“Primus barbaricam [sc. linguam] scribens faciensque saporam”).<sup>8</sup> Towards the end of his career, Notker himself wrote a letter to Bishop Hugo of Sion, in which he refers to his translation venture as a *res paene inusitata*:

Ad quos dum accessum habere nostros uellem scolasticos ausus sum facere rem pene inusitatam . ut latine scripta in nostram <linguam> conatus sum uertere et syllogystice aut figurate aut suasorie dicta per aristotelem uel ciceronem uel alium artigraphum elucidare.

[Since I wanted my students to have an introduction to these texts, I presumed to do something almost unprecedented: I ventured to translate them from Latin into our language, and to elucidate syllogistic, stylistic, and rhetorical precepts according to the teachings of Aristotle, Cicero, or other authors of the *artes*.]<sup>9</sup>

What made Notker’s pedagogic method so “almost unprecedented”? After all, vernacular glosses and interlinear translations had been used in medieval monastic schools for over two hundred years by the time Notker wrote his letter. It was not so much that Notker dared to apply the vernacular, or that his translations are much more refined and complete than scattered lexical glosses or interlinear versions, or even that he included vernacular commentary. The novelty of Notker’s method is that he not only implemented the vernacular as a classroom language but that he also moulded it in an unprecedented manner to meet the standards that such a role required. In order for the *lingua theutonica* to be *sapora*, it, like the Latin it accompanied in the manuscripts, had to follow the basic rules of written culture, which were set down by *grammatica*. German had to be recorded consistently so that it could be read correctly and be pleasing to both the eyes and to the ears.

The practical application of Notker’s texts in the tenth- and eleventh-century classroom has never been investigated in any depth. Rather than asking how and by whom Notker’s texts were used, past scholars have been more interested in other aspects of his work, such as proving Notker’s authorship, studying his dependence on or independence of sources, or praising the aesthetic merit of his translations. A majority of studies have concentrated on his language and on analyzing what Notker’s texts can tell us about the development of German. In their attempts to excavate Notker’s *langue*, linguists have often overlooked the original classroom function of the evidence upon which their studies are based and divorced Notker’s accomplishments from the medieval textual culture which they served. In order to understand Notker’s achievement fully and to appreciate its significance, it is necessary also to view his texts within developments in the St. Gall school and to see his language as a pragmatic component of a tenth-century St. Gall pedagogic *parole*. When seen from this perspective, Notker’s OHG translation/commentaries

<sup>8</sup> Ekkehard IV, *Liber benedictionum*, ed. Egli, p. 230.

<sup>9</sup> *NkS* 348, 9–12; trans. based on Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: University Press, 1991), p. 98.

## Introduction

provide an ideal source for investigating the complex interplay between orality and literacy and Latin and the vernacular and for gleaned useful information about medieval pedagogic and reading techniques in general.

Over the past few decades several significant advances have been made in Notker scholarship. With the completion of the new *Altdutsche Textbibliothek* edition of Notker's works by James C. King and Petrus W. Tax, we now have readily available texts in an easily accessible modified diplomatic format.<sup>10</sup> The editors have gone one step further and painstakingly investigated possible secondary sources that Notker may have used and collected them along with commentary in "*Latinus*" volumes that accompany his works.<sup>11</sup> A further important textual source are the recently published diplomatic transcriptions and concordances to Notker's major works prepared by Evelyn S. Firchow.<sup>12</sup> Much of the primary evidence needed for analyses is now in place.<sup>13</sup> In the past several years two exemplary studies of Notker's important translation/commentaries of Boethius' *De Consolatione* and Martianus Capella by Christine Hehle and Sonja Glauch have appeared.<sup>14</sup> They provide excellent overviews of Notker's method of text analysis, translation and commentary, carefully investigate his sources and how he used them, and contextualize his effort in the intellectual climate of the tenth and eleventh centuries. Each study also delves deeply and systematically into the contents of Notker's work. Hehle carefully analyzes the themes and other systemic complexes that structure

<sup>10</sup> *Die Werke Notkers des Deutschen*, ed. James C. King and Petrus W. Tax, 10 vols. (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1972–1996). Prior to this, some of Notker's works, such as *Ni*, *Nk* and *NkS*, were available only in the nineteenth-century edition by Paul Piper (*Die Schriften Notkers und seiner Schule*, 3 vols. [Freiburg: Mohr, 1882–1883]).

<sup>11</sup> Thus far the *Latinus* volumes to all of Notker's works except for *Nb* have appeared. In the case of *Ni* and *Nk*, the information appears in a supplement published with the text volume.

<sup>12</sup> Notker der Deutsche, *Categoriae. Boethius' Bearbeitung von Aristoteles' Schrift 'kategoriai'.* *Konkordanzen, Wortlisten und Abdruck der Texte nach den Codices Sangallensis 818 und 825*, ed. Evelyn S. Firchow, 2 vols. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996); *idem, De interpretatione. Boethius' Bearbeitung von Aristoteles' Schrift 'peri hermeneias'.* *Konkordanzen, Wortlisten und Abdruck des Textes nach dem Codex Sangallensis 818*, ed. Evelyn S. Firchow (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995); *idem, 'Die Hochzeit der Philologie und des Merkur' ('De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii von Martianus Capella').* *Diplomatischer Textabdruck, Konkordanzen und Wortlisten nach dem Codex Sangallensis 872*, ed. Evelyn S. Firchow (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1999); *idem, Lateinischer Text und althochdeutsche Übersetzung der 'Tröstung der Philosophie' ('De consolatione philosophiae') von Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius.* *Diplomatische Textausgabe, Konkordanzen und Wortlisten nach den Codices Sangallensis 825 und 844, Codex Turicensis C121 und Codex Vindobonensis 242*, ed. Evelyn S. Firchow (Hildesheim: Olms, 2003).

<sup>13</sup> An overview of Notker scholarship can be found in the bibliography by Evelyn S. Firchow, *Notker der Deutsche von St. Gallen (950–1022). Ausführliche Bibliographie*, *Studien zum Althochdeutschen* 38 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2000). See also the recent review article by Ernst Hellgardt and Norbert Kössinger, "Notker der Deutsche. Handschriften- und Sachregister zur Bibliographie von Evelyn Scherabon Firchow," *ZfdA* 133 (2004), pp. 363–380.

<sup>14</sup> Christine Hehle, *Boethius in St. Gallen. Die Bearbeitung der 'Consolatio Philosophiae' durch Notker Teutonicus zwischen Tradition und Innovation* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2002) and Sonja Glauch, *Die Martianus-Capella-Bearbeitung Notkers des Deutschen*, 2 vols. (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2000).

### Reading in Medieval St. Gall

the *Nb*, thereby making clear how the work could be used in the classroom to teach the seven liberal arts as well as theology. In addition, she provides a close analysis of Notker's interpretation of the all-important ninth metre of book three. Glauch investigates how Notker applied the first two books of Martianus' text to teach not so much the trivium, but the abstract mathematical concepts of the quadrivium and what later came to be known as *scientia naturalis*, that is, the observation of things that actually exist in reality, the *naturae rerum*. A sixth chapter is devoted to the topics of mythography and allegory. In the second part of her study Glauch provides a translation and commentary to the first book of *Nc* – an invaluable resource for Notker scholarship that will help future scholars to understand better this very difficult text. I hope that my own study will not only complement the efforts of Glauch and Hehle but also bring the illustrious St. Gall teacher to the attention of scholars outside the field of Old High German and make his work more accessible to an English-speaking audience.

My study is divided into two parts. Part one (chapters 1–3) contextualizes Notker's bilingual approach to reading by reviewing (1) the nature of monastic reading, its classical roots, function and cultural practice; (2) the nature of medieval classroom learning; and finally (3) the domain of the vernacular in textual culture at the turn of the second millennium. Part two (chapters 4–7) deals with various aspects of classroom reading as they were practised in the St. Gall school and manifest themselves in Notker's translation/commentaries, specifically syntactic analysis, punctuation, accentuation and spelling.

In chapter one, I discuss the inherent orality of classical reading and its repercussions for medieval monastic learning and the reception of texts. I trace *lectio* to its roots in classical *grammatica* and show how it was adapted to and refined for monastic and clerical culture. *Lectio* enabled primary access to a text by providing the tools with which to distinguish letters, to combine them into words, phrases, clauses and sentences (*discretio*) and to perform texts correctly out loud (*accentus*, *pronuntiatio* and *modulatio*). Correct oral performance based on a correct written text was a *sine qua non* in the reading process, since it was the text not only as read, but as read aloud – either to a group or to oneself – that formed the basis for any further analysis. Early medieval reading still had this intrinsic oral/aural character. Texts were read aloud, be it to an audience or *sotto voce* to oneself and the act of reading involved not only the eyes, but in most cases also the lips and the ears. This functional orality of written texts was deeply rooted in a “classical past” with its grammatical and rhetorical traditions and a “monastic present” in which the correct oral performance of liturgical and other texts was a crucial component of everyday life.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Cf. George Hardin Brown, “Latin Writing and the Old English Vernacular,” in Ursula Schaefer (ed.), *Schriftlichkeit im frühen Mittelalter* (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1993), p. 36.



## Introduction

Although still largely oral in nature, medieval monastic *lectio* was also firmly anchored in a written “scripture,” most often the Scriptures. It was necessary to stabilize Christian beliefs and dogma in the Frankish kingdoms, and one way to achieve this was by writing them down. The written text became all the more important, for when written correctly, it could guard against misinterpretation; when written incorrectly in the worst cases it could lead to heresy.<sup>16</sup> One of the major achievements of the Carolingian *renovatio* was to fix the written Word, the Scriptures and liturgy, by establishing canonical texts, normalizing Latin, and developing a common script, the Caroline minuscule. A further aspect was to avoid misreading and misunderstanding by making texts more legible and intelligible, by various means which M. B. Parkes refers to collectively as a “grammar of legibility.”<sup>17</sup> *Lectio* was thus modified to meet the needs of the new class of *literati*, monks and clerics, and adapted to the uses of the liturgy and the *lectio divina*. In his study on word separation in medieval manuscripts, Paul Saenger argues that the period from the ninth to the eleventh centuries “emerges as an epoch of revolutionary changes” that influenced a fundamental restructuring of Continental reading habits.<sup>18</sup> These changes are evident in the use of space in word separation, and the development of abbreviations, *prosodiae*, punctuation, terminal forms and other graphic innovations that facilitated word recognition and lexical access, thus enhancing the medieval reader’s ability to comprehend written texts rapidly and as a result silently. In the transitional phase, these new graphic techniques also aided readers in the oral performance of texts and are especially predominant in liturgical and other manuscripts destined for monastic reading, but are also frequently found in classroom texts that were used to train monastic and clerical lectors and future scholars. In the last part of chapter one, I place Notker’s practice within the context of medieval *lectio* and demonstrate how his venture was novel yet also deeply rooted in the traditions of grammatical and monastic culture.

Chapter two provides a general historical overview of learning in medieval St. Gall and focuses on the question “what was taught to whom and how?” I review the debate over the existence at St. Gall of an “external” school for the training of clerics and laymen and describe the daily life of pupils, of teachers and the methods of teaching that were applied. In the tenth century major curriculum changes were introduced with a shift in focus from *grammatica* to *dialectica* and to some extent *rhetorica*. Notker was at the forefront of this movement and translated and/or

<sup>16</sup> Cf. David Ganz, “The Preconditions for Caroline Minuscule,” *Viator* 18 (1987), 38–39.

<sup>17</sup> “The Contribution of Insular Scribes of the Seventh and Eighth Centuries to the Grammar of Legibility,” in Alfonso Maierú (ed.), *Grafia e interpunzione del latino nel medioevo* (Roma: Edizioni dell’Ateneo, 1987), pp. 15–31; repr. in M. B. Parkes, *Scribes, Scripts and Readers* (London: Hambledon Press, 1991), pp. 1–18.

<sup>18</sup> Paul Saenger, *Space Between Words. The Origins of Silent Reading* (Stanford: University Press, 1997), p. 21.

## Reading in Medieval St. Gall

compiled several treatises designed for an introductory study of these subjects. In doing so, he provided his students with the basic concepts needed to understand language and to move on to a more fruitful study of grammar and its complexities as well as of theology. Dialectic also had a significant impact on the way in which Notker and his contemporaries viewed language in general, and sheds important light on innovative methods for textual analysis developed in this period to grapple with the new material. The last section of chapter two presents a revised model for the function and application of Notker's texts based upon our knowledge of medieval classroom practices. In particular, I discuss how Notker's work could have served for instruction at various levels to teach pupils in the all-important subjects of grammar, dialectic and rhetoric. Finally, I address the logistics of using Notker's translation/commentaries in the classroom, for private tutoring and perhaps for individualized study and private reading.

Chapter three is devoted to the social history of language and to the sociolinguistic context needed to understand the feasibility and impact of Notker's bilingual teaching venture. An important premise for my study is that German was not only used but also read and performed in the tenth-century St. Gall schools. It is often assumed that all monastic education took place in Latin and that the vernacular, if present at all, was a crutch to be used as a last resort. Latin was, after all, the *sine qua non* of monastic life; monks communicated not only with God but also with one another in Latin. By applying the sociolinguistic framework of diglossia, I review the linguistic situation that pertained in early medieval St. Gall. A review of the historical evidence suggests that although Latin was perceived to be the prestige variety, in reality not all monks and clerics spoke it or even knew it very well. A unique source of evidence for everyday language use at St. Gall is found in the *Casus sancti Galli*, a history of the Abbey composed by Ekkehard IV. Ekkehard's comments provide important clues for how he and his contemporaries, including Notker, may have perceived Latin, the vernacular, the similarities and differences between the two and the functional domains of each. A review of the evidence shows that St. Gall was a multilingual community, in which in addition to Latin several other vernaculars were present and used in different functions.

The second part of chapter three reviews specifically the linguistic climate in early medieval classrooms and the function of Latin and the vernacular in teaching depending upon the goal of instruction. Medieval sources often recommend that instruction be carried out using a "direct method." Teachers are encouraged to speak Latin and to require the same of their students – inside and outside the classroom. Other sources testify, however, that this goal was difficult to realize and that many teachers resorted to an "eclectic method" in which recourse was made to the vernacular. Many early medieval classroom manuscripts contain both Latin and vernacular glosses that comment upon the meaning of words, their grammar and the syntax of sentences. Classroom glossing represents the written