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chapter 2

Plan vs. Reality
2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on two communities located respectively in and near Lake Constance or the ‘Bodensee’: Reichenau and St. Gall. The development of both Alamannian monasteries went hand in hand, from their (second) foundation in the early eighth century to their flowering in the early ninth. From the start, they had much in common: their close connection with the bishops of Constance, the tradition of ‘Iro-Frankish’ monasticism from which they were founded, and later the Rule of Benedict and their shared position as ‘Reichskloster’. Furthermore, the contacts between the two were manifold: only ca. forty kilometres apart, it was easy to exchange books and ideas and enter into a confraternity. Moreover, their abbots and socially, politically and intellectually most gifted monks moved in the same circles.

Three complexes of buildings will be highlighted in this chapter. The first merely existed on parchment: the famous Plan of St. Gall. This drawing representing a monastery was executed on the island monastery of Reichenau and sent to the abbot of St. Gall who, after receiving it, constructed a new abbey church. The actual abbey church of St. Gall is the second building scrutinized here. Lastly, the architecture of the monastery of Reichenau, the environment in which the creator of the Plan lived, will be studied. Within this triad, the Plan functions as the connection between the two monastic complexes that existed in reality.

In this chapter, unlike in the previous one concerned with two individual patrons of architecture, not the individual but the communities in their entirety and the environment they inhabited stand at the centre of attention. The material and visual evidence from these three cases has much to offer with regard to the architecture of early medieval monasticism. It shows that despite the similarities between the communities and their proximity to each other, subtle differences could

---

1 See a.o. Prinz, “Frühes Mönchtum”; Maurer, Die Konstanzer Bischöfe. Although the concept of Iro-Frankish or Columbanan monasticism has been problematised lately, it is undeniable that Pirmin and Gall brought with them certain traditions that have put a stamp on monasticism in Alamannia.
lead to very different architectural solutions. These case-studies, especially Reichenau, also make clear that monastic complexes grew and evolved more or less organically over time, instead of being planned completely when building first commenced. As will become clear, we must also see the Plan as a stage in the process of design and development, rather than as an end-product.

A wealth of information is available about the early medieval history of Reichenau and St. Gall, not in the last place because of the large number of extant manuscripts and, recently, their excellent digital accessibility. Scholars have made grateful use of this material, which has led to an extensive bibliography on both monasteries, focusing amongst others on aspects such as liturgy and liturgical commemoration, literary production in Latin and the vernacular, manuscript production, schooling and the study of the Bible. There were certainly many connections and parallels between these realms and that of architecture, yet I feel it is justified to leave these matters aside for now. They have been and are still sufficiently studied, generally without regard for the built environment in which the manuscripts came about and were used, whereas the architectural remains from Reichenau and St. Gall have not. This is unfortunate since the architecture have so much to offer, especially when combined with other types of sources.

2.2 THE PLAN OF ST. GALL AS SOURCE OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT MONASTIC LIFE

The so-called Plan of St. Gall, still kept in the ‘Stiftsbibliothek’ at the site of the former monastery, is a rectangular piece of parchment of about 112 x 77 cm, consist-
Fig. 2.2 Plan of St. Gall, schematic rendering. Carolingian culture at Reichenau and St. Gall, http://www.stgallplan.org.
ing of five pieces of parchment made of calf-skin, which were sewn together in several stages and inscribed with two types of red as well as some black ink (figs. 2.1-2.7). The ink drawings have been preceded by designs carved into the parchment by rule and compass and are accompanied by explicatory lines of text, mostly in prose. On the top right of the parchment a letter from its sender, addressing its recipient, was written. The back of the parchment was later used for (part of) another text.

The Plan depicts a monastic settlement that has been carefully spread out on the parchment, taking up almost all of the available space. The largest and visually most striking (due to their central position as well as the large amount of detail and thus ink) are depictions of the abbey church and cloister with surrounding buildings. Grouped around this central block are, roughly clockwise from the top, the graveyard, the vegetable garden, quarters for poultry, workshops for craftsmen and buildings that helped provide the necessities of life such as the bakery and brewery, a hospice, quarters for oxen, horses, cows, brood mares and foals, goats, swine and sheep, a house for guests, a school, the abbot’s house, physician’s quarters and separate quarters for novices and the sick. Most buildings are accompanied by accommodation for care-takers, workmen or servants, privies and several by separate

---

2 A reconstruction of the order in which the pieces of parchment were inscribed and sewn together can be found on http://www.stgallplan.org/stgall_flash/stgall.html. Jacobsen, Klosterplan, pp. 35-78; Bischoff, "Die Entstehung des Klosterplanes", p. 73: calf-skin was apparently preferred over sheep-skin in Reichenau.

3 The various stages of preparatory work only became clear after Stachura’s up-close research on the material aspects of the Plan. Stachura, “Der Plan von St. Gallen—Ein Original?”.


5 I will from now on use ‘Plan’ (capital P) as a shorthand for the plan of St. Gall.
kitchens and breweries.

Five captions, inscribed in the drawing of the abbey church, address the scale of the Plan. They all concern the dimensions of the abbey church and are unfortunately impossible to combine with the proportions of the church as it is drawn. There are also numerous captions (over 300) identifying the various buildings and their components.\textsuperscript{6} Judging from the size of the church as well as from the number and variety of outbuildings, the Plan depicts a great monastery. This also becomes apparent from the variety of functions accommodated within its walls.

Some parts of the complex have been drawn in much more detail than others. Perhaps this is partly due to the building materials intended to be used. The cloister and residence of the abbot for example show arcades, which are most likely to be constructed in stone, as was the abbey church. Yet in general, the Plan does not resemble the blueprints for buildings that we are used to nowadays. Walls, for example, are indicated only by single lines and there is no indication of the intended height of buildings. Unfortunately, not one other early medieval floor plan has been passed down to us and this lack of material for comparison is a major obstacle in interpreting the Plan.\textsuperscript{7} We have practically no knowledge of the kinds of designs used on Carolingian building sites and it is unclear if a Carolingian builder would ever provide or was provided with anything more detailed than this.

One of the most striking aspects of the plan is the amount of detail it shows. Attention is paid not only to lofty details such as the altars in the church or the number of steps leading up to the choir, but also to more mundane things such as bathing facilities, heating systems, the types of vegetables in the garden etc. However, the Plan’s creator is not always consistent, so in some cases necessary details are missing. The existence of these antinomies is one of the aspects of the Plan that make it difficult to interpret it. Discussions of the Plan have therefore often foundered on the issue of the Plan’s basic interpretation, its provenance and

\textsuperscript{6} Edited in Berschin, "Klosterplan als Literaturdenkmal".

\textsuperscript{7} The next extant example of architectural drawing are the thirteenth-century Reims palimpsests, Archives de la Marne, G 661. See Branner, "Drawings".
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use, which will briefly be discussed in the following section, concerned with the Plan’s historiography. In this chapter, the Plan is used as a source of knowledge of monastic life and architecture in the early ninth century; investigating it is not a goal in itself and I will therefore not offer a comprehensive analysis of the Plan here. The following section will discuss the Plan’s historiography only in regard to those aspects that are relevant to my subsequent use of it as an architectural source, which is the subject of the section thereafter.

**HISTORIOGRAPHY: INTELLECTUAL CREATION OR PRACTICAL INSTRUMENT?**

The Plan of St. Gall is a daunting subject for any student of the early Middle Ages. The amount of scholarly work dedicated to it is truly unbelievable and perhaps exactly because of this relentless attention, consensus has been reached on almost no aspect of the Plan. At least, that is what a close look at the literature indicates. This is often perceived otherwise because scholars working with the same frame of reference or within the same discipline generally seem to agree on matters such as the dating and general interpretation of the Plan. The most salient differences in interpretation exist between those viewing the Plan as text or intellectual creation and those perceiving it to be a practical instrument. Historians of art and architecture have most often opted for the latter, which has led research in the direction of geometry, the reconstruction of the size of tables and thus the number of monks, the comparison with extant or excavated monastic complexes etc. Historians, on the other hand, tend to approach the Plan as a text. Instead of studying its various

---

In this section, I will touch upon several aspects of the Plan that have been hotly debated. In so doing, several of the most important works on the subject will be mentioned. This is however by no means intended to be an exhaustive overview of the literature. A bibliography is provided on [http://www.stgallplan.org](http://www.stgallplan.org), which is the outcome of a project of the University of California at Los Angeles, funded by the Andrew W. Mellon foundation. The aim of the project is to ‘create an extensive data base to aid research into the Plan and Carolingian monastic culture.’ The site’s high-resolution images of the Plan have been of much help to me.
parts separately, they have looked at the Plan as whole and sought textual counterparts for it. Both approaches can and have proven to be useful. However, it is important to make this categorisation of the Plan as belonging to the realm of theory or that of practice explicit.

An author’s decision to categorise the Plan as either an intellectual creation or a reflection of practical realities, a choice which is mostly made a priori, seems to be the most important ground for all following interpretations. The importance of this categorisation is in fact supported by other contemporary sources, which show almost no relation between the realm of intellectual creation and that of actual building, thus making both categories almost mutually exclusive. It seems, then, that it is of crucial importance in which of these two realms we place the Plan. But it is this choice which is mostly passed over in silence. Individual scholars usually have a preconceived notion of the Plan’s identity on which they base their research methods without making this explicit. This has led to a debate at cross-purposes, discussing matters like the Plan’s date across disciplines, yet passing by the more fundamental presuppositions underlying interpretations of the Plan.

The discussion is further complicated by everyone using the work by Horn and Born – which does indeed offer the most elaborate investigation of the Plan – while simultaneously rejecting their methodology and interpretations to various degrees. Moreover, two other important monographs, by Konrad Hecht and Werner Jacobsen, were written around the same time, which does not make it any

---

9 Compare, for example, Ludwig, “Die Durchdringung”, Hugot, “Das Kloster Inda” or Huber, “Klosterplan im Context der Architekturzeichnung” with Carruthers, Craft of thought, pp. 228-231 or Coon, Dark Age bodies, pp. 165-215.

10 This divide, both in historiography and in ‘historical reality’ is a recurring theme in the study of architecture in this period. I am not the first to hold this point of view; see Collins, Domus domini. But also e.g. Binding, whose work shows the lack of attention paid to actual building by medieval authors.

11 Horn & Born, Plan of St. Gall (1979). One of the main problems is that Walter Horn attempts to contextualise the Plan by surrounding it with a large number of other sources, most of which are chronologically or geographically too far removed from the Plan, or originate in a totally different context.
easier to reconstruct the ways in which they influenced each other or kept silent on their disagreements for political reasons.\textsuperscript{12}

In the following section, I attempt to analyse the Plan as much as possible independently, with minimal recourse to earlier interpretations.\textsuperscript{13} As noted above, my goal is not to provide a comprehensive analysis of the Plan itself, but to investigate how it can help us understand monastic architecture of the period and the practices and processes behind it. In order to do so, however, we need to have some about the discussions surrounding attributions of time and place and of maker or patron as well as receiver, which does entail an examination of the historiography, but only with regard to these aspects of the Plan. I will also concisely touch upon technical analyses of the object itself.

Aspects of the dedicatory legend – written on the top right of the parchment – have been interpreted as confirmations of various theories on the Plan, which is reflected by the divergent translations of it that have been published. In the following, I will use Walter Berschin’s 2002 transcriptions. His critical edition is the most thorough and recent rendition of the texts and I agree with most of his interpretations. The text of the legend is:

Haec tibi dulcisssime · fili cozberte de positione officinarum paucis exemplata direxi · quibus sollertiam exerceas tuam · meamque deuotionem utcumque cognoscas · qua tuae bonae uoluntatis satisfacere me segnem non inueniri confido · Ne suspiceris autem me haec ideo elaborasse quod uos putemus nostris indigere magisteriiis sed potius o<b> amorem dei · tibi soli perscrutinanda pinxisse amicabili fraternitatis intuitu crede · Uale in christo semper memor nostri · amen ·


\textsuperscript{13} In a sense, this is a return to the sources as advocated by Rosamond McKitterick in \textit{Charlemagne}, pp. 6-7. Needless to say, my opinions have of course already been shaped by previous scholarship and to believe in a completely unbiased approach would be very naive, but I will do my best nevertheless.
In Berschin’s German translation:


Several parts of this text are problematic and have been much-discussed. At first sight, ‘dulcissime fili’ could be seen to imply that the sender of the Plan was more highly placed or at least older than its recipient. However, as Berschin has pointed out, both Bede and Alcuin used this term for equals.\textsuperscript{15} Another word shedding light on the relationship between sender and receiver is ‘fraternitas’, brotherhood, referring to either the brotherly bond between the author of the Plan and Gozbert, or between their respective communities.

Although the recipient at first sight seems straightforward – i.e. Gozbert the abbot of St. Gall – matters are perhaps somewhat more complicated.\textsuperscript{16} The St. Gall monastery was inhabited not only by abbot Gozbert, but also by his nephew Gozbert the Younger.\textsuperscript{17} Whoever it was, the Plan was clearly intended for him personally, as is attested by the phrases ‘sollertiam exercuas tuam’ and ‘tibi soli’, for

\textsuperscript{14} Berschin, “Klosterplan als Literaturdenkmal”, pp. 110-111.
\textsuperscript{15} Berschin, “Klosterplan als Literaturdenkmal”, pp. 111-112.
\textsuperscript{16} The combination of a Gozbert mentioned in the legend, the crypt housing the body of Gallus and the Plan’s preservation in St. Gall have led most authors to accept without question that it was meant for St. Gall in the first place. Nevertheless, it has also been suggested that the Plan was originally intended for other places than St. Gall, varying from the British Isles to Saxony. However, none of these theories has ever found common acceptance. See e.g. Noll, “The origin”.
\textsuperscript{17} Duft, Studien, pp. 42-43.
you alone. This makes it unlikely that the Plan was meant either as a classroom tool or as a model plan or discussion piece for intellectuals all over the Carolingian realm. That it was not a copy of a design made elsewhere and meant to be distributed is confirmed by Stachura’s discovery of underdrawings revealing that the Plan was made in several stages, certain designs being replaced by others that were apparently found more successful. I believe it sufficiently proven that at least a large part of the Plan was created specifically for the occasion of this gift to Gozbert. This is not to say there may not have been a preliminary sketch or something of this kind. Moreover, by the use of active wordforms such as ‘elaborasse’ and ‘pinxisse’, the sender renders himself the actual maker of the document.

18 It was thus not a model to be distributed more widely nor an educational device, as Stefan Weber had suggested in his appendix to Berschin’s article, “Klosterplan als Literaturdenkmal”, pp. 144-149. At least, it seems to me highly unlikely that someone of the same standing as the author of the Plan would need an aid like this to learn more Latin words, and the ‘tibi soli’ seems to rule out the use of the Plan in e.g. a classroom. Although the frequent use of synonyms is indeed noteworthy, it seems to me a waste of energy and resources to make an instrument like this for anyone to learn about 40 new words.

19 As Adalbert de Vogué has pointed out, however, the personal dedication was also a common topos for prefaces to texts. Although the preface might dedicate the text to its receiver only, some of these texts were clearly meant for a wider audience. “Le Plan de St.-Gall”, pp. 308-309. Bischoff and Meyvaert however, use this phrase as an argument against Horn’s model-theory and claim it clearly shows that the Plan was made for Gozbert only. Bischoff, “Die Entstehung des Klosterplanes”; Meyvaert, review of Horn & Born. I hover somewhere in the middle. See also Nees, “Plan of St. Gall”.


21 The most-discussed words in this text are ‘paucis exemplata’. ‘Exemplare’ means to transcribe, to copy, or to model, portray, design (as the latter it is for example to be found in Hrabanus Maurus, De laudibus sanctae crucis). As De Vogué has pointed out, the ablative ‘paucis’ belongs to the perfect participle ‘exemplata’, both in turn referring to ‘de positione officinarum’, thus yielding a translation along the lines of ‘succinctly recorded’. De Vogué, “Le Plan de St.-Gall” (1984), p. 301. Others, such as Bernhard Bischoff, have however translated this passage as ‘bescheidene Kopie’ or ‘briefly annotated copy’, thus suggesting that whoever sent it to Gozbert merely copied a document that he received from someone else. “Entstehung des Klosterplanes” (1962), p. 67. Yet in Bischoff’s time, the interpretation of the Plan not as an original, but merely as a copy, was commonly accepted. Walter Horn has added on this theory by arguing that this specimen was one of several, all based on a centrally distributed copy made in Aachen after Louis’ 816/817 ‘reform councils’. Horn & Born, Plan of St. Gall
On the basis of a palaeographical analysis of the inscriptions, Bernhard Bischoff has suggested that the Plan was drawn and written in Reichenau, and this assertion has received little criticism.\textsuperscript{22} Bischoff discerns two hands: one of them wrote most texts, in a slender Carolingian minuscule, and the other one made some additions and adaptations in an alemannian minuscule typical of the Lake Constance area. The former, in Bischoff’s opinion, belonged to a young Reichenau scribe, who worked under the supervision of the latter, possibly identifiable as Reginbert the librarian.\textsuperscript{23} Due to Bischoff’s unquestioned authority in this field, his localization is accepted by most scholars.\textsuperscript{24} I see no reasons to question Bischoff’s assertions regarding the Plan’s creation in Reichenau, as this seems to be a likely place of origin on non-palaeographical grounds as well. Reichenau and St. Gall had a close relationship based partially on their fraternity, and the monks of Reichenau had ample experience in the realm of architecture, as will become clear in the following section. Yet I do find it remarkable that hardly any other theories have seen the light of day since 1962. Apparently Bischoff’s expertise as well as his method are still universally accepted.\textsuperscript{25} Bischoff has assumed that both scribes worked on the Plan at the same time and place, in Reichenau. It is also possible, however, that the Plan was not yet completely finished when it left Reichenau. The Alemannian scribe may have accompanied the Plan to St. Gall and made final changes (such as the addition of the dimensions of the church in capitals) after discussing the Plan

\textsuperscript{1} pp. 15-34. Horn’s theory has remained influential for a very long time but must be written off on the basis of Stachura’s observations.

\textsuperscript{22} He was not the first to suggest Reichenau. See e.g. Schlosser, \textit{Abendländische Klosteranlage} (1889), p. 25.

\textsuperscript{23} Bischoff calls the younger scribe’s work the ‘Haupthand’, which is confusing since he may have written most of the text but was not, in Bischoff’s opinion at least, in charge of the production as a whole, ”Die Entstehung”. See also pp. 70-73 for a close comparison with other Reichenau manuscripts, such as those written by Reginbert.

\textsuperscript{24} E.g. Hecht, \textit{Klosterplan}, p. 314; Horn & Born, \textit{Plan of St. Gall} 1, p. 12; Binding, \textit{Köln – Aachen – Reichenau}, pp. 20-22. Binding however claims only the inscriptions were added on Reichenau.

\textsuperscript{25} True enough, no equally knowledgeable paleographers have risen since. Yet in general, at least in the field of art-history, the scientific validity of methods that rely almost solely on connoisseurship has been questioned. See e.g. Suckale, ”Stilgeschichte”.
with Gozbert.  

The dating of the Plan has, unlike its place of origin, Reichenau, been much-debated. What we can say with relative certainty is that the Plan is an original drawing made in Reichenau between 816 and 830. It is not possible to narrow down this time frame with certitude. Gozbert demolished the old abbey church of St. Gall in 830 and consequently began the construction of his new church. This reconstruction is generally viewed as the *terminus ante quem* of the Plan. The *terminus post quem* was mostly found in 816, when Gozbert first held the abbacy of St. Gall. Following Bischoff’s attribution to Reichenau and the dedicatory legend’s addressing Gozbert as someone with whom he had a brotherly bond, the abbot of Reichenau is the first to qualify for the role of sender. Haito, abbot of Reichenau from 806 until 823 and bishop of Basel between 803 and 823, is often mentioned, partly because of his previous experiences with rebuilding both the Reichenau monastery and the Basel cathedral. This would limit the time span of the Plan’s creation to 816-823. However, Haito’s successor Erlebald (abbot 823-838) might also be a candidate. Furthermore, we should keep in mind that it was not necessarily the abbot who designed or drew up the Plan, or even the one who commissioned it; the Reichenau librarian Reginbert may e.g. also be a candidate since he was the one overseeing the *scriptorium*. Gozbert’s abbacy, then, seems to be the only thing to hold on to when trying to date the Plan. Yet considering the presence of his nephew in St. Gall, even this may turn out to be an illusion, but since they were...
active around the same time, this does not have to constitute a problem for the dating of the Plan. The idea of the abbot’s nephew as overseer of the building activities certainly seems inviting considering other monasteries, such as Fulda, where someone other than the abbot was entrusted with the building project.  

There are many theories on the purpose of the Plan and the occasion for its creation, several of which are not mutually exclusive. On a very practical level, it is generally agreed that the Plan as we have it was drawn up for Gozbert of St. Gall to assist him somehow in the planning of the rebuilding of St. Gall. A second especially persistent theory about the occasion for the Plan’s creation is the idea that it was drawn for, at or after the Aachen reform synods of 816/817. Even the present state of knowledge that the Plan was not drawn after a model has not done much to question the idea that the Plan depicts a ‘Musterplan der anianischen Klosterreform’ from general literature. The author or commissioner of the Plan must, as any other prominent member of a ninth-century royal monastery, certainly have been aware of debates about monasticism that were going on at the time. This is however not to say that his major aim was to contribute to these discussions or to provide a visual summary of them by means of the Plan – there is simply no evidence indicating this. The Plan may be akin to the synodal decrees – and to many other contemporary monastic texts available in both Reichenau and St. Gall – in spirit, but there is no evidence for a direct connection.

The connection with Gozbert’s building programme is also difficult to pinpoint, and is hardly ever made explicit. It is universally accepted as a reason for dating the Plan around or prior to 830. Yet, believing that it would only make sense to send the Plan to Gozbert before he started rebuilding the abbey church implies

---

29 For a more detailed overview of the entire discussion on the issues of time and place, see Jacobsen, “300 Jahre Forschung”; Collins, Domus domini, pp. 168-191.
30 Dopsch, "Capitulare de Villis"; Hecht, Klosterplan, pp. 163-181.; cf. Jacobsen, Klosterplan, pp. 323-324. Elaborate theories on the exact role of the Plan during the councils have been drawn up. See e.g. Boeckelmann, "Der Widerspruch".
32 See e.g. Collins, Domus domini, pp. 186-204.
that the Plan was meant to serve some kind of practical use. This, however, is denied by many scholars who do accept the 830 dating. The dedicatory text discussed above can be used to endorse both an intellectual and a practical explanation of the Plan. Expressions such as ‘to exercise your ingenuity’ and ‘to scrutinize’ may point towards the sender’s view of the Plan as an object for study or meditation; more as a tool to reflect on monastic life in general than to help with planning new buildings. On the other hand the ‘instructions’ (which Gozbert should not feel were forced on him) seem to point towards an end-result and the much-discussed ‘de positione officinarum paucis exemplata’ puts more stress on the spatial lay out of the buildings than on the annotations (the latter being more important for interpretations of the Plan as text). The abundance of *topoi* in the dedication hampers the use of the text to conclusively prove either standpoint. That it is problematic for us, however, does not mean that the text was equally ambiguous for contemporary readers.

An aspect of the Plan that has so far not been mentioned, yet is crucial for attempts at understanding its relation to reality, is the presence of measurements. Titles in the church indicate that its length was 200 feet, the width of the nave 40 and that of the aisles 20. By looking at these measurements as well as the scale of the Plan and the units that may have been used in drawing it, Horn, Hecht, Huber and others have – largely unsuccessfully – attempted to bring the Plan into line with the Carolingian or the Roman foot.\(^{33}\) The underlying and somewhat problematic presupposition of all of these attempts is that the draughtsman used a scale in order to facilitate the translation of his drawing to built reality. This is at odds with interpretations of the Plan as an intellectual creation having nothing to do with ‘real’ buildings. That the size of the buildings did matter is made clear by the titles in the church, yet precisely the fact that this addition was necessary indicates that the Plan’s recipient did not look at it with a ruler in his hand.\(^{34}\) He either needed

\(^{33}\) It is difficult but not impossible to combine the proportions of the church as it was drawn with these titles. Boeckelmann, “Der Widerspruch”; Horn & Born, ’Dimensional Inconsistencies’; Hecht, *Klosterplan*, pp. 25-56; Huber, ”Klosterplan im Kontext”; Reinle, ”Neue Gedanken”.

\(^{34}\) Again, I will forgo describing the entire historiography on the scale of the Plan. See a.o. Huber,
a written or verbal explanation to be able to visualise the size of the depicted buildings, or the captions were added as an afterthought, possibly as the result of a discussion. It is therefore better to approach the scale of the Plan from the perspective of its sender instead of its receiver. The draughtsman may have followed certain conventions, or used ‘squared parchment’. As will become clear in the following, the drawings themselves also give the impression that there were conventions for depicting certain types of buildings. We may not know of any other early medieval floor plans, but the ease with which certain elements such as fireplaces and doors are drawn indicates that the scribe had made drawings of this kind more often.

Not only did he have personal experience with this kind of architectural drawing, the conventions he used stemmed from a long tradition. This leads us back to the discussion about the realm in which the Plan belongs: practice or theory? In which of these two realms were the conventions of architectural drawing transmitted?

As the only extant example of the survival of this tradition in the early Middle Ages, the Plan is in itself not enough to answer these questions. However, that a monastic scriptorium could produce such a drawing and that an abbot could read it shows that among men with a higher education, knowledge of architectural drawing was widespread. They could somehow communicate their wishes to those in charge of the building site, yet whether or not the drawing could be used for this, how many additional steps in the design process there were and if these also included drawings, cannot be determined at the moment. Yet although the Plan was made by and for intellectuals, its practicability shows that a black-and-white distinction between their world and that of the workmen cannot be drawn.

"Klosterplan im Kontext"; Jacobsen, "300 Jahre Forschung". To be fair, I must note that the connection between the drawing and the measurements is highly problematic. As mentioned before, they can be made to ‘fit’, but it is equally possible for the titles to have been added as an addition to or improvement of the Plan.
Beyond the heated debate on the context of the Plan’s creation lies a wealth of information about life in a Carolingian monastery and about early medieval building practices, provided by the Plan, which is pushed to the background by this debate that focuses mostly on the details of the Plan’s origin. So let us forget about this for now and instead, continue with an examination of the Plan, an examination that is emphatically not a technical analysis but an interpretation.

At the core of the Plan lies the area that was only accessible to the monks. The spheres surrounding it are gradually less exclusive and more worldly. Access to the various realms was carefully guarded by means of walls, gates and corridors. All activities and their practitioners have their own orbit – monks: praying and writing; pupils: studying; herds: livestock breeding; servants: brewing and cooking – and these groups were almost nowhere forced or given the opportunity to interact. At least in theory, many of them would only see each other in church.35 This distinction is also visible in the inscriptions. Monasterium was used in careful distinction to claustrum: the monasterium could be entered through the porch on the south-western side of the church by all servants, but the claustrum was strictly reserved for the monks, who could, however, speak to visitors in the corridor between the church and the cellar and larder. The word claustrum reappears only when referring to the housing of the oblates and postulants and to the monks’ cloisteryard: ‘semitae per transuersum claustri quattuor’. The realms of other groups are also carefully delineated, e.g. those of the students, ‘These fences

---

35 Even there, of course, the visibility of the various groups may be disputed.
enclose the endeavour of the learning youth'\textsuperscript{36} and of the pilgrims, ‘Here let the throng of pilgrims find friendly reception.'\textsuperscript{37}

The number of people for which the Plan provides is evidently large. Notable are in this respect the accommodation for high-ranking guests and their servants as well as the large number of servants living in the rest of the monastery. That the monks did not need to look after the animals should not be too surprising, considering the amount of time it would cost, but apparently they also did not partake in the chores pertaining directly to their own sustenance, such as baking bread. The only production units where no mention is made of servants are those connected to the liturgical life, such as the scriptorium and the place where holy bread and oil were prepared, and the monks’ kitchen. Here we also encounter the strict separation of the groups that inhabited the monastery. The corridor between the kitchen and the monks’ bakery and brewery is the only place of contact between the monks and lay servants that the Plan acknowledges. Otherwise, the claustrum seemed strictly separated from all other areas of the monastery. Only in this realm the connections between buildings are explicitly marked by passageways. Unfortunately, the execution of such corridors in reality remains unknown, although the additional entrance or exit in the corridor from the warming house to the bathhouse and laundry suggests it was more than just a marked path.

Another aspect of the Plan that is immediately apparent yet often overlooked is its extreme regularity: everything seems to have its place, and it all fits

\textsuperscript{36} “Haec quoque septa premunt discentis uota iuuentae”, ed. Berschin, “Klosterplan als Literaturdenkmal”, p. 120.

\textsuperscript{37} “Hic peregrinorum laetetur turba recepta”, Berschin, ”Klosterplan als Literaturdenkmal”, p. 132.
together perfectly, leaving no unused spaces on the (imaginary) monastic terrain. Matters of design have evidently been given precedence over practical demands, resulting in a neat but impractical drawing. This shows, for example, in the forced symmetry between the pilgrims’ and guests’ kitchens and breweries and between the cloisters for novices and sick. Were there really equal numbers of novices and sick, considering the latter did not even include the critically ill and those undergoing bloodletting? And did the gardener really need such a disproportionately (in comparison to the garden) large house? In my opinion this design was prompted by a desire to maintain the regularity of the drawing, whereas in reality resources would not be wasted on building a bigger house than necessary. Approaching the design from a functional standpoint, it seems that this concern did not always prevail, e.g. in the case of the house for pilgrims that is now located in the middle of the monastic precinct – and more importantly, has to make do without any sanitary facilities\footnote{As Walter Horn has already pointed out, privies were missing in several other cases as well (e.g. in the house of the gardener, all houses for animals and keepers and the housing for the emperor’s entourage). He contends that this is a case of social discrimination (Horn & Born, Plan of St. Gall 2, p. 311): the presence or absence of sanitary facilities indicates, in Horn’s opinion, the standing of the users of a certain building. Although I have not made a study of early medieval sanitary facilities – as he has – it seems reasonable to assume that at least some sort of toilet was provided for pilgrims, even if it was just to reduce stench and pollution of the complex. Horn agrees, stating that 'From a certain level downward the designer of the scheme left the solution of the individual privy to the ingenuity of the builder' and believes it was a conscious choice on behalf of the designer to leave out sanitary facilities in these cases, not an oversight. Horn & Born, Plan of St. Gall 2, p. 311. Whether intentionally or accidentally, this indicates to me, again, that functionality was not one of the designer’s main priorities.} – or with respect to the organization.
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of the cloisters for novices and sick brothers, for whom it would have been most practical to go to the bathhouse directly from the dormitory, as was possible for the regular brothers. Moreover, the sick monks now have the longest distance to cover between the dormitory and the chapel, thanks to the designer’s insistence to maintain symmetry and not let their kitchen and bathroom fall off the parchment. Clearly, this drawing was made on the drawing board in a nicely heated *scriptorium*, not on or near an actual building site.

This precedence given to matters of design over functionality suggests that the Plan was not meant to be used on a building site, nor as part of the planning process for a specific site. To depart from a blank canvas when making plans for a complex of buildings of this size that was meant to be realised would be foolish since every possible site would be restricted by topographical circumstances or previous inhabitation. Moreover, projects (monastic, palatial or otherwise) of this scope conceived, let alone built, in one go, are not known anywhere else. Even a highly prestigious project such as Aachen was built in several phases.\(^3^\) That it would be difficult, if not impossible, to use the Plan on a building site is confirmed by the omission of crucial information such as the thickness of walls or the placement of windows. Although these matters may be decided on the spot, some more crucial structural and functional elements may not. Most structures are derived from one type of building, which was presumably so common that it could be built without further instructions, but the granary for example is difficult to construct based on this rendering of it. Likewise, the placement of stairs is never indicated. Yet other practical details, such as fireplaces, are logically applied everywhere and doors have consistently been indicated, thereby showing the movements of individuals and groups through the monastery.

The Plan’s creator certainly made use of customs grown from experience during centuries of building monasteries in the West, such as the placement of privies in separate elongated structures or the use of arches around the cloister,

\(^{39}\) Untermann, "Opere mirabilia constructa"; Falkenstein, "Pfalz und vicus Aachen". Many new insights are to expected from the most recent excavations. See www.archaeologie-aachen.de.
confirmed by their reappearance in the cloisters of the sick and the novices. This obviously was a common type, as was for example the design used for kitchens and breweries, all showing a central stove with four openings for pots or kettles, surrounded by four tables or benches and four round objects – probably representing large pots or casks. Although sharing its interior lay out with the kitchen, the brewery is always paired with the bakery.\footnote{This is common in later monasteries as well, and makes sense because of the shared use of yeast. Horn & Born, \textit{Plan of St. Gall} 2, pp. 253-264.} Despite some differences in the elaboration of details, these recurrences suggest some common type of building (or design) that was automatically present in the mind of the draughtsman. So present, in fact, that he does not seem to have taken into consideration the various groups of users these buildings were servicing. The bakeries and breweries on the northern and southern side of the west portal of the church, for example, respectively service the distinguished guests and the pilgrims.\footnote{The inscriptions accompanying the guest quarters do not actually mention the guests’ eminence, yet the lay out of the building, the occurrence of servant’s and horse’s quarters and the heatable rooms all suggest these were highly placed guests.} Although one would expect a difference (the pilgrims were nourished almost exclusively with bread whereas the guests received more luxurious meals), the buildings are almost exactly the same with regard to size and interior organization. The store room (\textit{promptuarium}) may signal that the distinguished guests needed more supplies, yet purely visually it seems as if this room was simply added to maintain the building’s symmetry.

Another remarkable choice, from an architectural point of view, is the positioning of the scriptorium in the north-eastern corner of the church.\footnote{This has already been indicated by Beat van Scarpatetti, "St. Galler Scriptorium", p 39.} Although it was not unusual for a painter’s workshop to face north because of the consistent incidence of light, the small windows indicated on the Plan in combination with the closely surrounding structures make it doubtful the workshop would be illuminated enough for the monks to write a substantial part of the day.\footnote{If the scriptorium was located on the north-eastern side, it may have helped considerably to change places with the library, so it would be less hindered by surrounding buildings and could receive additional light from a dormer-window, as is depicted in an early 13\textsuperscript{th}-century copy of a manuscript.} The combi-
This brings us back to the matter broached at the beginning: was the Plan an intellectual creation or a practical instrument? The aspects of the Plan that have just been discussed indicate that it is not possible to make a black-and-white distinction between the two. I would therefore like to suggest an alternative that presents a middle way between these extremes. Something of the kind is suggested by the dedicatory text describing the writer’s intention as ‘quibus sollertiam exerceas tuam’ (to exercise your ingenuity). In other words: the Plan was meant as a tool to shape the receiver’s thoughts on monastic planning. Despite the text’s insistence on it being meant for the receiver alone, the Plan itself suggests that some parts of the planning process may, during the following steps to be taken in the design process, be delegated to others. The text accompanying the workshops states ‘Haec sub se teneat fratrum qui tegmina curat’ (‘Let him take charge of these things who takes care of the brothers’ apparel’). The drawing also shows that the design of this building was not yet completely worked-out: it is only accessible from one side and all the craftsmen were forced not only to enter their workshops through the house and chamber of the ‘camerarius’, but apparently also to use his forge.

Even as an intellectual instrument, a tool to assist the initiator of a building programme in shaping his thoughts, the Plan had a connection with building in reality. It was the first step in a design process consisting of several steps, including the design of a site-specific scheme, making decisions on the realisation of the design, such as the selection of building materials, and ending with its actual realisation. That the Plan was meant to be used at the start of this process, before the building site was even cleared, does not mean that it says nothing about monastic reality. Although the ‘officinae’ that were depicted in the Plan were not always realised, it is safe to assume that they all existed somewhere in the Frankish realm, written around 970 in San Salvador de Tabara in Spain. Pierpont Morgan Library MS M.429, fol. 183r. (fig. 2.7).
in either this shape or another. A telling example of this is the ‘outer school’, which was included in the Plan despite the insistence of the council of 817 that monastic schools were meant for oblates only. Its inclusion shows that the Plan stemmed from a tradition of monastic building that could not be changed overnight.

In certain places the practicalities of life in the monastery seamlessly blended in with its intellectual and spiritual aspects, most obviously so in the orchard, doubling as the monks’ cemetery, where we find this text:

\[
\text{Inter ligna soli haec semper sanctissima crux est / in qua perpetuae \cdot Poma salutis olent / Hanc circum iaceant defuncta cadauera fratrum / Qua radiante iterum Regna poli accipiunt}
\]

Among the trees always the most sacred of the soil is the Cross / On which the fruits of eternal health are fragrant. / Around let lie the dead bodies of the brothers / And through its radiance they may attain the realm of heaven

Unlike most other inscriptions on the Plan, which explain the drawings or offer additional practical information, this text reflects another monastic reality: the care the living were to take of the deceased and their hope of salvation. There are not many instances where the text on the Plan transcends the practicalities of everyday life so obviously. Fewer, in fact, than textual approaches to the Plan might lead us to believe. The presence of this text and others like it does not necessarily constitute a problem for my view of the Plan as part of the creative process surround—

---

44 “Ut scola in monasterio non habeatur nisi eorum qui oblate sunt”. Synodi secundae Aquisgranensis decreta authentica c. 5, ed. Semmler, CCM 1, p. 474.

45 Berschin traces this text on the Plan as well as a passage from Brun Candidus’ Life of Eigil, which will be discussed in the next chapter, back to a poem by Venantius Fortunatus. Berschin, “Klosterplan als Literaturdenkmal”, pp. 140-141.
ing the construction of a new monastic complex. They merely show that the two realms, practical and theoretical, were intertwined and that it was easier for the medieval monk to switch between the two than it is for us.

The regularity of the design and the consistent implementation of certain principles, such as symmetry and the strict separation of groups of people, signifies that the goal of the Plan’s creator was not to provide a drawing that reflected built reality or could be used to create it. In this sense, the Plan is part of a way of planning and thinking about architecture happened in the higher intellectual realms. At the same time, the ingrained design practices and architectural types that were used, which were apparently so common that they needed no further explanation, indicate that this way of thinking was not entirely cut off from reality. Unfortunately, the Plan does not tell us about the conversion of these ideas into built reality. That certain matters, such as the choice of material or modelling, were left to artisans or whoever was in charge of (this part of) the building site shows that several stages, in which various people were involved, were passed through before the final design was reached. This raises questions about the interplay between these people and stages on the building site of Gozbert’s abbey church, which is the subject of the next section.

2.3 THE REAL ST. GALL

Although we have now determined that the Plan of St. Gall was not meant to be implemented one-to-one, it is very tempting to compare it to the buildings Gozbert actually built in St. Gall, presumably shortly after he received the Plan. Did the Plan serve as a source of inspiration for him, and are aspects of it reflected in the architecture of St. Gall? If so, how did he adapt these elements from the Plan to the local situation? What are the major differences between the real St. Gall and the Plan? Finding answers to these questions is unfortunately hampered by a lack of reliable archaeological evidence. St. Gall’s abbey church – now cathedral – was
excavated in the 1960s at the occasion of the restoration of the late baroque church, yet these finds were scarcely published. Previously, the only clues about the monastery’s building history were provided by written sources, which mention only the dates of the various building phases and their instigators.\textsuperscript{46} Before turning to the material evidence for Gozbert’s church, let us take a brief look at the history of the monastery and its previous building phases.

The history of St. Gall starts in 612, when Gallus, a companion of Columbanus, built himself a cell near the waterfall in the Steinach river. Gallus’ origins are uncertain, yet he certainly spent a considerable amount of time in Luxeuil with Columbanus.\textsuperscript{47} It is commonly held that the ‘real’ foundation of the monastery, i.e. of an institutionalized, coenobitic settlement, followed only in 719 and was instigated by the community’s second founder Otmar, an Alamannian priest, who constructed a monastery at the site of St. Gall’s grave.\textsuperscript{48} Yet it seems there was a continuing line of development leading up to this ‘official’ foundation, as written sources speak of a ‘church of St. Gall’ in the seventh and early eighth centuries and archaeologists have found a so-called ‘Gallushorizont’, consisting of remains of

\textsuperscript{46} See Poeschel, \textit{Stadt St. Gallen} 2, also for (mostly sixteenth- and seventeenth-century) depictions of the medieval churches. Many authors have tried to reconstruct the church based on the Plan of St. Gall or on a combination of sources. See e.g. Hecht, \textit{Romanische Kirchenbau}.

\textsuperscript{47} Borst, \textit{Mönche am Bodensee}, pp. 21-23.

\textsuperscript{48} See e.g. Duft, "Geschichte des Klosters St. Gallen" and references there.
(repeatedly altered) wooden buildings.\textsuperscript{49} Although there is a clear increase in prosperity and productivity during the abbacy of Otmar (719-759), the architectural appearance of the monastery is difficult to trace. It is certain that an ‘Ot-marshorisont’ of stone structures existed, yet what kinds of buildings Otmar exactly constructed and what they looked like is unclear.\textsuperscript{50} According to the \textit{Life of St. Otmar}, he constructed suitable accommodations for the monks ‘to all sides’ (\textit{undiqueversum}) as well as houses for lepers and the poor.\textsuperscript{51} It is safe to assume that along with these constructions Otmar built a new church, made of stone. Although no rebuilding is explicitly mentioned, the growth of the monastery, both literally and in terms of wealth, makes it highly likely that it had outgrown the old wooden church. Moreover, the Lives of both Otmar and Gall speak of a church with a crypt and Otmar apparently asked Pippin to donate a bell ‘\textit{ad sancti loci ornatum}’, which points towards the presence of a tower.\textsuperscript{52}

It has been suggested that the occasion for these building activities was the introduction of the Rule of Benedict in St. Gall in 747. Conversely, it has also been

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Walahfrid Strabo, \textit{Vita S. Otmari} c. 1&2; ed. Von Arx, \textit{MGH SS} 2, p. 42.
\item Walahfrid Strabo, \textit{Vita Sancti Galli}, b. 2, c. 10, 24, 31; ed. Krusch, \textit{MGH SS rer. Merov.} 4, pp. 280-337; Walahfrid Strabo, \textit{Vita Sancti Otmari}, c. 13; ed. Von Arx, \textit{MGH SS} 2, pp. 41-47. We should treat these references to the crypt with due caution since both texts were probably written at Reichenau in the 830s, when construction on Gozbert’s building had already started. Walahfrid did, however, base his \textit{vitae} on older texts from St. Gall. Berschin, "Lateinische Literatur", p. 111. See also Poeschel, \textit{Stadt St. Gallen} 2, pp. 7-9. A more detailed investigation of these sources might lead to further knowledge of the built environment of St. Gall and especially the interior and use of the abbey church.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
claimed that Otmar’s monastery must have been erected before that time because it is said to have followed the lavrite system (‘Laurensystem’), in which individual cells are clustered around a church, and this is believed to be incompatible with the Rule of Benedict.\(^5^3\) Objections must be raised to both ideas not only because there is no evidence of the shape of the ‘undiqueversum congrua monachilis vitae habitacula’ but also because of the mistaken premise that there is a direct connection between the ‘Vierflügelanlage’ and the Rule of Benedict.

The occasion for introducing the Rule of Benedict in St. Gall was the visit of Carloman (King of Austrasia 741-747), son of Charles Martel († 741) in 747. Along with the – forced? – change of Rule, the monastery had to adapt to the new political and economic situation that followed from the definite establishment of Frankish rule in Alamannia after the battle of Canstatt in 746.\(^5^4\) Otmar became the victim of the new situation: on his way to complain to Pippin about the new local rulers in 759, he was caught and sentenced to exile by the bishop of Constance. The latter then managed to gain control over the monastery, making it dependent on the bishopric until Louis the Pious granted the monks immunity in 818.\(^5^5\) The monastery, which was traditionally supported by the local Alamannian aristocracy and not by the Franks who defeated them, remained in a precarious position during the eighth century, subject to various fields of force. This, along with the rapid growth of the monastery which necessitated the construction of new, larger, buildings, makes it less likely that the building phase attributed to Otmar took place towards the end of his abbacy.\(^5^6\) Nonetheless, the continuing growth of the monastery, its library and its scriptorium, could have led to another building phase in the second half of the eighth century, yet this is not attested anywhere. A decade after his

---

\(^5^4\) Duft, “Sankt Gallen”, p. 1189. Before then, the monks had probably followed a Regula Mixta. The promotion of the Rule of Benedict was an aspect of the reforms which Carloman instigated along with Boniface. Brown, “Introduction”, pp. 11-12.
\(^5^5\) The exact relationship between the bishopric and the monastery, at least judicially, is uncertain. Seibert, “Konstanz und St. Gallen”.
\(^5^6\) Duft counts a total of 53 professions during Otmar’s abbacy; “Sankt Gallen”, p. 1267.
death on an island in the Rhine in 759, Otmar was translated to St. Gall and buried in the abbey church in an elevated sarcophagus placed behind an altar dedicated to St. John.\(^{57}\)

It is not Otmar, but Gozbert, whose abbacy (816-837) has been viewed as the start of St. Gall’s ‘goldene Zeitalter’.\(^{58}\) His building activities were only one part of an extensive reorganization, affecting also the management of the monastic property, the administrative system and the scriptorium. Bonds with the Carolingians also really took off during Gozbert’s abbacy, yet one may wonder if this was due to his political talents or simply an acknowledgment of the growing importance of the monastery. Written sources attest that Gozbert ordered the destruction of the eighth-century church in 830.\(^{59}\) Then, the construction of a new abbey church began. This church was to be dedicated to St. Gall – as the Life of Otmar shows, another church, dedicated to St. Peter, remained standing – and Otmar’s relics were taken there.\(^{60}\) The dedication of Gozbert’s church has been recorded under various dates ranging from 835 to 839.\(^{61}\) In the light of Gozbert’s resignation in 837 it is unlikely that he did indeed dedicate the church in 839, making it more likely that the event happened between 835 and 837. The *Casus S. Galli* gives, between the lines, quite a lot of details about Gozbert’s church. Two entrances to the church are mentioned: one for monks, which gave access to the *claustrum*, and one for lay people.\(^{62}\) Furthermore, Ratpert mentions an apse behind the altar of St. Gall,


\(^{58}\) Duft, “Sankt Gallen”.

\(^{59}\) Ratpert, *Casus S. Galli* c. 6; ed. Von Arx, *MGH SS* 2, p. 66; Walahfrid Strabo, *Vita Sancti Otmari*, c. 16; ed. Von Arx, *MGH SS* 2, pp. 41-47; “muros ecclesiae machinis aggressi”; *Annales Sangallenses Maiores* a. 830, ed. Von Arx, *MGH SS* 1, p. 76: “initium basilice sancti Galli” – this is also recorded in the Annals of several neighbouring monasteries such as Einsiedeln and Reichenau.

\(^{60}\) Walahfrid Strabo, *Vita S. Otmari* c. 16; ed. Von Arx, *MGH SS* 2, pp. 41-47.

\(^{61}\) For specific references, see Jacobsen, *Klosterplan*, p. 177, n. 107. The most problematic source is Ratpert, *Casus S. Galli* c. 6; ed. Von Arx, *MGH SS* 2, pp. 59-74, at p. 66, who describes a dedication nine years after the construction of the old church. By 839, however, several of the men he mentions as present had already died.

\(^{62}\) Ekkehard, *Casus S. Galli*, ed. Von Arx, *MGH SS* 2, pp. 114 and 143 respectively. Although only men-
which was presumably the main altar. The existence of the apse is mentioned only in passing; it was painted as part of embellishments to the abbey church added by Hartmut, who acted as pro-abbas on behalf of abbot Grimalt, probably in the 850s. About a decade later, St. Otmar received a church of his own, located to the west of the abbey church yet on the same axis. It was dedicated in 867, as was a church or chapel for St. Michael, sandwiched between the two. It is possible that the Michael-chapel was located on the first floor of the building between the churches, which may have functioned as the entrance of the abbey church. Both were built towards the end of the abbacy of Grimald (841-872), as was a nicely furnished Palatinate. Fire ruined both the Gallus- and the Otmar church in 937 and both were rebuilt; in the late tenth century abbot Immo added several structures to the monastic complex, among which a crypt underneath the church of Otmar.

Some similarities between the actual monastery in St. Gall and the one depicted on the Plan already become apparent in the descriptions in the sources. Otmar’s monastery in the middle of the eighth century already disposed of accommodations for lepers and the needy, which may have resembled the pilgrim’s house.
on the Plan. The knowledge that the monks of St. Gall took care of lepers may also set us thinking about the patients of the physician whose clinic is depicted on the Plan. Perhaps the dividing wall between the clinic and the house of bloodletting was drawn to minimize contact between the monks and outpatients. Gozbert’s church, it has turned out, was directly accessible from the claustrum. This not only facilitated access, for example for the nightly services, but also minimized contacts between the monks and others, which is a concern also visible in the Plan. In the second half of the ninth century, St. Gall received two additional western sanctuaries, which turned the abbey church into a more complex structure, as was the Plan church. The textual evidence may have given us a broad overview of the abbey’s building history, but as usual, it is not enough to allow a full reconstruction. For this, we must turn to the remains that have been found on the site, although these are not sufficient to fill all the gaps.

THE GOZBERT-BASILICA: EXCAVATIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS

The excavations that took place between 1964 and 1966 under the supervision of Hans Rudolf Sennhauser seem to have focused on recovering the ninth-century churches. Compared to what was previously known about these, the excavations indeed marked an enormous leap forwards. They are, however, surrounded by problems. Firstly, large parts of the church, especially in the baroque choir area, were either disturbed by later rebuilding or were not accessible to the archaeologists. Secondly, the results of the excavations have scarcely been published. Hans

---

68 As far as I am aware, no excavations have been undertaken since the 1960s, either within or outside of the Stiftskirche. Sennhauser called for a continuation of the project on the rest of the area in 1965, “Zu den Ausgrabungen in der Kathedrale”, p. 114, but to my knowledge this has fallen on deaf ears. It is remarkable that he became more and more certain about the interpretations of his finds as time passed by: in the sixties, he maintained that more digs were necessary before final conclusions could be drawn.

Rudolf Sennhauser still claims, now almost 50 years later, that a comprehensive publication will soon appear. Even if such a publication ever appears, the amount of time that has passed since the field research was undertaken increases the likelihood of mistakes, not to mention the methodological and technical advances made since then. In this respect, St. Gall is more problematic than some of the other churches discussed in this study. Until the appearance of a comprehensive publication of all of the finds, we have to rely on extremely concise reports that only provide reconstructions, instead of documentation of the material that was found. It is not possible to test the validity of the archaeologists’ interpretations from this scanty material. For this reason, I will keep my discussion of St. Gall brief. Although it is important not to lose sight of the limitations of the material, several important conclusions can nevertheless be drawn from it.

The problem with the publications, especially those by Sennhauser, is not only that they are quite limited. They also suffer from his double agenda. His goal is often not primarily to publish his finds in a neutral way, but to use these to prove several other points, such as the parallels he believes exist between the Gozbert-church, the Plan and the monastery of Müstair. Although he acknowledges the risks of this comparison, the Plan has always played a leading role in the excavations. Yet for lack of a better alternative, or points of departure for alternative reconstructions, we are forced to make do with what little Sennhauser offers us. Although Sennhauser’s reconstruction has thus eventually found its way into architectural history, it does not seem to have been completely accepted, at least judging by the lack of attention architectural historians have paid to the St. Gall monastery. Sennhauser himself explains it thus:

70 Werner Jacobsen voices his frustrations eloquently in “300 Jahre Forschung” at p. 55.
72 Sennhauser, ”Zu den Ausgrabungen”, pp. 112-113. The idea that the Plan was leading in the design of Gozbert’s abbey church is omnipresent, e.g. in Reinle, Kunstgeschichte der Schweiz 2 ed., Horn & Born, Plan of St. Gall 1 pp. 158-159 etc.
Mehrfach habe ich bisher Anfragen von Kollegen beantwortet, die eine Vierung, ein ausladendes Querschiff, eine Apsis usw. als mehr oder weniger selbstverständlich voraussetzen und sich mit dem vermeintlich simplen Plan des Gozbertbaues nicht abfinden möchten, weil schliesslich nicht sein kann, was nicht sein darf.73

Perhaps his irritation is not entirely unjust. It is indeed easier to find confirmation of what one expected than accept something entirely novel, of which no known parallels exist. But Sennhauser is partially to blame himself, because he did not give full disclosure about his findings, nor did he publish them systematically.

At first sight, the St. Gall church does seem a bit peculiar compared to other Carolingian abbey churches we know (fig. 2.10). According to Sennhauser’s reconstruction, the church that Gozbert built was ca. 58 m long, about 27 m wide and consisted of two roughly square spaces: one for the monks, one for lay people. The design of the lay part is not that unusual: it is an aisled basilica with side-aisles giving access to a crypt and a nave ending in a triumphal arch, blocked by a choir screen. The monks’ choir is more unusual: it is in fact a continuation of the nave, with aisles, and is almost equally as long.74 The side-aisles of the nave and choir are separated by walls, reminiscent of the set-up in Steinbach, where the side-aisles and the spaces flanking the choir room were also blocked off from each other.75 The nave side-aisles each provide a staircase giving access to a barrel vaulted crypt corridor running all along the exterior walls of the choir. The corridors met at the eastern end of the choir in a crypt in the shape of a ‘Vierstützenraum’

74 Sennhauser at some point started reconstructing the piers of the nave and choir. Klosterplan und Gozbertbau. Initially, however, he gave the impression that the finds did not allow the reconstruction of the bays. Reinle, “Neue Gedanken”, fig. 88 at p. 113; Horn & Born, Plan of St. Gall 1, pp. 158-159.
75 Sennhauser, “St. Gallen: zum Verhältnis”, p. 51. Sennhauser believes there were altar niches next to the stairs in the nave aisles, but he does not substantiate this idea.
of about 7 x 7 m.\textsuperscript{76} The tomb of St. Gall was not incorporated in the crypt; it was placed in a small grave chamber in front of the choir platform but may have been visible from the crypt by means of a diagonal shaft. The grave was visible from the nave through a fenestella.\textsuperscript{77} One or more altars may have stood on either side of the tomb.\textsuperscript{78} Sennhauser has reconstructed an elevated monks’ choir behind the altar, but again, his arguments for doing so are unclear. Sennhauser maintains that the choir definitely did not end in an apse, since he found indications for a crypt window placed in a straight eastern wall.\textsuperscript{79} Yet his first statements on the ongoing work were not as peremptory as his later ones, and other authors have since questioned the non-existence of an apse.\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{76} Sennhauser, \textit{Klosterplan und Gozbertbau}; Jacobsen, \textit{Klosterplan}, p. 180; Reinle, \textit{Kunstgeschichte der Schweiz} 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed., p. 112.

\textsuperscript{77} The idea of a ‘Sichtstollen’ originates with Sennhauser, but the evidence he found for it is hard to trace. Horn (\textit{The Plan of St. Gall} 2, p. 359) speaks of ‘the masonry of a tapered shaft’, which does give the impression that there was some material evidence for it. Moreover, the whole purpose of a crypt meant for lay people, as its origin in the nave aisles presupposes, would be lost unless there was some kind of connection with the grave. That the tomb did not, in fact, stand in the crypt itself is made clear by Ekkehart, \textit{Casus S. Galli}, c. 67, ed. Von Arx, \textit{MGH SS} 2, p. 112, in which broken barriers, cancellos, are placed over the grave to protect it from fire. Sennhauser has identified a trapezium-shape stone slab as a marker in front of the western end of the grave. Reinle, \textit{Kunstgeschichte der Schweiz} 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed., pp. 146-147.

\textsuperscript{78} The details of this arrangement are totally unclear. One would not say this is the case upon reading most of the descriptions, e.g. Horat, "Mittelalterliche Architektur", pp. 189-190. Then again, Horat’s judgement may be a bit off considering he also claims there was a similar crypt (Winkelstollenkrypta mit Stützenhalle) in Steinbach, which, as we have seen, was not the case. Also Horn & Born, \textit{Plan of St. Gall} 2, p. 359.


\textsuperscript{80} Their insistence on an apse is based on a remark made by Ratpert in \textit{Casus Sancti Galli}. Ratpert, \textit{Casus S. Galli}; ed. Von Arx, \textit{MGH SS} 2 pp. 59-74 at p. 70 As Werner Jacobsen has suggested, we need not interpret this as a semi-circular apse. Ratpert could have referred to a square altar room, yet it remains remarkable that this space is supposed to be behind the altar; Jacobsen, \textit{Klosterplan}, pp. 176-185. Yet as we have seen before, this is not the first case where textual and material sources conflict. I think we should not take Ratpert’s brief comment too literally, and should in any case base ourselves on a careful analysis of these sources instead of just looking for the appearance of certain terms in the text. However, although Sennhauser insists that there cannot have been an apse, he did not publish enough of his finds for us to be able to test this conclusion.
The next major problem in the interpretation of the finds is the reconstruction of the northern and southern parts of the choir. Sennhauser found traces of foundations in line with the division between nave and side-aisles. These may have supported an arcade, thus demarcating a central part and side-aisles. The aisles may have housed secondary altars, which must have existed considering the large number of monks and the necessity of celebrating votive masses.\(^{81}\) Alternatively, there may have been three altar rooms preceded by an internal transept, as Werner Jacobsen and others have suggested.\(^{82}\) Sennhauser denies this possibility, saying he found no crossing piers, yet his plans do not exclude it. Although a continuous transept, as Jacobsen proposes, seems unlikely considering the existence of ‘Spannfundamenten’, foundations meant to stabilise that were not covered by a superstructure, the existence of a crossing seems likely. This may be corroborated by the discovery of three large capitals, now visible in the lapidarium, which must have been placed in the (monks’) choir. These may, however, also have been used in the arcades which Sennhauser reconstructs.

Bearing in mind that these conclusions are tentative at best, since the re-

\(^{81}\) The barriers mentioned by Ekkerhart may have functioned as partitions of chapels. Ekkehart, *Casus S. Galli* c. 67, ed. Von Arx, *MGH SS* 2, p. 112.

liability of Sennhauser’s reconstruction is questionable, analysis of this building yields the following. In outlines, it is not such an unusual design. Most unexpected for us are the absence of an apse or salient altar room and the dimensions of the choir. Seeing that this church was primarily meant for a sizable monastic community, it should not be surprising that the choir is so large. The Erlebald-church in Reichenau has comparable proportions. More remarkable are the blind walls closing off the side-aisles, the width of the choir, and the extremely long arms of the crypt. The nave and choir, which we tend to see as separate entities, not only functionally but also architecturally, are visually not very different from each other. From the outside, they could not even be distinguished – at least, in Sennhauser’s reconstruction. This sets apart the Gozbert-basilica from the Plan church. Within the church, however, the two realms were carefully and rather strictly separated: to get a glimpse of the tomb, lay visitors had to enter into the underground corridor from the nave. They were then led around and below the monks’ choir and when they surfaced, they were once again in the nave. The Plan shows a similar angular crypt, known as a ‘Winkelgangkrypta’, yet it is much smaller, accessible from a transept and has an apse to its east. If Sennhauser’s reconstruction is in fact correct, we may wonder why such a strict separation between monks and visitors to the grave was necessary: did Gozbert expect many pilgrims? Did he want to shield the monks from *pollutio* by carefully delimiting the various realms, as also happened on the Plan? Another open question regards the use of the north- and south-eastern corners of the church: were they used as separate altar spaces or chapels? And where was the monks’ entrance mentioned by Ekkerhard to be found? These questions as well as others – for example regarding the crypt – can-

---

83 Sennhauser stresses three points he apparently thinks are most surprising, or that he has received most questions about: the absence of an apse, of any form of transept, and of a semicircular (western) atrium (as it is depicted on the Plan). Sennhauser, *Klosterplan und Gozbertbau*, p. 8-9. Perhaps he is referring to Jacobsen, *Klosterplan*, pp. 177-178.

84 We should tread carefully when making these assumptions: the crypt in Steinbach, which I have interpreted as a liturgical space, was also only accessible from the nave aisles, Seligenstadt is a better case in point: here, the division between lay people and clerics was probably less strict, and visitors were hence allowed to proceed further east before descending into the crypt.
not be answered as long as we do not have more detailed information about the material evidence and a more trustworthy reconstruction.

Although there are some parallels between Sennhauser’s reconstruction and the abbey church on the Plan, such as the ‘Winkelgangkrypta’ or the angularity of the choir, there are more divergences. So notwithstanding the enthusiasm with which it has been attempted, it is not possible to reconcile the ‘Gozbertbasilica’ with the Plan.\(^{85}\) Parallels with Reichenau are more easily found, which may be a sign of the draughtsman’s being formed by his own environs. What is more, all Carolingian churches can, if one wants to, be shown to have some similarities.

Gozbert took his time before he started the rebuilding; he had been abbot for almost fifteen years when he had the old church torn down. St. Gall was relatively late in the construction of a new abbey church compared to other monasteries, which seems to reflect the pace of its development in other realms. Only in 818 the monastery was granted immunity by Louis the Pious, followed by the right to choose their own abbot in 833, granted by Louis the German. Until that time, the abbacy of St. Gall was in the hands of the episcopacy of Basel. Either the bishop himself was simultaneously abbot of St. Gall, or he exerted a large amount of influence over him, as was the case with Gozbert’s predecessor Werdo (784-812).\(^{86}\) As has been mentioned before, Gozbert not only managed to free the monastery from the interference of the bishop of Basel, he also reformed and significantly increased the abbey’s property. In time, he must have amassed sufficient funds to rebuild the abbey church. This was something his predecessors either did not need to do because Otmar’s church sufficed, or because they did not have the means or the power to do so. Besides architecture, Gozbert also invested significantly in the monastic library.\(^{87}\) One of the reasons for rebuilding may have been that the old abbey

\(^{85}\) All attempts to unite Sennhauser’s reconstruction and the Plan church appear artificial since forced interventions such as radically altering the proportions of the Plan church, or blaming it on the shrinking of the parchment are necessary to make the two overlap. Sennhauser, “Verhältnis”; Hecht, Klosterplan, pp. 25-56.

\(^{86}\) Duft, “Sankt Gallen”, p. 1271.

\(^{87}\) Bruckner, Katalog der datierten Handschrifte in der Schweiz 3, pp. 21-23.
church no longer suited the growing community’s requirements, one of which could have been a more strict separation between lay and monastic areas. Gozbert acted at exactly the right time; in 837 he was forced to retreat from the abbacy. Gozbert had received assistance for his building project from neighbouring Reichenau in the shape of the Plan. It is possible that he also welcomed artisans or received practical tips from the island monastery, which went through a building phase at roughly the same time. Because of the close connections that existed between the two monasteries, Reichenau offers valuable material for comparison and this is what we will turn to next.

2.4 REICHENAU: BACK TO REALITY

A century after the foundation of St. Gall, around 724 the missionary Pirmin established the monastery of Reichenau on what is now lovingly referred to as the ‘Blumeninsel’, the largest island in the Lake of Constance. Long before that, the island was inhabited. Remarkably, earlier settlers chose almost the exact same spot as Pirmin. This curve on the northern shore of the island, on the side of the ‘Gnadensee’, was suitable as a harbour and protected from south-western storms. It also provided quick and safe access to the mainland. Moreover, the site that Pirmin chose had the advantage of the presence of a spring, later called the ‘Pirmensbrunnen’. Since it is located roughly in the middle of the island, the settlement is referred to as Reichenau-Mittelzell, setting it apart from the later foundations of cellae in Reichenau-Oberzell and -Unterzell.

88 After a brief period of unrest, under Grimald (841-872), a man of the calibre of e.g. Hilduin, the monastery continued to prosper economically, intellectually and architecturally. See Sprandel, Das Kloster St. Gallen.


90 The location of the spring had long been named as the prime reason for founding the monastery at this spot, e.g. in Reisser, Die frühe Baugeschichte, p. 24. Zettler has convincingly argued that the other reasons mentioned above were more important. Zettler, Die frühen Klosterbauten, pp. 39-40.
The remains of the monastery have been relatively well-preserved (figs. 2.11-2.15). This is partially due to the climate and the position of the abbey near the lake. The moist soil has been the perfect environment for the building materials, both wood and stone. The first buildings were only 3.5 meters above the water-level of the lake and every time parts of the monastery were rebuilt, the ground-level was heightened a little. Therefore, it is possible to find remains of every single building phase. At the same time, the early seventeenth-century rebuilding of the monastery in a different place has saved the older foundations. These were simply covered with soil and the area was then used as a garden.\textsuperscript{91}

During the first century and a half of its existence, the monastery went through a large number of building phases; some consisting of minor alterations, others of the destruction of the old structures and the erection of entirely new ones. These changes to the monks’ built environment were closely connected to the development of the monastery in other fields, such as the monastery’s independence from the bishops of Constance, the growing manuscript production and the arrival of relics on the island.

However, the fact that the remains are well-preserved does not mean that they are also well researched. The most extensive archaeological research has been done by Emil Reisser in the 1920s and -30s, but unfortunately, he has been unable to publish these findings himself. In 1960, a book based on his work was published posthumously.\textsuperscript{92} Subsequently, his material has been re-interpreted and new archaeological research has also been undertaken.\textsuperscript{93} The most recent extensive survey of all available material is given by Alphons Zettler.\textsuperscript{94} Zettler does not make it easy

\textsuperscript{91} Zettler, \textit{Die frühen Klosterbauten}, pp. 156-157.
\textsuperscript{92} Reisser, \textit{Die frühe Baugeschichte}.
\textsuperscript{93} For critical remarks on Reisser’s work, see e.g. Lehmann, review of Reisser; Lehmann, “Baugeschichte”.
\textsuperscript{94} Zettler, \textit{Die frühen Klosterbauten} (1998).
for his readers to survey the excavated material, nor does he visualise it in his reconstructions. Nevertheless, his analyses are in general convincing and in the following, I will mainly rely on his work.\textsuperscript{95}

The buildings in Mittelzell, constructed between ca. 724 and 1048, have been divided into ten building phases.\textsuperscript{96} Yet especially in this case, it is fundamental to keep in mind the importance of continuity. During any sort of building activity, the monastery had to keep functioning. Each time, small parts of the buildings were being modified or rebuilt while others remained unchanged.\textsuperscript{97}

The first buildings at the site were made of wood. Dendrochronological research has established that these were built in the early eighth century, so they may date from Pirmin’s time.\textsuperscript{98} The wooden buildings (phase I) were part of the monks’ living quarters and were accompanied by a church, built in stone. This may have been the first church ever to be built on the site, but there is a possibility that a wooden church preceded it. The elongated stone church consisted of two parts, roughly equal in size. At the eastern end of the church a square altar room was added whereas the western part was preceded by an ante-room. Of the wooden monastic buildings, which were connected to the northern wall of the church, an ambitus or covered walkway and a large room can be traced quite precisely. Presumably, the cloister was surrounded with buildings on all sides, but the areas to

\textsuperscript{95} I cannot not go into as much detail as I would like, since the lack of detailed information about the finds does not allow this, e.g. with regard to the floor levels or the connections between walls.

\textsuperscript{96} Phases A, I, IA, II, III, IIIA, IIIB, IV, V and VI.

\textsuperscript{97} Zettler acknowledges these problems. It is also problematic that Zettler counts all building activity from the ninth century onwards as one phase. (Phase III, subdivided in IIIA and B). This does not do justice to the far-reaching changes that were made.

\textsuperscript{98} Underneath, Zettler has found the remains of two ovens that were presumably used during the construction and were abandoned when the building activity had progressed towards the west. He has classified this deepest layer as phase A. Zettler, \textit{Die frühen Klosterbauten}, p. 158.
its north and west have not been researched in detail.

The eastern part of the church (phase IIA) was built first. It consisted of a single nave with a rectangular altar room of which the floor-level was slightly elevated over the nave. The eastern walls of the nave were continued past the start of the altar room, thereby providing space for two altars on either side of the entrance to the choir, one dedicated to St. Peter, the other to St. Paul.99 The altars themselves were placed on rectangular elevations. The choir-room had only one freestanding altar, dedicated to Mary.100 In the south-western corner of the choir the grave of the local Count Gerold († 799) was placed.101 Behind the altar, a bench was built against the eastern wall of the choir. This was part of a later renovation of the interior of the church.102 In the north-western corner, two stairs provided a connection to the cloister. The descending stairs gave access to the monks’ living quarters or warming room, roughly two meters below the level of the choir. The ascending stairs connected the choir to the dormitorium located above the warming room. A western extension to the church, roughly the same size as the nave but with a lower-lying floor level, was

---

99 One of these altars was definitely dedicated to St. Peter. Versus Augienses, ed. Strecker, MGH Poet. Lat. 4.2, 3, p. 640. It has been assumed that its counterpart, the existence of which has been proven by the archaeological investigations, was dedicated to St. Paul.

100 Versus Augienses, ed. Strecker, MGH Poet. Lat. 4.2, 3, p. 639.


102 The wall behind the bench has been plastered, which would not have happened if the bench had been planned from the start. Zettler, Die frühen Klosterbauten, pp. 170-171.
added later, along with an ante-room that presumably functioned as an entrance hall (phase IIB).\footnote{Zettler, \textit{Die frühen Klosterbauten}, pp. 167-172. Zettler has, based on mid-eighth-century graves in the altar room and on the connection that existed between the eastern part of the church and the wooden monastery, established that the eastern part was added later, contrary to Reisser who suggested the opposite sequence of events. According to Reisser, the structure now identified as the entrance was meant for lay people whereas the monks celebrated the liturgy in the western part of the nave, before the eastern half was added to the church. Reisser, \textit{Die frühe Baugeschichte}, pp. 31-32. I am not convinced by his arguments.}

It is difficult to provide any of the eighth-century buildings with a precise date. The grave of Gerold was incorporated in the church after its flooring had been renewed at least twice, which indicates that the church was built quite some time before 799.\footnote{Some time before 799, Gerold had already provided new decorations for the altar of Mary. \textit{Versus Augienses}, ed. Strecker, \textit{MGH Poet. Lat.} 4.2, 3, p. 639. Zettler dates the church, as well as the other buildings in stone, around the middle of the eighth century. Zettler, \textit{Die frühen Klosterbauten}, p. 170.}

The building of the western extension may have given rise to a renovation of the interior of the old church, including a new floor. The design of the church may be relatively simple, but its size was not necessarily modest with an interior length of ca. 45 m. The reconstruction of the way it was used is hampered slightly by our lack of knowledge about the passages between the spaces: the continuous foundations either do not betray the position of doors, arches etc., or the evidence for these has been destroyed by later...
interventions.\textsuperscript{105} The wooden monastery was replaced after only a few decades. Its successor, made of stone, had roughly the same layout and was, interestingly, for a large part built around the wooden structures while they remained standing.\textsuperscript{106} The cloister shared its southern wall with the northern wall of the church.\textsuperscript{107} The southern gallery of the cloister walk was broader than the other ones and was outfitted with benches running along the whole width of the northern wall and the wall of the church. The corner between the southern and western corridors of the cloister provided an entrance to the \textit{claustrum}.\textsuperscript{108}

This simple, single-naved church with rectangular altar room did not survive for very long. It was replaced during the abbacy of Hatto (806-823) and the new church (phase III) can be dated quite precisely thanks to Herman the Cripple who, in his chronicle for the year 816, wrote:

\begin{quote}
Augiae basilica sanctae Mariae a Heitone abbate et episcopo constructa et dedicata est.\textsuperscript{109}
\end{quote}

The basilica of Saint Mary in Reichenau is constructed and dedicated by Hatto, abbot and bishop.\textsuperscript{110}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{105} Reisser, \textit{Die frühe Baugeschichte}, p. 32.  \\
\textsuperscript{106} The foundations of the western part of the cloister, for example, are situated inside of the foundations of the wooden cloister-wall. Zettler counts the rebuilding of the cloister in stone among phase II.  \\
\textsuperscript{107} The eastern and western outer walls of the cloister are connected to the church, but clearly belong to a different building phase, having been built either just before or just after the church. These stone walls follow the direction of the previous wooden walls, which were not connected to the church in a straight angle. Zettler, \textit{Die frühen Klosterbauten}, pp. 167-174.  \\
\textsuperscript{108} The above has been based on the drawing in Zettler, \textit{Die frühen Klosterbauten}, p. 172 and the description in Reisser, \textit{Die frühe Baugeschichte}, pp. 32-35.  \\
\textsuperscript{109} Hermannus Contractus, \textit{Chronicon}; ed. Pertz, \textit{MGH SS} 5, p. 102.  \\
\textsuperscript{110} ‘Basilica’ can also simply be translated with ‘church’. However, taking into account the shape of the church, I have decided to keep basilica in the translation. About the use of this term, see Binding, \textit{Planen und Bauen}, p. 314.
\end{flushleft}
The building period of the church is thus restricted to the time frame between 806 and 816. The old church was also dedicated to Mary, but it is not strange that Herman makes it appear as a foundation ex novo. For indeed, almost the whole church was new. It was much larger than the old one, extended further eastwards and had a very different model: a basilical nave of four bays with side-aisles followed by an eastern transept to which three eastern rooms were attached. The central altar room, slightly elevated and accessible through a wide staircase, ended in two joined retracted apsidioles. The old church was not entirely torn down in favour of its successor; its western end, part of the phase IB nave as well as the entrance hall, remained standing.

Therefore, when one looks at a plan of this church, it seems quite unbalanced. The eastern part (transept and choir) is both wider and longer than the nave. This could easily have been avoided by tearing down the old structures entirely and lengthening the nave. It has therefore been suggested that this was the initial plan that was changed for some reason or other. This could be possible, but it must be noted that the church probably did not appear very unbalanced from the inside. The rooms to the sides of the main choir were hardly visible from the

---

111 Isidor of Seville and Hrabanus Maurus use Vituvius' concept of architecture consists of three parts: dispositio (planning), constructio (construction) and venustas (decoration). Constructio is used for the erection of the building. Binding, Planen und Bauen, p. 19. The same meaning is given in Lewis & Short, Latin dictionary, p. 440 under constructio: an erecting, building, constructing.

nave. Moreover, there was no need for a large nave since the lay audience visiting this church was probably rather small. Keeping a part of the old church could also have had its advantages, for example for the continuity of the monastic liturgy, although this could also have been achieved by adding the new altar room before tearing down the old one.

The main altar, still dedicated to Mary, was placed in the central part of the choir. It is likely that the altars for Saints Peter and Paul were set in the two apsidioles behind this main altar. In the middle of the nave, just before the transept, another altar was added. This has been interpreted as a lay altar, dedicated to the Saviour or the Holy Cross. Together with the construction of the new church, the older room to the east of the cloister was provided with floor heating and a small new room was added, partly enveloping the north-eastern corner of the choir. This room also had floor heating and has been identified as the *scriptorium*.

Quite soon after the building of the new church, probably during the abbacy of Erlebald (823-838), the simple western wall closing off the nave was replaced by the so-called ‘older western transept’, which is part of Zettler’s phase III. The new western transept had roughly the same dimensions as its eastern equivalent. It continued past the northern nave wall and therefore protruded into the cloister. The southern cloister walk, which was repositioned towards the north, was transformed into a narrow corridor connected to a small hall, located between the transepts, in which the old benches were incorporated. A direct connection with the bay that was added at the western end of the nave was created in the shape of a wide staircase. Together with the transept, a proper entrance was built: two wide doors flanked by two staircases. When exactly the western transept and the entrance were built is unclear. Walahfrid provides a *terminus post quem*: when he ar-

---


114 Reisser, *Die frühe Baugeschichte*, p. 38; Zettler, *Die frühen Klosterbauten*, p. 176. The scriptorium was later extended towards the east.

115 Zettler, *Die frühen Klosterbauten*, pp. 177-180.
ived in the monastery in 825 he could still see both the old and the new church.\footnote{Walahfrid Strabo, 

Sometime after the construction of the western transept, the so-called ‘Markuskirche’ was built inside of it.\footnote{Reisser seems to attribute the Markuskirche to monk-architect Einmut, working under abbot Erlebald and finds written sources to support this thesis. Reisser, *Die frühe Baugeschichte*, pp. 45-49. Zettler now agrees with Reisser as far as the dating of the transept is concerned, but is hesitant to draw conclusions about the dating of either the ‘Markuskirche’ or the rotunda which was built behind the choir apses. Zettler, *Die frühen Klosterbauten*, pp. 176-179; cf. Erdmann & Zettler, “Zur karolingischen Baugeschichte”, p. 503. In the legend underneath the floor plan on p. 178, however, he is more certain: ‘Westkirche des abtes Erlebald (sogenanntes Älteres Westquerhaus) mit Einbauten der ‘Markuskirche’ seit 873/75’ (italicization mine).} During the building of the western transept, the nave had been elongated, now consisting of five bays. At some later date, possibly during the abbacy of Ruadho (871-888), a small structure was built inside of the western transept and the last bay of the nave (tentatively labelled phase IIIA by Zettler).\footnote{Zettler, *Die frühen Klosterbauten*, p. 180. Reisser, on the other hand, uses the term ‘Markuskirche’ for the structure inside the Western transept in combination with the western apse. He believes that they formed a second sanctuary and choir, facing West. Reisser, *Die frühe Baugeschichte*, p. 50. Zettler, on the other hand, assigns the western apse to the abbacy of Witigowo (985-997). Zettler, *Die frühen Klosterbauten*, pp. 181-183. I have to agree with Zettler. The western apse was not built until the late tenth century, and therefore there is no reason to assume that the altar faced west before then.} The structure divided off a part of the nave, thereby creating a second sanctuary where an altar was placed. The direct connection between the western part of the church and the *claustrum* facilitated easy access for the monks, which may indicate that the sanctuary was not primarily intended for a lay audience or the veneration of relics.

The construction of first the western transept and then the ‘Markuskirche’ have been connected with the arrival of relics on the island. Around 830, the relics of a saint Vales or Valens came to the island, along with those of other saints.\footnote{For references, see below.} In the 870s, Bishop Gebhart of Constance was informed in a vision that the so-called relics of Valens were actually the mortal remains of St. Mark the Evangelist. When combining this information from the tenth-century *De miraculis et virtutibus S. Marci evangelistae* with Zettler’s and Reisser’s interpretation of the archaeolog-
ical evidence, the most likely conclusion would be that the western sanctuary (the ‘Markuskirche’ inside of the western transept) was built after the vision of Gebhart, so during the abbacy of Ruadho (871-888).\textsuperscript{120} If this is the case, then the ‘Markuskirche’ was constructed to create a separate sanctuary for the Evangelist.

A number of building phases followed after the western transept. To the eastern choir, a \textit{rotunda} was added. It was dedicated to the Holy Cross, a relic of which arrived on the island around 925.\textsuperscript{121} Possibly in connection with the growing importance of the western part of the church, the heating room was moved from the eastern part of the monastery to the western part, which was also enlarged at this occasion.\textsuperscript{122} Further renovations were initiated by abbots Witigowo (985-997) and Berno (1008-1048).\textsuperscript{123}

THE ABBEY BEYOND THE CHURCH

The abbey church and the cloister, which have up until now been at the centre of attention, were surrounded by a number of other buildings. To the east of the church, behind the choir, the monastic cemetery was located. With every extension to the building, the space available for burials decreased, yet the cemetery stayed in roughly the same spot from the eighth to the seventeenth century. Reisser grants the graveyard both an \textit{oratorium in cimiterio} and a chapel dedicated to Saints Cosmas and Damian.\textsuperscript{124}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{120} \textit{Miraculis et Virtutibus S. Marci}, ed. Mone, Quellensammlung.
\item \textsuperscript{121} Zettler phase IIIB. \textit{A translatio} in the same manuscript as that of St. Mark tells of the arrival of a piece of the Holy Cross and some earth from mount Golgotha, soaked with blood. Manser & Beyerle, "Aus dem liturgischen Leben", pp. 361-374.
\item \textsuperscript{122} Zettler phase IV. Zettler, \textit{Die frühen Klosterbauten}, p. 181; pp. 198-202. Phases IIIA-IV have proven difficult to date. The finds clearly belong to different building phases, but Zettler is not even entirely sure about the order in which they were constructed.
\item \textsuperscript{123} Zettler phases V and VI. Zettler, \textit{Die frühen Klosterbauten}, pp. 181-183.
\item \textsuperscript{124} Reisser, \textit{Die frühe Baugeschichte}, p. 27. It would make sense for the cemetery to have some sort of chapel, but Reisser does not make a clear reference to the sources upon which this statement is based.
\end{itemize}
To the north-west of the church, directly adjacent to the western tract of the cloister, was the area that has been classified as ‘Wirtschaftsbereich’ or economic area. It was the part of the monastery that was closest to where boats would land and it would therefore be logical that goods coming from the mainland would be taken there first, to be moved to another part of the monastery when the need arose. Although several high-density early medieval building phases have been uncovered here, the excavations were too limited to allow a further specification of the use and lay out of this area.125

On the opposite end, southwest of the church, lay the palace or Palatinate (Pfalz).126 Excavations in the late 1970s have, according to Zettler, given reason to believe that buildings at this spot have existed since the ninth century. However, their shape and function are not clear.127 Written sources exist only from the tenth century, when a new church was constructed there.128 It is possible that the Pfalz served as a house for the abbot and a guesthouse for important guests from the ninth century onwards, but so far it has been impossible to validate this assumption. Without more archaeological data we can only speculate about this area and the buildings that may have stood there. In any case, it is clear that in the twelfth century and later on it was used for the abbot’s legal transactions, such as the writing of charters.129

Lastly, Zettler hypothesizes about the existence of houses for guests and pilgrims to the west of the church. Sources from the thirteenth century speak of a ‘domum hospitalem conuersorum’, a place where lay brothers would be taken care

---

125 Zettler, Die frühen Klosterbauten, pp. 148-150; Reisser, Die frühe Baugeschichte, p. 27: "als Mindestbedarf [sind] zu vermuten: Ställe für Reit- und Zugtiere sowie für Geflügel, [...] Gesindewohnungen, Werkstätten, und von der Lebensmittelbereitung mindestens die Pfisterei [bakery]."

126 Not to be confused with the 'Königspfalz' Bodman, which was located on the mainland.

127 Zettler, Die frühen Klosterbauten, pp. 150-155.


129 Brandi, Die Reichenauer Urkundenfälschungen, p. 30 nr. 107.
Zettler interprets this as a ‘Konversenhospital’ and concludes that this would be a logical spot for a hostel, mainly based on the place of this on the Plan of St. Gall. However, this suggestion cannot be proven because any evidence for the existence of such buildings has been disturbed by the building of the new monastery at the start of the seventeenth century.

Not or only partially connected to the monastery was the church of St. John, a parish church. Once again, the interpretation of the archaeological remains is not unequivocal. The written sources refer to a church dedicated to St. John built during the abbacy of Ekkehart I (958-972). By that time, there was surely a lay cemetery accompanying the church, but long before then, a chapel of John the Baptist was mentioned in martyrologies. Its dedication may point towards a function as a baptistery for lay people. Zettler places it at the same spot as the later church but Reisser attaches it to the Pfalz. Although we know that they existed, it has so far not proved possible to construct an image of any of the structures surrounding the monastery.

The situation is more favourable for the dependent churches that were founded on other parts of the island. Near the north-eastern tip of the island Egin, former bishop of Verona, dedicated Reichenau-Niederzell in 799 after founding this church several years before in order to have a place to die in peace. The first church, built in the late eighth century, was in itself quite simple. It was a hall church with a slightly raised eastern part, ending in a single, semi-circular apse. To the north of the church living quarters were situated. There was no proper cloister but there was a rectangular inner courtyard, surrounded to the north and east by other buildings. To the south-east of the church there was a chapel, also a hall church ending in an apse, but about one fourth of the size of the church. The eastern third of the chapel was marked off from the rest by a wall and in the south-

---

131 Zettler, Die frühen Klosterbauten, p. 155.
132 Manser & Beyerle, "Aus dem liturgischen Leben", pp. 383; Reisser, Die frühe Baugeschichte, p. 27.
133 Haubrichs, "Neue Zeugnisse", p. 5.
134 Zettler, Die frühen Klosterbauten p. 150; Reisser, Die frühe Baugeschichte, pp. 27-28.
ern part of the church, slightly more towards the west, a baptismal font has been found. Towards the west of the chapel, ending together with the western wall of the church, was some sort of enclosure. It is unclear whether this was a courtyard or a sort of portico. Further towards the west there was a graveyard, which has led Wolfgang Erdmann to conclude that the chapel was used as a place to commemorate the dead, to baptize and to keep the Host.  

The other major church on the island, located more or less on the opposite end of the island, was Reichenau-Oberzell. Hatto I (806-823), the patron of the phase III abbey church, could already have built a *cella* there, but the church that is for a large part still standing in Oberzell was built by his successor and namesake Hatto III (888-913). Hatto acquired a relic of St. George in Rome in 896 and brought this either immediately or within the next few years to Reichenau, where he dedicated the church in Oberzell to St. George. The church was dedicated at the end of the ninth century, on 18 November between 896 and 899. It has some similarities with the church Hatto (806-823) built in Mittelzell, but there are also a lot of dissimilarities. The church consist of a basilical nave with a central western

---

135 Erdmann, "Die ehemalige Stiftskirche St. Peter und Paul in Reichenau-Niederzell", p. 527.
136 This is indicated by a passage in Gall Ohem’s chronicle, which refers to a priest who was sent to Oberzell, ‘die zelg Hättonis’ under abbot Ruodhelm (838-842). Gallus Ohem, *Cronik des Gotzhuses Rychenowe*, ed. Brandi, *Die Chronik*, p. 50.
137 Notker Balbulus relates that Hatto III was given the head of St. George by Pope Formosus (891-896). Notker Balbulus, *Martyrology*, St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek Cod. 456, fol. 110-111; ed. *PL* 131, pp. 1025-1163, here p. 1070. Hatto was in Rome on the occasion of king Arnulf’s being crowned Emperor by the Pope. Little is known about St. George, except that he was one of the early martyrs. Despite the lack of information about his life, his cult was celebrated in the East as well as in the West from at least the fifth century. Masses for George can be found in the Veronensis or ‘Leonine Sacramentary’, ed. Mohlberg, *Sacramentarium Veronense*, and churches were dedicated to him in for example Paris, Mainz and Naples. From the sixth century, relics of George had been circulating widely in the West, as noted for example by Gregory of Tours in his *Miracles*. This patronage for the church in Oberzell is therefore not very remarkable.
138 Jakobs, *Sankt Georg*, pp. 17-18; Haubrichs, "St. Georg", p. 511. Haubrichs has found this date in the Martyrology from Reichenau, now kept in Zürich. Zürich, Zentralbibliothek Ms. Rh. Hist. 28, fol. 152r. This date would point to the political significance the building of the church had for Hatto: it is the octave of the feast of St. Martin of Tours, who was the patron saint of Mainz. Apparently, his two functions were closely connected for Hatto.
apse. The nave aisles end in internal apses. A wide staircase connects the nave with the eastern part of the church, which is elevated over a crypt. The eastern spaces become successively more narrow: first the crossing, crowned with a tower, then the square altar room. Flanking the crossing are a northern and southern space with curved western walls blocking off the exterior of the apses of the nave aisles. The western apse is preceded by a rectangular ante-room which functions as the entrance to the church. The second floor of this small structure is used as a chapel dedicated to St. Michael. It is very likely that both the western apse and the ante-room (including the chapel) are later, that is tenth-century, additions. The dating of the rest of the church as well as the way in which its earliest state should be reconstructed exactly is under discussion. The general opinion that has been propagated for years is that the building is late Carolingian and has been decorated with murals in the late tenth century under abbot Witigowo (985-997). However, it has recently been argued by both Dörthe Jakobs and Koichi Koshi that the church should be dated shortly before the arrival of the relics of St. George in 896. They do not agree on the dating of the murals as well as on several other matters, although they both claim that the murals should be dated earlier than they have been in the past.

The church of St. George in Reichenau-Oberzell is for a large part still an unsolved puzzle waiting for the next detective who is willing to go over all the clues another time. This would be worthwhile not only because it is a fascinating and well-preserved late Carolingian or early Ottonian church, but also because it might offer some valuable insights into the ways in which the buildings belonging to a single monastic community were connected. A detailed and simultaneous

140 Jakobs, Sankt Georg, pp. 146-147.
141 For a very extensive discussion of previous scholarship on St. George, see Jakobs, Sankt Georg pp. 33-52.
142 Erdmann, "Neue Befunde", p. 590.
143 Jakobs, Sankt Georg, pp. 279-281; Koshi, Die frühmittelalterlichen Wandmalereien, pp. 30-32. A very extensive bibliography on the Oberzell murals is given by both authors.
analysis of all the early medieval buildings on Reichenau may tell us much about
design practices, the interplay between local traditions and circumstances and the
world beyond the monastery, the availability of materials and craftsmen and the
importance of the time factor. I will not pursue this line of investigation since it
would lead us to far beyond the time period this study is concerned with. Some of
these questions will however be addressed in the next chapter, where we will study
at Fulda and its dependencies. For now, however, we still have more than enough
work to do with regard to the interpretation of Reichenau-Mittelzell’s development
in the first half of the ninth century.

WORK IN PROGRESS

The building history of the monastery at Reichenau is a reflection of the general
development the community went through. The monks started out with a simple,
single-naved church with an eastern altar room with a floor area of roughly a third
of that of the nave, accessible through a central opening in the eastern nave wall.
Altars were placed not only in the middle of this room, but also at the eastern cor-
ners of the nave. They were dedicated to Mary, Peter and Paul, who seem to have
been Pirmin’s favorites: he also dedicated the church in Hornbach to them.\textsuperscript{144} This
patronage could suggest that Pirmin was referring to Rome, but then again, this
was a widespread dedication for monastic churches.\textsuperscript{145} As Eugen Ewig has shown,
during the seventh century Peter, sometimes in combination with Paul, was the

\textsuperscript{144} Manser & Beyerle, “Aus dem liturgischen Leben”, p. 331.
\textsuperscript{145} Previous scholarship has put before these a dedication to the ‘Salvator Mundi’. Manser & Beyer-
le, “Aus dem liturgischen Leben”, pp. 328-331. His main arguments are the Rule of Benedict which,
according to Manser, describes the monastic calling as ‘Heerdienst für den Herrn und wahren König
Christus’ and the Ottonian school of book illumination on the island whose main subject was Christ
himself. Neither of these arguments are very convincing: the former goes for each Benedictine
monastery and the latter goes for practically all Ottonian schools of book illumination. Moreover, as
Arnold Angenendt had argued, every church was first and foremost dedicated to Christ and should
therefore not be seen as a separate dedication. Angenendt, \textit{Heilige und Reliquien}, pp. 203-206.
most popular patron-saint for monastic churches. Especially in monasteries somehow connected to Luxeuil, this patronage was often combined with Mary. Ewig has attributed the rare occurrence of ‘Sonderpatrozinien’ in this period to a lack of relics.\textsuperscript{146} The number of newly founded monasteries simply was too large to provide local relics for all of them. Only with the influx of relics from Rome, or with the development of local saints’ cults, did this change. Reichenau is a case in point: the monastery had, at least in the first century of its existence, no major relics of its own. It differed in this respect from others such as St. Gall or Fulda who boasted the relics of their founders.

In the following years, the monastery grew bigger and eventually, from 782 onwards, managed to free itself from interference of the bishops of Constance. At the same time, the connections to the royal court grew stronger. Gerold, the king’s brother-in-law, became one of the monastery’s patrons and even expressed the wish to be buried there. After his death in 799, he received a prominent place inside the altar room. By then, the abbey church had been enlarged by the addition of a western space as large as the old nave as well as an entrance hall of sorts that preceded the western part of the nave. It is possible that the old nave was from then on used as the monks’ choir, whereas the new western addition was used by laymen. Both groups had probably increased in size. The model of the church, still single-naved, may not have been very special, but its size (ca. 45 m in length) was certainly impressive, which also illustrates the growth of both the number of brethren and their resources. The interior of the phase II church was renovated at least three times and the shape of the cloister was also adjusted over the course of time. In the second half of the eighth century the wooden claustral buildings were replaced by accommodations in stone. The way in which these were built around the old structures indicates how important it was that the monastery could remain in function during the building activities.\textsuperscript{147} The earliest phases of Reichenau’s built

\textsuperscript{146} Ewig, "Der Petrus- und Apostelkult”.
\textsuperscript{147} This may also be one of the reasons why the old western end of the church remained while Hatto built the phase III church in the east.
history thereby indicate how early medieval monastic complexes grew and developed over time: organically instead of programmatically. As demands changed, the old buildings were gradually adjusted or transformed. This is one of the strongest arguments against the idea that the Plan was supposed to be used for the planning and construction of an entire monastery. Even the most unworldly monk must have realised that things just did not work that way.

On the Plan of St. Gall, the *claustrum* is depicted in the shape many people nowadays associate with the beautiful Romanesque cloisters of southern France: a square open space surrounded by galleries. We encounter it in a similar form in Reichenau, although not to the south, where it is most often placed, but to the north of the abbey church. We should however take care not to let this shape our image of the medieval *claustrum* too much, since built reality indicates that only in rare instances did the *claustrum* have the shape and position in which it is depicted on the Plan of St. Gall. Examples such as San Vincenzo al Volturno, Müstair and Reichenau demonstrate that the cloister could be located on different parts of the monastic terrain, and that it could take various shapes (not necessarily including a square, covered walkway) and incorporate buildings that were not exclusively meant for the monks themselves.\(^{148}\) The repeated depiction of the cloister on the Plan of St. Gall in the shape which would later become standardized as well as the occurrence of a similar shape in Reichenau does however indicate that this was not an unusual design in the ninth century.\(^{149}\) This need not surprise us since similar schemes had been in use for much longer.

\(^{148}\) Now that the reader has been warned that the cloister could take many shapes, I believe I can safely use it in the following. The German Kreuzgang is probably more problematic since it immediately evokes an image of a corridor or passageway around or in the shape of a cross.

\(^{149}\) Hardly any examples of the square claustral scheme originating prior to the ninth century seem to be known. In my opinion this is partly due to a lack of archaeological research into early medieval, most of all Merovingian, monasteries and the priority given to the study of the abbey church over the rest of the complex. There could indeed be older cloisters, but we simply do not know of them. This mainly shows from the matter of course with which the existence of a cloister is treated, for example in the Plan of St. Gall, where even the novices and the sick are provided with a cloister of their own, and its widespread occurrence from the early ninth century onwards. If it were indeed an innovation, there may have been references to this new and revolutionary invention in written sources.
Previous research has mostly focused on two possible paths by which the cloister came to Western Europe, one originating in early Christian Syrian and Egyptian monasteries, the other in the Graeco-Roman *stoa* or *porticus*.\(^{150}\) Rolf Legler has given a thorough overview of these in his 1989 book *Der Kreuzgang*.\(^{151}\) He has pointed out the common origin of both the Syrian and Western-European monastic tradition, i.e. antiquity, and does not see any other characteristics of the Syrian monasteries that could have influenced the emergence of the claustral shape in the West. However, although there are no direct architectural links, the concept of an enclosed space, surrounded by a wall that fenced off the monastic community from the outside world and possibly connected its various building, was a common theme in near-eastern monasteries such as Deir Seman (or Telanissos) and Sagmata.\(^{152}\) In a way, the same can be said about Irish monasteries: monks’ cells and workshops were grouped around a central open space in which the church and possibly a communal building were located. The surrounding wall around the whole complex again separated the community from the outside world.

More direct predecessors of the cloister have been sought in the atria of early Christian churches and the atrium and peristylum of the the Roman *domus* and *villa*, all descendants of the Greek peristyle court.\(^{153}\) Although a direct line

---

\(^{150}\) Advocates of the ‘Orient-theory’ are e.g. Julius von Schlosser, *Die abendländischen Klosteranlage* and Fendel, *Ursprung und Entwicklung der christlichen Klosteranlage*.

\(^{151}\) Legler, *Der Kreuzgang*.

\(^{152}\) Walter Horn also notes this, yet the rather over-simplified views put forward in his article seem to drown out the valid points he makes. Horn, “On the origins of the medieval cloister”, pp. 14-15.

\(^{153}\) The early Christian atrium, a peristyle court in front of the main entrance to the church, typically located to its West, seems to be a direct descendant of the development from Greek *stoa* to Roman *porticus*. It continues to exist into the early medieval period. Although alike in shape, the atrium and the *claustrum* had a very different function. The atrium in the Roman town house or *domus*, which was quintessentially a semi-public space, functioned as a ‘Regieachse’ that connected the main reception hall with the other rooms as well as with the official entrance of the house. In addition to underlining the status and wealth of the owner, it provided the often windowless surrounding spaces with light and fresh air and the house’s inhabitants with a semi-outdoor place for relaxation. Hoepflner, *Geschichte des Wohnens*, p. 878. In Late Antiquity, the *villa* or country house transformed from a rustic retreat, with *thermae*, libraries and art collections, into a show of wealth and prestige. This representative function is visible for example in the emergence of semi-circular colonnaded courts.
of ascendency between the peristyle court and *porticus* on the one hand and the medieval cloister on the other cannot be proven, it seems likely that they are somehow connected. Important characteristics that all of these architectural elements share are their position inside of a house or building complex, secluded from the outside world, and their function as a transitional space between inside and outside. These characteristics are also present in eighth- and ninth-century monastic complexes that do not take the shape of the cloister as we know it. The architecture made visible which parts of the complex belonged to the *claustrum* and were the exclusive domain of the monks, and which parts did not. Although alike in design, the atrium, which functioned as a reception space, and the *claustrum* were thus essentially very different.

Lastly, it is important to note that the *claustrum*, both as a concept and as an architectural element, was not reserved for communities of monks. Archbishop Leidrad of Lyon, for example, reports to Charlemagne around 810 that he established a *claustrum* for his own – canonical – clerics. Whether he is referring to the monastic complex he built or a part of it, or to a group of clerics leading a communal life, confined to a ‘mental claustrum’, the source illustrates that a sharp distinction between monks and canons cannot be made in this period. The Rule that a leading up to the entrance of the house. Conceptually as well as architecturally, there seems to have been a stricter separation between private and public spaces in the *villa* than in the *domus*. Especially in the North, different functions were accommodated in groups of buildings clustered around a central porticoed court. Whereas the peristyle was at the centre of the house and all rooms opened towards it, this *porticus* was more like a covered walkway that connected several buildings. The cloister betrays similarities with both the *porticus* of the *villa* and the peristyle court of the *domus*. The Greek peristyle court is characterized by its central component, the colonnaded portico or *stoa*. In his article in the *Gesta* volume dedicated solely to the question of the cloister, Alfred Frazer has pointed out that the essence of the Greek peristyle court, consisting of a simple roof connecting a closed rear wall with a line of columns, was its emphasis on the exploitation of the open space. Roman borrowings of this architectural element in buildings constructed of brick-faced concrete transformed the post system into an arcaded wall. On a superficial level, the idea of a peristyle (and its symbolic connotations) was kept, either by covering piers with half-columns, or by alternating columns and arcades, yet the underlying structural concept was quite different from the Greek original. Frazer, “European courtyard design”, p. 4.

154 De Jong, "Charlemagne’s church", pp. 103 and 121.
community followed is not necessarily reflected in the buildings they inhabited.

Unlike the earlier phases, which consisted mostly of gradual adjustments of and additions to the old buildings, the construction of the phase III church probably did call for well-thought-out planning, since it involved tearing down almost the entire old church and completely remodelling it. This could be entrusted to Heito (or Hatto; 806-823). Both he and his predecessor Waldo (786-806), tutor of Charlemagne’s son Pippin, maintained close ties with the Carolingian court. In 810/11 Heito I was sent on an imperial mission to Constantinople, which has been seen as a source of inspiration for the rebuilding of the abbey church.\textsuperscript{155} Considering the unusual shape of the phase III church with its squat nave, extensive eastern part and double apsidioles, scholars attempted to account for it by pointing at exotic examples that Heito may have seen whilst on diplomatic mission to Byzantium.\textsuperscript{156} However, we need not look so far to find an explanation for the appearance of these shapes in Reichenau. As the buildings discussed in other chapters, e.g. Steinbach and Soissons, demonstrate, many shapes were available for churches and their constituent parts and builders could combine these as needed. In the case of Reichenau, what was needed was apparently an extension of the parts of the church primarily meant for the monastic community itself. The church was extended towards the south-east, so it continued to share its northern nave wall with the cloister, which remained as it was. This made it necessary to relocate the altars, which is, especially with regard to the main altar, rather remarkable. Proceeding from the idea that the apsidioles housed the altars of Peter and Paul that used to be placed to the west of the old altar room, the new choir was densely populated with three altars. Double, horseshoe-shaped apsidioles such as those of the Haito-basilika appear also in Northern Italy, e.g. in the Pietro e Paulo in Sureggio, with which Reichenau also shares its three altars: two dedicated to the Apostles and a central altar dedicated respectively to Christ and Mary.\textsuperscript{157} Moreover, similarly shaped

\textsuperscript{156} Klüppel, Reichenauer Hagiographie, p. 103, n. 374.
\textsuperscript{157} Meier, "Baukonzept und Klosterreform", p. 464; Reinle, Kunstgeschichte der Schweiz 2nd ed., p. 130;
apses have been found in Müstair and Disentis, also located in the Alps south of Reichenau, although in different numbers.\textsuperscript{158} Haito, it turns out, created the apex of the choir by combining a shape that was not uncommon in the region (the horseshoe-shaped apse) with the local tradition of having twin altars dedicated to the princes of the Apostles. In other respects, such as the placement of an altar dedicated to the Holy Cross at the end of the nave, he was more in keeping with general trends in the Carolingian realm. Haito was certainly up-to-date with the most recent developments; in defiance of his wish to live a quiet monastic life, as expressed in Walahfrid’s introduction to the \textit{Visio Wettini}, he was confronted with worldly and political matters amongst others in his capacity as bishop of Basel.\textsuperscript{159} As such, he took part in the synod in Aachen in 816, the year in which the abbey church was dedicated. Shortly afterwards, two monks from Reichenau, Grimalt and Tato, sent an authoritative copy of the Rule of Benedict to their former teacher Reginbert on the island.\textsuperscript{160} Under Reginbert’s guidance the library grew. He had already started cataloguing the books that the monastery possessed, yet the earliest extant catalogue dates from 821 or 822.\textsuperscript{161} The books may have been written in the structure that enveloped the north-eastern corner of the church. This heated room, ca. 3.5 x 3.5 m, has been identified as the scriptorium.\textsuperscript{162}

Within two decades after the dedication of Haito’s church, during the abbacy of Erlebald (823-838), the nave was elongated and preceded by a western

\textsuperscript{158} Sennhauser, ‘Monasterii’.
\textsuperscript{159} \textit{Visio Wettini Walahfridi}; ed. MGH Poet. Lat. 2, pp. 305-307. His actions as bishop are reflected in the Basel Capitularies, \textit{Hettonis Capitulare}, ed. Migne, PL 105, col. 761-768. See also Künstle, “Die Theologie”.
\textsuperscript{160} Stiftsbibliothek St. Gall codex 914; Gerlich, “Hatto”, \textit{Lexikon des Mittelalters online}, Beyerle, “Von der Gründung”, at pp. 71-84. Haito has also been mentioned as the author of the ‘Statutes of Murbach’, although this is nowadays deemed unlikely. Haubrichs, “Das monastische Studienprogramm”. Haito and his architectural patronage in Reichenau and Basel might also be a rewarding subject for a study such as those of Einhard and Hilduin presented in the previous chapter.
\textsuperscript{161} Ganz, “The Libraries”.
transept and an entrance flanked by towers. The abbey church, previously mainly focused on the choir and its surrounding rooms, was thereby transformed into a representative structure, ready to welcome high-ranking visitors from outside of the claustrum. During the last years of Erlebald’s abbacy, several important guests did indeed visit the monastery. In 837, patriarchs Basil of Jerusalem and Christopher of Antioch were in Reichenau and in 838 King Lothar I donated the relics of St. Januarius of Benevent to the monastery on occasion of his visit there. Most probably, an altar dedicated to Januarius was set up in Mittelzell. In the year after Lothar’s visit, 839, the first mention is made of Bodman, the palatium regum or palatinate. In the same year, 838, Walahfrid Strabo returned to Reichenau after tutoring Louis the Pious’ youngest son. He was made abbot, but had to flee the monastery in 840 due to his lending support to Louis the Pious’ son Lothar. Walahfrid and Louis the German were however soon reconciled and Walahfrid returned to Reichenau in 842, remaining abbot until his death in 849. During his abbacy, no building projects were initiated. In his Libellus de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum Walahfrid voices his disapproval of the construction of churches that are needlessly big. His predecessors Haito

---

163 Before then, the church had been further embellished with a sort of ciborium, donated by Haito, probably at the occasion of his withdrawal from the abbacy. Walahfrid Strabo, Tituli Augienses V:II, ed. Dümmler, MGH Poet Lat 2, p. 426.

164 Walahfrid Strabo, Carmina 77; ed. Dümmler, MGH Poet. Lat. 2, pp. 415-416. To my knowledge, little is known about the visit of the Byzantine patriarchs. It is possible that they belonged to one of the diplomatic missions that came to Francia in 838, yet I find it very unlikely that men of such importance would belong to the entourage of such a mission, without being named in any document. Charters relating to Byzantine embassies to Francia can be found in Dölger, Regesten. About contacts between the Franks and Byzantium, see McCormick, “Byzantium and the West, 700-900”; “Diplomacy”; Borgolte, Gesandtenaustausch.

165 Bodman is located to the north of Reichenau, facing the ‘Obersee’. It had existed as the centre of a large fisc (a conglomeration of royal lands) since the eighth century. The first royal charters were issued there in 839 by Louis the Pious. Louis the German and Charles the Fat also resided there for some time. Binding, Deutsche Königspfalzen, pp. 138-142; Maurer, ”Bodman”. About fiscs in general, see Nelson ”Kingship and royal government”, esp. pp. 385-387.

166 Walahfrid Strabo, Libellus de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum, ed. Boretius & Krause, MGH Capit. II, pp. 473-516; transl. in Harting-Correa, Walahfrid Strabo’s
and Erlebald may have enlarged Reichenau’s abbey church, but it never became a magnificent edifice like, for example, Fulda. Walahfrid knew from his own experience there that such an endeavour could end dramatically.

The initial use of the western transept is unclear. In 830 the monks received relics from bishop Ratolt of Verona, who had been brought up in Reichenau.167 Ratolt ardently collected relics and brought them to the Lake Constance region; most of them were intended for his foundation cella Ratoldi, later Radolfszell, but he brought the relics of Valens and part of the relics of Genesius/Senesius to the monastery.168 Both Reisser and Zettler have attributed the western transept to Erlebald (823-838), partly because it is unlikely that the ‘unfinished’ state of the abbey church lasted for long. Reisser interprets the western transept as a separate, lay choir initiated by Erlebald before the arrival of the relics in the 830s.169 The connection with the claustrum however speaks against this identification as a space meant specifically for the lay community on the island. I concur with Reisser and Zettler’s idea that it is unlikely that the Heito-church remained without a proper entrance for very long. However, the remaining question is whether it was built before 830 to complete the Heito-church, or after 830 so as to provide the relics that were do-

---

Libellis de exordiis. This text is a highly valuable source with regard to ninth-century views on the liturgy, monasticism, contacts between clerics and lay people and many other issues. The text has not been studied enough and I would, at some other time, love to investigate what relevance it may have for architectural historians. A start has been made in my MA thesis, entitled 'Domus dei' and 'opus dei'. The Reichenau monastery in the eighth and ninth centuries. Utrecht: 2007, pp. 62-72.

167 Hermannus Contractus, Chronicon, a. 830; ed. Pertz, MGH SS 5, p. 103.
168 Genesius and Senesius are commemorated on respectively June 21 and April 20. They both figure in the tenth-century calendar kept in Zurich, but neither in the ninth-century Vienna calendar nor in that of Walahfrid. An account of the miracles of Genesius was written in Reichenau during the abbacy of Erlebald (822-838). However, it was probably written for the monastery of Schienen, where the relics of St. Genesius had been kept for thirty years already. Badischen Landesbibliothek Karlsruhe, Cod. Aug. CCII, fols. 109v-122r; ed. MGH SS 15, pp. 169-172 (partial). See also Manser & Beyerle, "Aus dem liturgischen Leben", pp. 345-352; Klüppel and Berschin, Reichenauer Hagiographie, pp. 18-25. The relics of Senesius on the other hand were brought to Radolfzell by Ratolt together with the relics of Theopontus. In later history-writing from Reichenau (e.g. Hermannus Contractus) both stories were combined and Ratolt was said to have brought relics of Valens and Genesius.
169 Reisser, Die frühe Baugeschichte, p. 50.
uated by Ratolt of Verona with a suitable accommodation. In the years immediately following this donation, there are no indications of the passionate veneration of these relics. A few decades later, however, there are.

When Herman the Cripple mentioned the relics in his eleventh-century chronicle, he said with the advantage of hindsight that the relics of St. Mark, along with those of Genesius, were brought to the monastery under the name of Valens.\(^\text{170}\) Two centuries earlier, there was some confusion over the identity of these relics. The saint was referred to as Valens. However, he was honoured on 21 May, the feast-day of Vales of Auxerre.\(^\text{171}\) This is odd considering that there was a much more likely candidate: the sixth-century Valens of Verona, one of Ratolt’s predecessors (26 July). Genesius was equally problematic, since we also encounter him as ‘Senesius’.\(^\text{172}\) The impact the relics of both saints had on life in the monastery is hard to trace. Only in the 870s, when the confusion ended and the relics of ‘Valens’ revealed their true identity (as St. Mark’s) do we see an upswing in the veneration and liturgical celebration of the relics. The air of mystery surrounding the relics is explained in the early-tenth-century *Miraculis et Virtutibus S. Marci* from Reichenau.\(^\text{173}\) It relates that Ratolt was sworn to secrecy about the identity of the relics by the Venetian who provided him with them. St. Mark himself divulged the secret when he appeared to bishop Gebhard I of Constance (?873–?875) and complained that his remains were not well taken care of in Reichenau: they were suffering from the moistness of the ground. Abbot Ruadho (871–888) acted swiftly and placed the relics in the sun to dry.\(^\text{174}\) Although the real identity of the saint was


\(^{171}\) Klüppel, *Reichenauer Hagiographie*, pp. 43-44.

\(^{172}\) *Miraculis et Virtutibus S. Marci evangelistae* c. 6, ed. Mone, *Quellensammlung*, p. 64.


\(^{174}\) This has been seen as in indication that the relics were not simply human bones, but part of a mummy, since mummies are more affected by moisture than skeletons. Dennig & Zettler, “Der Evangelist Markus”, p. 32. Although I am not sure we should interpret this passage in the *Miraculis*
still kept a secret, the liturgical cult of St. Mark was probably already gaining in importance.\textsuperscript{175} Around the same time, \textit{passiones} were written for Saints Januarius and Fortunata and a second tradition about the arrival of the relics of Januarius in Reichenau was developed.\textsuperscript{176} Apparently, there was a need for authenticated relics in the 870s.\textsuperscript{177} But since this is not the period we are primarily interested in here, let us return to look at the situation in the 830s in more detail.

According to the \textit{Miracula}, the relics of Valens/Mark were upon their arrival on the island placed ‘in basilica S. Mariae in una absida cum omni honore’.\textsuperscript{178} The ‘una absida’ seems to imply that there was more than one apse, which, as we have seen, was indeed the case. This could mean that the relics were placed in one of the apses housing the altars of Peter and Paul. The text does not mention a later transfer of the relics, yet later on in the text a ‘basilicam S. Marci’ which is connected to but not identical with the ‘basilica S. Mariae’, is mentioned.\textsuperscript{179} This ‘Markuskirche’ has been identified with the structure built inside of the western transept (Zettler IIIA).\textsuperscript{180} The sanctuary cannot be dated on the basis of the material evidence, but Reisser has attributed it to abbot Ruodho (871-888) based on the fact that the sources always refer to it as the ‘Markuskirche’.\textsuperscript{181} Hence, it must have been built

---

\textsuperscript{175} As can be seen from the \textit{Miraculis et virtutibus S. Marci evangelistae}.
\textsuperscript{176} Previously, the relics were said to have been a gift of the emperor Lothar; the new translation claimed they were brought to Reichenau by an Alamannian who had found the relics while he was fighting the Saracens in southern Italy. Manser & Beyerle, “Aus dem liturgischen leben”, pp. 354-356.
\textsuperscript{177} See also Rulkens, “St. Markus incognito”.
\textsuperscript{178} \textit{Miraculis et Virtutibus S. Marci evangelistae} cap. 7, ed. Mone, Quellensammlung, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{179} \textit{Miraculis et Virtutibus S. Marci evangelistae} cap. 8, ed. Mone, Quellensammlung, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{180} Reisser, \textit{Die frühe Baugeschichte}, p. 7: Reisser argues that since there are no recorded building activities in the period between the ‘Erlebaldbau’ and the composition of the \textit{Miracula}, we can safely assume that the situation that the \textit{Miracula} describes is identical to the ninth-century one. He contradicts himself, however, when he later claims (at p. 50) that the Markuskirche cannot be dated in the time of Erlebald but must belong to the 870s – a building period for which there are also no records.
\textsuperscript{181} Reisser, \textit{Die frühe Baugeschichte}, p. 50.
after the identity of St. Mark was revealed. Zettler seems tentatively to follow this interpretation.\textsuperscript{182} It is indeed likely that the occasion for the setting up of the structure inside of the western transept, which was built later than the transept itself, was the unveiling of St. Mark. But had the relics already been kept in an altar in the transept for the last forty years? And if so, was the relics’ arrival the primary reason for the construction of the western transept in the 830s? At the moment, we cannot be certain. It is possible that ‘absida’ refers to some sort of niche within the western transept, meaning that the relics were immediately placed there. In that case, the transept was not built specifically for these relics, but it is still possible that it had been built with the intention of later looking for relics to be placed there. It can hardly be a coincidence that a number of relics arrived on the island from various sources in the 830s: perhaps the monks were starting to suffer from the lack of relics (of e.g. their founder) in the competition with other monasteries, or they simply followed the spirit of the times in a quest for relics. However, only in the 870s a serious attempt at promoting the relics and deploying them to the benefit of the monastery was undertaken.\textsuperscript{183}

The heightened interest in relics in the 830s may have been one of the factors leading to the construction of the western transept with at its centre an altar, but it is unlikely that the donation of the relics of Valens was the primary reason for its construction. This explains why the set-up no longer sufficed when it had become clear that the relics belonged to none other than Mark the Evangelist.


\textsuperscript{183} Traditionally, the death of Walahfrid in 849 has been viewed as the end of the hey-day of the monastery. This is partially affirmed by the decline in the number of monks. Rappmann & Zettler, \textit{Mönchsgemeinschaft}, p. 245. However, at the same time, the relationship with the emperor grew stronger once again. Charles III (Charles the Fat) had been crowned emperor by the Pope in 881 and in the following year, after the death of Louis the German’s son Louis the Younger, also managed to gain control over the East Frankish kingdom. The centre of his rule always remained in Alemannia, of which he had been king since 876. In 884, he celebrated Easter in Reichenau. After his death, preceded by several troublesome years, he was buried in Reichenau in 888 (Keller 1966). Of course, he received an appropriate place next to the main altar (Hermannus Contractus, \textit{Chronicon}; ed. Pertz, \textit{MGH SS} 5, pp. 67-133. Zettler, \textit{Die frühen Klosterbauten}, pp. 105-109).
Reichenau’s building history closely followed its development in other fields and demonstrates that the monastery was a work-in-progress. What we can see clearly here is the rapid succession of a large number of minor building phases that together led to a final stage which determined for a large part what the church and monastery would look like for the centuries to come. The first half of the ninth century has turned out to be the most creative and energetic phase in the history of the monastery. At this time especially, all developments, whether they were liturgical, architectural or literary, were interconnected. Under the abbacy of Hatto I, the monastery became a flourishing intellectual centre whose leading scholars were appreciated all over the realm. In the two decades after his resignation in 823, both the plan of St. Gall and the De Exordiis were written. Both reflect contemporary debate about the way a monastery, and its most important occupation, the celebration of the liturgy, should be run. The abbey church that was consecrated in 816 had a short nave with side-aisles and a non-continuous eastern transept giving access to three eastern rooms. The addition of the western transept and entrance hall with flanking stair towers in the 820s or 830s added to the church’s representative character. Although the death of Walahfrid in 849 has traditionally been viewed as the end of the hey-day of the monastery, from the 870s onwards the monks attempted to regain some of its former standing. The translation of relics, the writing of translationes and the construction of St. Mark’s sanctuary demonstrate an attempt at drawing the attention of the world that lay beyond the shore of the island. This seems to have worked, because Charles III chose Reichenau, instead of St. Gall, as the place where his physical remains would be kept. This meant, of course, that he would benefit from the liturgical commemoration of the monks.
2.5 CONCLUSION

At the start of this chapter, the parallels between Reichenau and St. Gall have been pointed out. After surveying the architectural material from both monasteries, we can conclude that this also shows remarkable similarities. The size of the abbey churches for example was roughly comparable, as were their proportions. In both cases, the choir areas were extensive and subdivided into three or six parts. Yet other aspects of the churches were highly dissimilar: St. Gall had a crypt, which Reichenau did not, whereas the island monastery’s altar room ended with the singular combination of two apsidioles. Without pointing out all the other similarities and dissimilarities between the two, and keeping in mind the problematic nature of the evidence from St. Gall, we can say that they shared certain traditions and functionalities, while simultaneously making their own decisions based on the local situation. The monks of St. Gall for example needed to make the relics of Gallus accessible, whereas those of Reichenau chose to continue the tradition of twin altars for Saints Peter and Paul.

The Plan of St. Gall may have played a part in the transmission of some of the characteristics of the Haito-church to St. Gall. This is indicated not only by the occurrence of some of the characteristics binding together the Reichenau and St. Gall churches on the Plan, such as the subdivision of the choir, but also by the experiments of the draughtsman with the design of the western part of the abbey church. When the church was first drawn, on a single piece of parchment, it had a short nave and western transept. After the addition of the second piece the nave was extended by the length of the old transept, which was replaced further west and completed by an apse and paradise reflecting the eastern ending. In the final design, the western transept had completely disappeared.184 As the design of the church developed, it started to look less and less like the church in Reichenau-Mittelzell, which may be an indication that the Reichenau church was one of the

---

184 An animation of the folding and drawing process is available via www.stgallplan.org/stgall_flash/stgall.html. It is described in Jacobsen, Klosterplan, p. 76.
starting points for the Plan. The difficulties the designer encountered with the western transept may have been caused by his lack of experience with this arrangement. Alternatively, he may have been experimenting with this model for the benefit of Erlebald who would use it in Reichenau.

But even without the Plan, because there were so many contacts on so many levels, Gozbert and his subordinates must have known what the abbey church of their colleagues on the other side of the Bodensee looked like, and what the successes and disappointments of their building project were. Considering the geographic and chronological proximity of the construction works, we may even speculate that there were craftsmen who contributed to both monasteries. They may also have played a part in the transfer of techniques and ideas.

The Plan did not only function as a mediator at the time; it can also do so now, by telling us about things we cannot deduce from the material evidence, such as design practices and the ways in which architecture and space were viewed. The regularity of the design and the use of fixed shapes to represent certain types of buildings and their constituent parts indicates that, although no other examples of it have survived, a tradition of drawing architecture still existed. That the drawing was made by a trained scribe who was not necessarily a master builder is only one of the difficulties in connecting it to realised buildings. Another is the ease with which practice and theory could, in this medium, both be combined and separated from each other.

The combined study of these three examples of monastic complexes has resulted in a more complete picture than the separated study of each one of them.

---

185 If this is the case, then it was adapted right from the start, e.g. by the addition of the crypt and apse. Other similarities between the Plan and the situation we know from Reichenau are the position of the claustrum and the scriptorium for instance.

186 We know far too little about building practices, the organisation of building workshops, the specialisation of craftsmen etc. in the early middle ages to allow for anything more than speculation on this subject at the moment. For what little we do know, mainly on the basis of later material, see e.g. Binding, Planen und Bauen. The lack of written sources may however partially be compensated by a technical analysis of the materials and building techniques that were used, which has so far not been done sufficiently.
would have yielded. The Plan visualises the desired separation of the groups of people inhabiting the monastery: monks, pupils, visitors both high and low, servants and craftsmen. This can, to some extent, also be witnessed in both ‘real’ churches. In Reichenau, there was only one point of entrance to the cloister, which could be carefully guarded. The stairs connecting the abbey church with the cloister at different points give some indication of the ways in which the monks moved through the complex. The church was made accessible to different people at different times through different routes. In St. Gall the lay and monastic areas were carefully separated from each other. The only point of contact was marked off by a choir screen and the crypt, although located underneath the choir, could be reached only from the side-aisles.

The abundant information that is available on the various building phases of Reichenau puts the Plan and Gozbert’s abbey church in perspective by reminding us of reality’s uncertainty and messiness. The scribe who drew the Plan attempted to create a perfect world, in which everything was regular and symmetrical. In a sense, so did Sennhauser when he made his reconstructions: there is no room for crooked walls or irregularities. In a similar way, we are tempted to view churches and monastic complexes as neatly fitting into a repertory of forms, types and models. As Heito’s church with its unbalanced appearance makes clear, we should not forget that reality often does not allow itself to be so neatly categorised.

In the next chapter, which focuses solely on the monastery of Fulda, we will be compelled even more forcibly to part with one of the most well-known cases of such categorisation: that of the so-called ‘Ratger-church’ as a copy of St. Peter’s in Rome.