

MONKS & NUNS,
SAINTS & OUTCASTS

RELIGION IN MEDIEVAL SOCIETY

ESSAYS IN HONOR OF LESTER K. LITTLE

EDITED BY

SHARON FARMER & BARBARA H. ROSENWEIN

CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS

ITHACA AND LONDON

Copyright © 2000 by Cornell University

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations in a review, this book, or parts thereof, must not be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher. For information, address Cornell University Press, Sage House, 512 East State Street, Ithaca, New York 14850.

First Published 2000 by Cornell University Press
First printing, Cornell Paperbacks, 2000

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Monks and nuns, saints and outcasts: religion in medieval society:
essays in honor of Lester K. Little / edited by Sharon Farmer and Barbara H. Rosenwein.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8014-3445-9 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 0-8014-8656-4 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Church history—Middle Ages, 600–1500. 2. Civilization, Medieval.

3. Europe—Church history—600–1500. I. Little, Lester K.

II. Farmer, Sharon A. III. Rosenwein, Barbara H.

BR252.M575 2000

274.03—dc21 99-056454

Cornell University Press strives to use environmentally responsible suppliers and materials to the fullest extent possible in the publishing of its books. Such materials include vegetable-based, low-VOC inks and acid-free papers that are recycled, totally chlorine-free, or partly composed of nonwood fibers. Books that bear the logo of the FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) use paper taken from forests that have been inspected and certified as meeting the highest standards for environmental and social responsibility. For further information, visit our website at www.cornellpress.cornell.edu.

Cloth printing 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Paperback printing 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1



Lester K. Little

tween the choir and the west end of the church, structures that were otherwise routine in the region.⁷⁶

Organized as heaven's answer to worldly troops and as the vicarious expression of the piety of bishops too busy to pray themselves and too vulnerable to be sinless, the monks at Agaune carried out a liturgy that needed only the whisper of an idea of Sleepless monks to inspire it. In essence, it was homegrown.⁷⁷ As such, it reveals (as the old Benedictine trajectory cannot do) some of the extraordinary variety, creativity, and meaning in Western monasticism.

76. For example, Bonnet, *Les fouilles*, pp. 38–39; Charles Bonnet and Béatrice Privati, "Les origines de Saint-Gervais: Recherches archéologiques," in *Le temple de Saint-Gervais* (Geneva, 1991), p. 21. In Gregory, *Liber in gloria martyrum*, c. 75, MGH SSrerMerov 1, pt. 2, p. 88, a mother is invited to come to Saint-Maurice as often as she likes to hear the voice of her dead son chanting in the choir with the other monks.

77. Masai, "La 'Vita patrum iurensium,'" p. 69, seems ready to come to this conclusion as well. Wood, "Religion and Culture," p. 100, has observed that the Lyon-Vienne region in fact formed a sort of "pocket" where the Eastern devotions of men like Cassian passed by with barely a trace. Rather, "it is fair to see monasticism in the central Rhône valley as a product not so much of the major traditions of Tours or Lérins, but rather of the devotional readings of the aristocracy."

C H A P T E R T H R E E

Claustration and Collaboration between the Sexes in the Twelfth-Century Scriptorium

Alison I. Beach

The monastic renaissance of the twelfth century was vitally connected to the work of the scriptorium. As the intellectual life of reformed and newly founded monasteries expanded, interest in libraries and demand for books surged.¹ Many religious houses worked to enlarge collections that were outdated or lacking the basics—biblical and liturgical texts, patristic sermons and commentaries, saints' lives, histories, grammars, and legal texts—while others moved beyond mere copying, and devoted new energy to composing original texts.² In both cases, the scriptorium functioned as an intellectual nerve center, collecting and transmitting texts to the community and beyond.

During the twelfth century it was generally a monastery's own scribes who did the work. This fact tends to bring to mind the image of a monk-copyist seated before a book with a writing instrument in his hand. But if we stop here in the monks' scriptorium, our image is incomplete, and our understanding of the monastic renaissance flawed. Religious women also worked as copyists in a variety of institutional settings—in the se-

1. Wilhelm Wattenbach, *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*, 3d ed. (Leipzig, 1896), p. 441. Bernhard Bischoff credited the new monastic orders—the Cistercians, the Premonstratensians, and the Carthusians in particular—with a rise in scribal activity during the twelfth century. See Bernhard Bischoff, *Latin Paleography*, trans. Dáibhí Ó Cróinín and David Ganz (Cambridge, 1990), p. 216. Raymund Kottje makes this same connection between monastic revival and book production for the monastic reforms of the eleventh century. See Raymund Kottje, "Klosterbibliotheken und monastische Kultur in der zweiten Hälfte des 11. Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 80 (1969): 145–62.

2. Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), pp. 78–82.

clusion of the recluse's cell, at monasteries for women only, and in monasteries for both women and men. Female scribes worked alone, in teams of women, and in collaboration with their male counterparts.

Our vision of female participation in creating books during the twelfth century, though, has been limited primarily to a few outstanding books and individuals, particularly Herrad of Hohenbourg and her *Hortus deliciarum* and Hildegard of Bingen and the Wiesbaden Codex of her *Scivias*.³ But the more ordinary women who did more ordinary work have largely escaped modern notice.⁴ Female copyists produced texts on a less grand scale at Admont, Lamspringe, Lippoldsberg, Mellersdorf, Münsterbilsen, Regensburg, Niedermünster, Schäftlarn, Schwarzenhann, Wessobrunn, and an unidentified monastery in the Middle Rhine region.⁵ Women certainly worked as scribes at other centers, and the list will grow as fragments of evidence are reconnected.

Manuscripts produced at two of these houses—Benedictine Admont and Premonstratensian Schäftlarn—offer us an extraordinary glimpse into the intellectual and institutional lives of religious women in two twelfth-century double monasteries.⁶ At both of these Bavarian monas-

3. For a reconstruction and discussion of Herrad's compendium, which was destroyed during the bombardment of Strassburg during the nineteenth century, see Rosalie B. Green, ed., *Hortus deliciarum* (London, 1979). On Hildegard's *Scivias* and the Wiesbaden Codex (Wiesbaden, Hess. LB, Hs. I), see *Hildegardis Scivias*, eds. Aldegundis Führkötter and Angela Carlevaris, CCCM 43 (Turnhout, 1978), and Antonius Van der Linde, *Die Handschriften der Königlichen Landesbibliothek in Wiesbaden* (Wiesbaden, 1877), pp. 22–28. On Hildegard's role in the design of the Rupertsberg *Scivias* illustrations, see Madeline Caviness, "Artist," in *Voice of the Living Light. Hildegard of Bingen and Her World*, ed. Barbara Newman (Berkeley, 1998), pp. 110–24.

4. Of the approximately 1,615 pre-twelfth-century scribal subscriptions listed in Bénédictins du Bouveret, *Colophons de manuscrits occidentaux des origines au XVI^e siècle*, Spicilegii Friburgensis Subsidia 2–7 (Fribourg, 1965–1982), only roughly 1 percent (16) are female. Women may have been less likely to sign their names to their work than men, making female scribes less visible than their male counterparts. See Alison I. Beach, "The Female Scribes of Twelfth-Century Bavaria" (Ph.D. diss. Columbia University, 1996), pp. 2–3. It is important to note that the names of scribes—female or male—were seldom recorded before the fifteenth century. For a discussion of the factors that led to the increase in the use of scribal colophons after the fourteenth century, see Pamela R. Robinson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 737–1600 in Cambridge Libraries* (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 5–12.

5. My doctoral dissertation provides both a general survey of female scribal contributions from the Carolingian period through the twelfth century and a detailed study of female scribal activity in twelfth-century Bavaria. For early medieval female scribes, see Rosamond McKitterick, "Frauen und Schriftlichkeit im Frühmittelalter," in *Weibliche Lebensgestaltung im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Hans-Werner Goetz (Cologne, 1991), pp. 70–73. On the role of female copyists before the Middle Ages, see Kim Haines-Eitzen, "'Girls Trained in Beautiful Writing': Female Scribes in Roman Antiquity and Early Christianity," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6:4 (1998): 629–46.

6. Recent scholars have called into question the use of this term, which has traditionally been used to describe a variety of institutional arrangements at religious communities with both female and male members. See Penelope D. Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession: Religious Women in Medieval France* (Chicago, 1991), p. 7; Penny Schine Gold, *The Lady and the Virgin: Image, Attitude, and*

teries we see women contributing at many levels to a community effort to produce and reproduce texts. Patterns of collaboration in books produced at both houses reflect differing levels of claustration and degrees of tolerance for contact between the sexes, complicating our picture of strict enclosure. When books needed to be produced, intellectual and social barriers came down.

Collaboration between men and women to produce texts was an invention neither of the twelfth century nor of Bavaria. We learn from Eusebius, for example, that female copyists assisted Origen in transmitting his work.⁷ In the eighth century, the missionary Saint Boniface relied on Eadburga, abbess of the Anglo-Saxon monastery Minster-in-Thanel, to provide books for his missionary work on the German frontier. In one case, Boniface sent her the materials she needed to copy the Pauline Epistles in gold letters.⁸ The nun-scribes of Chelles, working in the late eighth or early ninth century, produced a six-volume copy of Augustine's *Commentary on the Psalms* for Archchancellor Hildebald of Cologne.⁹ During the twelfth century, Idung of Prüfening addressed the preface of his *Dialogue between Two Monks* to Kunigunde, abbess of Niedermünster, a Benedictine monastery in the diocese of Regensburg. He requested that the sisters there make a legible, carefully corrected copy of his text.¹⁰ The collaboration between Hildegard of Bingen and Volmar of St. Disibod, the monk who was both her teacher and her secretary, is well known. After Hildegard composed the *Scivias* on tablets (assisted within the monastery by the nun Richardis von Stade), Volmar transcribed the text onto parch-

Experience in Twelfth-Century France (Chicago, 1985), pp. 101–2; Sharon Elkins, *Holy Women of Twelfth-Century England* (Chapel Hill, 1988), pp. xvii–xviii; while the term may be so broad as to include many diverse types of dual-sex communities, it is a convenient description that can be bolstered with a discussion of the precise institutional relationship between male and female members. I use it here to indicate a community of both male and female religious organized under one superior and sharing a common endowment.

7. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 6.23, ed. and trans. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 2d ser., vol. 1 (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1976), p. 271. See Haines-Eitzen, "Girls," pp. 631–34.

8. Boniface, *S. Bonifatii et Lulli epistolae*, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epp. 3:285–86; Ephraim Emerton, ed. and trans., *The Letters of Saint Boniface*, (New York, 1940), pp. 64–65.

9. The nuns may have produced these on commission for Hildebald. On the nun-scribes of Chelles, see Bernhard Bischoff, "Die Kölner Nonnenhandschriften und das Skriptorium von Chelles," *Mittelalterliche Studien* 3 vols. (Stuttgart, 1966–1981), 1:16–34; McKitterick, "Frauen und Schriftlichkeit," pp. 70–73.

10. R. B. C. Huygens, "Le moine Idung et ses deux ouvrages: 'Argumentum super quatuor questionibus,' et 'Dialogus duorum monachorum,'" *Studi Medievali*, 3d series, 13/1 (1972): 320 and 376; Jeremiah F. O'Sullivan, Joseph Leahy, and Grace Perrigo, trans., *Cistercians and Cluniacs: The Case for Cîteaux: A Dialogue between Two Monks and an Argument on Four Questions by Idung of Prüfening* (Kalamazoo, 1977), pp. 21–23; Wattenbach, *Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*, pp. 445–46.

ment.¹¹ There were no doubt other collaborative efforts for which no manuscript or documentary evidence has survived.¹²

What makes Admont and Schäftlarn unique in this context is, first, the survival of substantial physical evidence of male-female collaboration, and second, the close relationship between men and women that this material reflects. Let us now turn to the two monasteries, the manuscripts, and the stories they tell about men and women working together in the context of claustration.

ADMONT

On March 11, 1152, a fire broke out at Admont.¹³ The flames quickly swept through and destroyed all of the buildings belonging to the community's monks. As the fire reached the women's enclosure, the senior monk—guardian of two of the three keys required to unlock the bolts that secured the only door—panicked and was unable to find them. A desperate Abbot Gottfried (1138–1165) gave the order to break down the door and rescue the women. The nuns, once outside their familiar quarters, were uncertain where to go—being outside the cloister seems to have been as upsetting and disorienting as the fire itself.¹⁴

We hear this story from the monk Irimbert, who would serve as abbot of Admont from 1172 to 1176. He states that the three-lock door that caused such distress during the fire was, under normal circumstances, opened only for the entrance of a sister making her profession, the administration of last rites, and burial.¹⁵ All communication with the out-

11. Barbara Newman, *Sister of Wisdom: St. Hildegard's Theology of the Feminine* (Berkeley, 1987), p. 6.

12. Joan Ferrante, *To the Glory of Her Sex: Women's Roles in the Composition of Medieval Texts* (Bloomington, 1997) provides a discussion of collaboration between men and women in the composition of Latin texts.

13. Admont is located in a valley on the Enns River in the twelfth-century archdiocese of Salzburg (modern Graz-Seckau). For a general history, see Jakob Wichner, *Geschichte des Benediktiner-Stiftes Admont*, 4 vols. (Graz, 1874–80); Rudolph List, *Stift Admont, 1074–1974. Festschrift zur 900-Jahrfeier* (Reid im Innkreis, 1974); and Walter Steinböck, "Die Gründung des benediktinischen Reformklosters Admont," *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-ordens und seiner Zweige* 84 (1973): 52–81. On the women's community at Admont, see Jakob Wichner, "Das ehemalige Nonnenkloster O.S.B. zu Admont," *Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner-orden* 2 (1881): 75–86 and 288–319.

14. See Bernard Pez, *Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova* (Regensburg, 1725), 8:454–64. Fire that threatens nuns locked in their enclosure is a literary topos in medieval writing about holy women. See Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession*, pp. 154–55. We know from monastery records, including the report of the consecration of the rebuilt abbey church, that a fire did, in fact, destroy a number of buildings at Admont in 1152.

15. Pez, *Bibliotheca*, p. 459.

side world, Irimbert claims, took place through a single small window in the enclosure. This opening, and the bolted door, provided the only physical link to the world beyond the cloister.¹⁶ Irimbert's account is interesting for its reflection of contemporary concern about the proximity of men and women in double monasteries. He makes it clear that no such improprieties were possible at Admont.¹⁷ Still, even if we allow for enthusiastic exaggeration, it appears that the monastery's nuns and monks were physically segregated and did not interact freely.¹⁸

Given this clear preoccupation with claustration, it is surprising that nuns were not marginal figures at Admont. In fact, they played a particularly active role in the lively intellectual life of the monastery.¹⁹ The author of a contemporary *Life* of one unnamed *magistra*, or abbess, praises this highly educated woman for her ability to write both German and Latin, and for her mastery of sacred Scripture as well.²⁰ The *Life*, written after 1137, presents the author's vision of the ideal Admont nun: pious and highly literate.²¹ Irimbert himself later testifies that the sisters conducted their own daily chapter meeting under the leadership of the *magistra*. Many, he says, were highly literate and skilled biblical exegetes, and a few could preach in place of the abbot when he was unable to deliver

16. The abbot did not refer to the arrangements for necessities such as food, materials for making clothes, and other essential supplies passing into the women's enclosure. Clearly, these must have entered through something other than the small window in the chapter house. Refuse, clothing made by the nuns for the monks, and other materials must likewise have found their way out.

17. The nuns maintained written contacts with the outside world, as evidenced by fragments of extant correspondence preserved in Admont's archives. See Admont, *Stiftsarchiv II/1*, fragments of twelfth-century parchment containing a collection of letters written by the nuns. Admont librarian Jakob Wichner transcribed two of these letters and published them in the appendix to his article, "Das ehemalige Nonnenkloster," pp. 318–19. My article "Voices from the Cloister: A Nuns' Letter-Book from Twelfth-Century Admont" is forthcoming.

18. The issue in this context is not active enclosure—that is, whether nuns occasionally left the cloister to defend their interests, visit ailing family members, or tend to other pressing business—but that when they were in residence, a strict separation between men and women was maintained. On the types of enclosure, see Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession*, p. 151, and Jane Tibbetts Schulenburg, "Strict Active Enclosure and Its Effects on the Female Monastic Experience (ca. 500–1100)," in *Distant Echoes, Medieval Religious Women*, vol. 1, ed. John A. Nichols and Lillian Thomas Shank (Kalamazoo, 1984), pp. 51–52.

19. As both Suzanne Wemple and Jane Schulenburg point out, claustration in the early Middle Ages tended to isolate women from educational opportunities. See Wemple, *Women in Frankish Society: Marriage and the Cloister, 500–900* (Philadelphia, 1985), pp. 187–88, and Schulenburg, "Strict Active Enclosure," p. 78.

20. "Vita, ut videtur, cuiusdam magistrae monialium Admontensium in Styria," *Analecta Bollandiana* 12 (1893): 356–66.

21. While scholars debate the precise identity of the author, she was certainly a nun at Admont. See Frederick Ohly, "Ein Admonter Liebesgruß," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 87 (1956): 13–23.

his daily sermon.²² Some of the nuns may even have written down their own sermons or composed their own biblical commentaries.²³

In spite of their physical restrictions, the women were well integrated into the community's intellectual life, which was a defining feature of twelfth-century Admont. Under abbots Wolfhold (1115–1137) and Gottfried, the monastery became one of the most important centers of learning in Bavaria. Wolfhold, who had been a monk at the reformed monastery of St. George in the Black Forest, introduced the customs of Hirsau to Admont upon his arrival in 1115.²⁴ Medieval monastic reform tended to rekindle interest in book copying and library building, and this was especially true of monasteries affiliated with Hirsau, where an upswing in book production often paralleled the composition of original texts.²⁵ The wealth of surviving manuscripts copied by the community's twelfth-century scribes, as well as the number and variety of original texts copied by community members, testify to the intellectual revival that followed the advent of this reform.²⁶

The degree to which monks and nuns worked together to compose and copy the fruits of that revival, in view of the women's alleged strict enclosure, is also surprising. We hear first of collaboration from Irimbert, who states in the prologue to his sermon-commentary on 2 Kings, one in a series of sermons originally preached through the window in the nuns'

22. Pez, *Bibliotheca*, p. 460.

23. Stephan Borgehammar, "Who Wrote the Admont Sermon Corpus—Gottfried the Abbot, His Brother Irimbert, or the Nuns?" in *De l'homélie au sermon: Histoire de la prédication médiévale*, ed. Jacqueline Hamesse and Xavier Hermand (Louvain-La-Neuve, 1993), p. 49.

24. Hirsau was a Benedictine monastery in the Black Forest, reformed following the model of Cluny during the eleventh century. The monastery soon became a powerful center of reform in Germany. See Stephanus Hilpisch, *Benedictinism through Changing Centuries*, trans. Leonard J. Doyle (Collegeville, 1958), pp. 62–63, and Hermann Jakobs, *Die Hirsauer. Ihre Ausbreitung und Rechtsstellung im Zeitalter des Investiturstreites*, Kölner historische Abhandlungen 4, (Cologne, 1961). Some scholars have argued that the connection between Hirsau and Admont predated the arrival of Wolfhold. See Helmut J. Mezler-Andelberg, "Admont und die Klosterreform zu Beginn des 12. Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereines für Steiermark* 47 (1956): 28–42.

25. Kottje, "Klosterbibliotheken," pp. 145–62. See also Karin Dengler-Schreiber, *Scriptorium und Bibliothek des Klosters Michelsberg im Bamberg* (Graz, 1979), for a study of scribal culture at Michelsberg, a community that joined the Hirsau Reform in 1112. Dengler-Schreiber documents the increased output of the scriptorium there between 1112 and 1114. Michelsberg may have had close ties to Admont, since Irimbert was Abbot of Michelsberg for many years before returning to Admont to serve as abbot there in 1172. Romuald Bauerreiss, *Kirchengeschichte Bayerns*, 7 vols. (Munich, 1958), 3:132–74, provides a survey of the blossoming of interest in theology, historical writing, poetry, and drama that characterized monasteries affiliated with the Hirsau Reform.

26. These include a large corpus of biblical commentaries and sermons, several biographies, and an historical chronicle. See Beach, "Female Scribes," pp. 72–81. For a general description of the form and content of the Admont sermon corpus, see Stephan Borgehammar, "The Admont Sermon Corpus" (paper presented at the International Congress for Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, Mich., 8 May 1993).

enclosure between 1151 and 1152, that the nuns secretly and without his knowledge recorded his words on parchment. Perhaps his claim of ignorance was no more than a formulaic expression of modesty. Maybe he was trying to shift the responsibility for initiating what may have been a rather unconventional collaborative effort onto the nuns. It is also possible that Irimbert truly did not know that the nuns were taking notes, since he probably could not see his entire audience as he preached.²⁷ In any case, his comments draw our attention to the presence of female collaborators.

In the prologue to his sermon-commentary on 4 Kings, Irimbert again acknowledged the help he received from the women's community:

In the very great difficulty of this work, I was refreshed thoroughly by the liberality of the aforementioned sisters, since they appointed me two sisters free from every occupation, who continually and diligently transcribed my spoken words onto tablets.²⁸

From this account, it seems that the work that began spontaneously had become an official collaborative project. Two nuns were now primarily engaged in helping Irimbert with his work. These women must have been skilled writers, for taking dictation is a complex task requiring simultaneously careful listening and fast writing. To this, we must add the need for thorough comprehension, since the nuns probably did some editing of the dictated material in the process of converting their notes, necessarily written in haste and abbreviated, into a manuscript draft.²⁹ The cumbersome nature of the materials they used—in this case a stylus and wax tablets—further complicated their task. The collaboration between preacher and scribe cannot have been made easier by Irimbert's need to speak, or even shout, loudly and clearly enough to be heard and understood through a small aperture in the wall.

This was not, however, the nuns' first involvement with Irimbert's corpus of commentarial works, and their interest, whether hidden or not, in

27. Johann Wilhelm Braun, "Irimbert von Admont," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 7 (1973): 288. It would not have been unusual for the nuns to have access to parchment for this project since they operated their own scriptorium within the enclosure. It is also possible that one of the monks, or even Irimbert himself, provided the needed materials, casting doubt on the secrecy of the project and the sincerity of Irimbert's ignorance.

28. "... difficultate earundem sororum utrimque recreatus sum liberalitate, ut duas michi sorores ab omni occupatione liberas deputarent, que continue ac diligenter transcriberent, que a me dicta in tabulis excipi potuissent." Braun, "Irimbert von Admont," p. 320.

29. Nicole Bériou, *La prédication de Ranulphe de la Houblonnière: Sermons aux clercs et aux simples gens à Paris au XIII^e siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1987), 1:59–64, examines the process of recording "live" sermons, stressing the impact of the recorder's own interests and understandings on the form and content of the resulting written text.

his Kings sermons must not have come as a complete surprise to him. A few years earlier, between 1140 and 1149, as many as eleven women helped to copy, and possibly to edit, his commentaries on the book of Ruth and on Judges 19–21.³⁰ Two primary hands appear consistently throughout the early redactions of these texts. These two scribes, who may have been the two who would later help Irimbert with his Kings commentaries, worked together to turn preliminary versions of the text (Voraus MS 193, Admont MS 650, Admont MS 682) into the final version of the text (Admont MS 17). The rubricator of MS 17 identified them as Irmingart and Regilind.³¹

The execution and construction of the “draft” volumes containing the Ruth and Judges texts provide important clues to the circumstances of their production. The small (octavo) format of these books reduced the amount of parchment required for each gathering. There are frequent hand changes, and the scribes often appear to have been writing quickly. This implies that speed of execution was important, and copyists working cooperatively could produce faster results. Practical considerations took precedence over aesthetics, although an effort was made to use a uniform book hand and parchment with the same characteristics throughout. A more elegant script, illuminated initials, and a larger format distinguish the manuscript containing the final recension of the texts (Admont 17) from the earlier recensions.³²

If we look at the physical structure of the early manuscripts, we see what may have been a strategy for facilitating collaborative production. The basic subunit of most medieval manuscripts is the quire or gathering. Once filled with text, gatherings were stitched together to produce a book. The most common type of gathering is the quaternio, comprising four sheets of parchment folded to form eight folios.³³ The scribes of Admont’s early commentary manuscripts, though, used a different approach. Instead of using uniform gatherings as the basic subunit of their books, they used booklets: independent subunits made up of one or more quires tailored to the text contained.³⁴ Most of these booklets contain just one

30. Admont, Stiftsbibliothek MS 650 and MS 682; Voraus, Stiftsbibliothek Ms 193.

31. Admont, Stiftsbibliothek MS 17, p. 393 and p. 420; Braun, “Irimbert von Admont,” p. 288; Beach, “Female Scribes,” p. 67.

32. Significant modifications were made to the texts from recension to recension, indicating that the commentary was still a work-in-progress. A collation of the various manuscripts and an analysis of the textual changes made, while clearly beyond the scope of the present study, would likely yield interesting information about the genesis of both works.

33. For a full treatment of gatherings, see Jacques Lemaire, *Introduction à la codicologie* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1989), pp. 39–67.

34. Pamela R. Robinson, “The ‘Booklet’: A Self-Contained Unit in Composite Manuscripts,” in *Codicologica* 3 (Leiden, 1980): 46–69.

text. Many contain one or more irregular gatherings (i.e. other than the common four-bifolium gathering or quaternio) to provide exactly the space for that text.³⁵

Admont MS 650, for example, is a composite of three independent booklets.³⁶ For booklet one, Irimbert’s *Commentary on the Book of Ruth*, Irmingart used three regular quires and two single folios (quires one through three in Table 1). For the *Commentary on Judges 19–21*, contained in booklet two, Irmingart and Regilind first filled three regular gatherings (quires 4–6). To accommodate the short piece of text remaining after completing quire six, they added an irregular gathering of two bifolia and two single leaves to provide a total of six folios. Had Irmingart and Regilind copied this text in a standard quire, two folios would have remained unused. Booklet three contains an anonymous commentary on Exodus that was nine folios long—too long to fit in a single quaternio. Irmingart and Regilind added a single leaf to a regular gathering of four bifolia to provide the nine folios needed. If the nuns had used a standard quire to accommodate the last folio of text, they would have left seven folios blank. The women thus produced three independent booklets, each containing a single text. These may initially have circulated as individual units, but they were combined into composite volumes at an uncertain date.

Table 1. Use of Booklets in Admont, Stiftsbibliothek MS 650

Booklet	Text	Scribe	Location in Manuscript
One	Irimbert of Admont, <i>Commentary on the Book of Ruth</i>	Irmingart	fols. 1v–25r [quire 1 = III + 1] [quire 2 = IV] [quire 3 = IV + 2]
Two	Irimbert of Admont, <i>Commentary on Judges 19–21</i>	Regilind	fols. 26r–47v [quire 4 = IV] [quire 5 = IV] [quire 6 = IV]
		Irmingart	fols. 48r–49v [completes quire 6]
		Regilind	fols. 50r–55r [quire 7 = II + 2]
Three	Anonymous, <i>Commentary on Exodus</i>	Irmingart	fols. 56r–64r [quire 8 = IV + 1]

35. The distinction between quire-based and booklet-based book construction is analogous to the distinction between a standard book (even today composed of gatherings) and a series of offprints bound together to form a single volume.

36. I used the tables in Johann Wilhelm Braun, “Die Überlieferung der Schriften Gottfrieds und Irimberts von Admont mit einem Lebensabriß Irimberts” (Ph.D. diss., Universität Gießen, 1967), pp. 207–11 and pp. 215–18 as a base for my analysis of Admont MS 650 (Table 1) and Voraus MS 193 (Table 2) respectively. In the course of my work with the manuscripts, I made numerous changes to Braun’s analysis.

The use of booklets may have served two purposes. First, because each subunit contained a complete text with little or no unused parchment, there was no need to coordinate space between texts. When the text ended, the booklet ended.³⁷ Another booklet was constructed to accommodate the next text. This was an efficient and economical strategy for accommodating the monastery's rapidly growing corpus of sermons and commentaries. As Irimbert and others wrote new texts, scribes copied them into independent booklets.

Second, the nuns' use of booklets could have facilitated collaboration between Admont's segregated scriptoria. While it was only the nuns who worked on the three booklets that comprise Admont MS 650, booklets in other composite volumes may have been copied by either male or female scribes. Table 2 contains a description of Vorau, Stiftsbibliothek MS 193, a collection of biblical sermons and commentaries, including Irimbert's Judges and Ruth texts, at least part of which was copied at Admont during the 1140s.

Only the sections containing Irimbert's Ruth and Judges texts can be attributed to nun-scribes. These were added to the work of an unidentified scribe who copied the entire first section of the book (fol. 3r–80r, quires 1–11), a collection of anonymous sermons.³⁸ Five other unidentified scribes copied section two, which itself can be divided into five subunits. None of the six unidentified hands is among the eleven female hands that I have identified at Admont. It is possible that these scribes were monks.³⁹ The composite approach may thus have eased coordination between the products of the monks' and nuns' scriptoria.

In the commentary manuscripts from Admont we do not see a group of individuals acting independently, but a team of scribes working in close coordination to produce a manuscript that appeared a unified whole. Two elements help to link the individual booklets. First, the careful training of the community's copyists to write a uniform bookhand helped to minimize the negative aesthetic impact of frequent alternation of scribes. Second, using a standard parchment format, with standard dimensions and ruling patterns, also helped to minimize visual differences

37. In the case of very short texts (one or two folios), booklets sometimes contain two or more.

38. The scribe of section 1 used a bookhand distinct from any other seen in the commentary manuscripts, and the parchment contains a unique ruling pattern, suggesting that this section was copied at another time or at a different monastery. The sermons in this section have been attributed to Abbot Gottfried, Irimbert's brother, with no clear justification. See Borgehammar, "Who Wrote the Admont Sermon Corpus," p. 48. For an overview of Admont's twelfth-century biblical sermons and commentaries, including the issue of authorship, see Fritz Peter Knapp, *Die Literatur des Früh- und Hochmittelalters in den Bistümern Passau, Salzburg, Brixen und Trient von den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 1273*, *Geschichte der Literatur in Österreich 1* (Graz, 1994), pp. 74–79.

39. Beach, "Female Scribes," pp. 95–96.

Table 2. Composition of Vorau, Stiftsbibliothek MS 193

Section/ Booklet	Text	Scribe	Location in Manuscript
One	Anonymous, Sermones de tempore et de sanctis; Sermones de tribus sapientibus	unknown #1	fol. 3r–80r [quire 1–11 = II, IV, V]
Two	Anonymous, Sermo de duobus ducibus et oblatione eorum	unknown #2	fol. 81r–83v [quire 12 = III]
	Anonymous, Sermo in dominica palmarum	unknown #3	fol. 84r–91v [quire 13 = III quire 14 = II]
	Anonymous, various short sermons	unknown #2 and unknown #4	fol. 92r–104v [quire 15 = IV quire 16 = II]
	Anonymous, various short sermons	unknown #5	fol. 105r–120v [quire 17 = IV quire 18 = IV]
	Anonymous, various short sermons	unknown #6	fol. 121r–156r [quires 19–22 = IV quire 23 = II]
Three	Irimbert of Admont, <i>Commentary on Judges 19–21</i>	Irmingart, Regilind, and nun-scribe A	fol. 157r–185r [quire 24 = IV quire 25 = V quire 26 = IV quire 27a = II]
Four	Irimbert of Admont, <i>Commentary on the Book of Ruth</i>	Irmingart, Regilind, and nun-scribes A and B	fol. 186r–214v [quire 27b = IV quire 28 = IV quire 29 = IV]

among the booklets. This facilitated the rapid production of manuscripts that were, nevertheless, harmonious in appearance.

SCHÄFTLARN

The scribes of the Premonstratensian double monastery of Schäftlarn developed different strategies to facilitate male-female collaboration.⁴⁰ Like their counterparts at Admont, Schäftlarn's women lived within the boundaries established by regulations for female claustration. The stat-

40. The priest Waltrich founded Schäftlarn, located south of Munich on the Isar River in the diocese of Freising, as a Benedictine community of men in 760. The community was destroyed by the Magyars and the secularization of its property early in the tenth century. Religious life was restored at Schäftlarn by the end of the century when a chapter of secular canons was established. This community was on the verge of extinction in 1140, when Bishop Otto of Freising (1138–1158) refounded it as a Premonstratensian house. See P. Leo Abstreiter, *Geschichte der Abtei Schäftlarn* (Schäftlarn, 1916); Paul Ruf, ed., *1200 Jahre Kloster Schäftlarn* (Schäftlarn, 1962); Josef Hemmerle, *Die Benediktinerklöster in Bayern* (Munich, 1951), pp. 115–16.

utes that the Premonstratensian order issued in 1134 demanded the strict enclosure of all professed sisters, or *sorores*.⁴¹ Only priests were permitted to enter the women's cloister, and then only in groups of two or three to deliver a sermon, to hear confession, to administer communion, to perform last rites, or for other sacred duties.⁴² Travel to other religious communities was permitted only for groups of at least ten women.⁴³ The door to the canonesses' enclosure was, in theory, opened only in the presence of two or three mature sisters, and conferences with visiting abbots or other religious persons took place through a window in the presence of witnesses.⁴⁴ A woman who left the cloister without following proper procedure was to be refused readmission.⁴⁵

The statutes, however, tell only part of the story. We know from entries in the community's necrology that Schäftlarn housed a number of lay sisters, or *conversae*.⁴⁶ The term *conversa*, as used in the context of twelfth-century religious orders, is ambiguous and difficult to define precisely, and it is unclear how these women differed, if at all, from *sorores*.⁴⁷ Practice probably varied with time, location, and order. The distinction is especially unclear for Premonstratensian women, for whom manual labor in the service of an associated male community, a role that we have come to associate with lay sisters, was universal. While the *conversae* and *sorores* probably lived within a single community, we do not know whether the two groups were subject to the same strict cloister regulations.

Schäftlarn differed sharply from Admont in its assessment of the value of female education. While Admont operated a school for nuns and praised their abilities, Schäftlarn, as far as we know, provided no school for canonesses and was silent about their intellectual potential. Because Premonstratensian women lacked pastoral duties and did not, before the double monasteries were separated, participate in the celebration of the

41. Raphael Van Waefelghem, "Les premiers statuts de l'ordre de Prémontré," *Analectes de l'Ordre de Prémontré* 9 (1913): 65.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 65.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 66.

44. *Ibid.*

45. *Ibid.*

46. See Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession*, pp. 178–80, for a description of French *conversae*.

47. On the vexed issue of the distinction between *conversae* and *sorores*, see Sally Thompson, *Religious Women* (Oxford, 1991), p. 147, who argues that there was little practical distinction between the two types of women within the early twelfth-century Premonstratensian order. See also Brian Golding, *Gilbert of Sempringham and the Gilbertine Order* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 119–26, for a useful synthesis of current scholarship on the distinction between *conversae* and *sorores*, especially at Gilbertine, but also at Cistercian, Arrouaisian, and Premonstratensian houses in England. The issue has not been settled and requires further examination.

opus Dei,⁴⁸ the order felt no need to educate them.⁴⁹ The head of the female community was the prioress, and she assigned manual tasks, such as sewing, washing, and weaving.⁵⁰ These activities, which occupied most of the canonesses' daily life, required neither reading nor writing.⁵¹ The statutes did not mandate the operation of schools for the order's women, and in fact specifically limited devotional reading to a few psalms and prayers. Female reading was merely tolerated, with special concessions sometimes made for those who arrived at the monastery better educated.⁵² The lack of evidence of a canonesses' library (in the form of, for example, *ex libris* entries indicating that manuscripts belonged to the women, lending lists, or other records of book use by the women) suggests that the community heeded this limiting directive. There is no evidence to suggest that Schäftlarn held a more positive view of the intellectual potential of women than did the larger order.

Yet women were a significant component of the monastery's exceptionally visible scribal work force.⁵³ Three of the thirteen named scribes of the house were female.⁵⁴ How did women come to copy manuscripts

48. The *opus Dei*, or Divine Office, is the daily liturgical cycle of seven chanted services mandated by the *Rule of Saint Benedict*.

49. The Premonstratensian governing body ordered the separation of the women's and men's communities in 1141, and although the decree was not immediately or uniformly obeyed, this move reflects both an ongoing discomfort with the presence of women within the order and the contemporary distrust of double monasteries. See A. Erens, "Les soeurs dans l'ordre de Prémontré," *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 5 (1929): 5–26. In newly divided houses in which women began to sing the liturgy, a distinction between those who specialized in manual jobs (*conversae*) and those who specialized in liturgical ones (*sorores cantantes*) may have emerged with greater clarity. This argument, however, cannot be made for Schäftlarn, where the male and female communities were not separated.

50. The ultimate earthly authority in the monastery, however, was the prior, and he was responsible for monitoring the canonesses' activities and administering the sacraments to them. See Hugues Lamy, *L'abbaye de Tongerlo* (Louvain, 1914), p. 94, and Clifford Hugh Lawrence, *Medieval Monasticism: Forms of Religious Life in Western Europe in the Middle Ages* (London and New York, 1989), p. 223.

51. Manual work was central to the canonesses' daily life, and they formed a kind of manual labor corps, primarily in the service of the male community. The statutes list sewing, repairing, and washing clothing for the canons as possible occupations, suggesting that these activities were among the most common for Premonstratensian women. See Van Waefelghem, "Les premiers statuts," pp. 64–65, and Lamy, *Tongerloo*, p. 93. See also Erens, "Les soeurs," p. 14.

52. "[A sister] may have a Psalter or individual psalms, or the prayers or vigils of blessed Mary according to the provision of the abbot, but then she may learn nothing else. If any one shall have greater learning from outside the community, she shall be able to examine another book on feast days with the permission of the Abbot." Van Waefelghem, "Les premiers statuts," p. 66.

53. An exceptionally large number of Schäftlarn's scribes identified themselves in subscriptions under both Henry and his three predecessors. Almost one fifth of Schäftlarn's approximately sixty-six surviving twelfth-century volumes contain the name of a scribe or scribes. Schäftlarn alone accounts for eleven of the thirty-four named scribes who emerge from the manuscripts cataloged by Elisabeth Klemm, *Die romanischen Handschriften der bayerischen Staatsbibliothek*, 3 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1980).

54. Two female copyists, Sophia and Irmingart, are identified in colophons, and a third, Adelhait, in the house necrology. See notes 58–60 below.

in this restrictive environment? The answer may be simple community need. When Bishop Otto of Freising (1138–1158) refounded Schäftlarn in 1140 as a Praemonstratensian monastery, the library was insignificant.⁵⁵ A scriptorium was immediately established to produce texts needed for the central work of training priests.⁵⁶ Under priors Englebert (1140–1153) and Henry (1164–1200), book production was especially vigorous.⁵⁷ During this time of active book production, competent copyists of both sexes would have been welcomed into the community and its scriptorium. Recruits with previous scribal training could be assigned to the scriptorium for their primary manual work.

The first female scribe we meet at Schäftlarn is Sophia, who names herself in two signatures in the surviving volumes of what was originally a three-volume copy of Augustine's *Commentary on the Psalms*.⁵⁸ Sophia was active in the scriptorium as early as the 1160s, and it is possible that she was still producing books as late as 1180. The house necrology identifies two lay sisters (*conversae*) named Sophia. Although we can only speculate, it is possible that Sophia was a lay, rather than a professed, sister.⁵⁹ Schäftlarn's necrology names a second scribe, Adelhait, as both *conversa* and *scriptrix*, proving that the scriptorium did, in fact, employ lay sisters.⁶⁰

Sophia worked under Adalbertus, who was master of the scriptorium under Prior Henry. In the two volumes of Augustine's *Commentary on the Psalms* (Clm 17052 and Clm 17053) the two worked closely together—and probably even in the same workshop.⁶¹ Their hands alternate throughout both volumes. Adalbertus wrote the titles and portions of the text and made corrections, while Sophia copied the bulk of the text. Tables 3 and 4 detail the hand changes in these manuscripts, and illustrate the extent

55. Ruf, "Handschriften des Klosters Schäftlarn," pp. 29–39.

56. Hugues Lamy characterized Premonstratensian monasteries as "veritable seminaries," where the canons pursued a practical course of study geared toward the pastorate rather than one intended to foster literary productivity. See Lamy, *Tongerloo*, p. 289.

57. Beach, "Female Scribes," pp. 304–7.

58. The first signature—*scripsit Sophia*—is found at the bottom edge of fol. 214v of Codex latinus monacensis (Clm) 17052. The second—*sophia scripsit*—is found at the bottom edge of fol. 108v in Clm 17053. For a complete description of these signatures and Sophia's hand, see Beach, "Female Scribes," pp. 312–17 and 330–32.

59. "Sophia cv." See *Necrologium Sheftlariense*, ed. F. L. Baumann, MGH Nscr. 3:116.

60. "Adelhait cv. nra. scriba." See *Necrologium Sheftlariense*, p. 116; Penelope Johnson has observed that *conversae* in France were generally unlettered. See Johnson, *Equal in Monastic Profession*, p. 178. This was not the case with Adelhait or Sophia, if the latter was also a lay sister.

61. Schäftlarn's booklist, compiled between 1160 and 1162 includes an "Exposition of Augustine on the Psalter in Three Volumes." See Klemm, *Die romanischen Handschriften* vol. 2, pt. 1, pp. 97–98, and Günter Glauche and Hermann Knaus, eds., *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, vol. 4, pt. 2, p. 726.

Table 3. Hand Changes in Clm 17052

Location in Manuscript	Scribe	Comments
fols. 1r–1v (to line 7) [quire 1]	Adalbertus	
fols. 1v (line 8)–41r (to line 10) [quires 1–6]	Sophia	Corrections and titles by Adalbertus.
fols. 41r (line 11)–44v (to line 20) [quire 6]	Adalbertus	
fols. 44v–60r (to line 26) [quires 6–8]	Sophia	Corrections and titles by Adalbertus.
fols. 60r–94r (to line 21) [quires 8–12]	Adalbertus	
fols. 94r–129v [quires 12–17]	Sophia	Corrections and titles by Adalbertus.
fols. 130r–146r (to line 21) [quires 17–19]	Adalbertus	
fols. 146r–214v [quires 19–27]	Sophia	Corrections and titles by Adalbertus. Contemporary subscription on 214v, probably written by Sophia (<i>scripsit Sophia</i>).

Table 4. Hand Changes in Clm 17053

Location in Manuscript	Scribe	Comments
fols. 1r–28v [quires 1–4]	Sophia	Corrections and by Adalbertus.
fols. 29r–35r (to line 11) [quire 4–5]	Adalbertus	Hand change in middle of line 11.
fols. 35r–115r [quires 5–15]	Sophia	Corrections and titles by Adalbertus. Contemporary subscription (f.108v), probably written by Sophia herself (<i>sophia scripsit</i>).
fols. 115v–139r [quires 15–18]	Adalbertus	
fols. 139v–150r (to line 31) [quires 18–19]	Sophia	Corrections and titles by Adalbertus.
fols. 150r–177r (to line 5) [quires 19–22]	Adalbertus	
fols. 177r–277r [quires 22–35]	Sophia	Corrections and title by Adalbertus. "SOPHYA" scratched into parchment on fol. 269v.

to which the two worked together, often changing in the middle of a folio or, in places, in the middle of a line.

How was such close collaboration between a male and female scribe possible at Schäftlarn? One answer may lie in Sophia's status at the monastery. If she was, in fact, a lay sister, her close cooperation with Adalbertus reflects a somewhat relaxed policy regarding the enclosure of such women in order to facilitate book production—an important piece of information that sheds light on the elusive category, *conversa*. The 1134 statutes specified that *sorores* were to be cloistered, but this document makes no specific mention of lay sisters and no documents of practice have survived to fill in the gaps. Here manuscript evidence offers a unique insight: whatever the official policy may have been regarding the segregation of the sexes, women and men could interact within the context of the scriptorium.

The logistics of this interaction are uncertain. Perhaps lay sisters had access to the men's scriptorium. Alternatively, Adalbertus may have had permission to enter the residence of the women to copy and to oversee

book production. A third, less likely, possibility is that there was no direct interaction between Sophia and Adalbertus. To argue that Sophia and Adalbertus worked in two separate facilities is to accept an elaborate scenario of exchange of materials. At each hand change—sometimes in the middle of a line—the scribe stopped work, marked the stopping point in the exemplar, cleaned up his or her materials, and passed the parchment on to the collaborating scribe in a separate workshop. The second scribe would have to reverse the process, setting out the parchment, preparing the ink, and locating the starting point in the exemplar before beginning work anew. Such a transfer would have occurred thirteen times in the two surviving volumes alone and perhaps an additional six or seven times in the third, lost volume. It seems much more likely that the materials remained stationary while the scribes themselves changed places. This supports the theory that the two worked in the same scriptorium, although not necessarily at the same time. Either Sophia left her enclosure and went to work in the monk's scriptorium or Adalbertus left his and entered the women's enclosure.

Sophia was also the main scribe of Clm 17054, a copy of Augustine's *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, which contains the hand of two male scribes: Adalbertus and Marchwardus. As in Clm 17052 and 17053, Adalbertus executed the titles and the beginning of the text and made corrections to the entire manuscript. His hand does not reappear in the body of the text. This was not a joint copying effort such as that seen in the psalm commentaries. Adalbertus, rather, seems to have directed Sophia's work without functioning as a co-scribe. He copied the prologue to the commentary on folio 1r, and Marchwardus copied the next section of the text. Sophia completed the volume, and both Adalbertus and Marchwardus corrected her work.

This limited collaboration did not require the extensive interaction evident in Clm 17052 and 17053; at no point did Adalbertus and Marchwardus and Sophia collaborate within a quire.⁶² The canons may have

Table 5. Hand Changes in Clm 17054

Location in Manuscript	Scribe	Comments
fol. 1r [quire 1]	Adalbertus	
fols. 1v–8v [quire 1]	Marchwardus	
fols. 9r–200v [quires 2–25]	Sophia	31v, col. 1 contains an 11-line correction made by Marchwardus. Other corrections and titles by Adalbertus.

62. On collaboration within a quire as evidence of close contact between scribes, see Beach, "Female Scribes," pp. 15–16.

written the first quire for Sophia to use as a model for the layout of the remaining text.

Perhaps this change in the pattern of collaboration reflects Sophia's growing scribal experience and maturity.⁶³ As time passed, she may have been able to work faster and with less supervision, factors that could have encouraged Adalbertus to assign her jobs to complete by herself. It is also possible that claustration at Schäftlarn was tightened after the completion of the earlier volumes. Sophia and Adalbertus copied Clm 17052 and 17053 between 1165 and 1170, while Clm 17054 may have been completed as late as 1180. The community may have tightened claustration for lay sisters during the intervening years.

A third scribe, Irmingart, who was a professed sister at Schäftlarn between 1164 and 1200, is named both in the community necrology and in two contemporary colophons.⁶⁴ A moderately skilled scribe, she seemingly worked alone; there is no evidence that Irmingart participated in team copying. She, like Sophia later in her career, may have been prevented from team collaboration by the requirements of claustration. As a professed sister, Irmingart was probably subject to the strict cloister regulations set down in the Premonstratensian statutes.

Also like Sophia, Irmingart worked under Adalbertus's direction. Adalbertus copied the first column of text in Clm 17087, a collection of patristic homilies on the Epistles and Gospels, to establish a pattern for Irmingart to follow before the parchment was passed into the enclosure for her to complete (see Table 6). Given this limited exchange, Irmingart could easily have worked for Adalbertus without having any direct contact with him.

Irmingart's hand also appears in a copy of Palladius's treatise *On Agri-*

Table 6. Hand Changes in Clm 17087

Location in Manuscript	Scribe	Comments
fol. 1r (column 1) [quire 1]	Adalbertus	
fols. 1r (column 2)–223v [quires 1–28]	Irmingart	Corrections and titles by Adalbertus. Cruciform colophon on f. 223v.

63. Elizabeth Klemm dated Clm 17052 and 17053 to 1165–70, and Clm 17054 to 1175–80. Klemm, *Die romanischen Handschriften*, vol. 2, pt. 1, pp. 97 and 104. I disagree with Klemm's attribution of Clm 17054 to Irmingart.

64. The necrology entry reads "Irengardis scriba." See *Necrologium Scheftlariense*, p. 121; Clm 17087, fol. 223v contains a cruciform colophon in Irmingart's own hand: this colophon reads, "Iste liber pertinet ad sanctum Dyonisium Schleiftlaren quem scripsit soror Irmingart obtentu Domni Hainrici prepositi." ("This book, which was written by sister Irmingart with the permission of Prior Henry, belongs to Saint Dionysus, Schäftlarn.") Clm 17116, fol. 129v contains a similar colophon by a second hand. A colophon is a scribal notation that records information about the production of the text. A colophon can include one or more identifiers such as the name of a copyist, the name of the person who commissioned the copy, the place of production, or the date of completion.

culture (Clm 23478). A single hand change occurs on folio 52v of this volume, and a second scribe steps in and completes the text. It is impossible at this point to say whether this second scribe was a canon or a canoness. Irmingart copied Clm 17116, Rupert of Deutz's *On the Divine Offices*, without collaborators, and was also the sole scribe of an alphabetical glossary (Clm 17151).

Although Schäftlarn's copyists frequently produced texts collaboratively, they did not use a standard bookhand. This resulted in manuscripts with a rather careless appearance. Indeed, the wide variation in scribal hands in evidence in the products of Schäftlarn's scriptorium suggests that individual scribes learned to write in diverse settings, before arriving at this monastery. In contrast to Admont, we can identify no single bookhand as typical of Schäftlarn's workshop. We can attribute this difference to the presence of a school for scribes, male and female, at Admont. There was no analog at Schäftlarn, where women were not taught to write, and scribes simply used the hand that they had previously learned.

Although none of the texts copied by Schäftlarn's female scribes was, according to the statutes, available for their reading, this apparently was not an impediment to participation in book production. The drive to produce more books for the library probably cleared the way for female copyists' activity. Reading and copying are two distinct activities, and it is possible that appropriately trained women were assigned to copy books without encouragement—or even permission—to explore their contents. The formula used in two colophons identifying Irmingart's work—"Sister Irmingart copied this book for the monastery of Schäftlarn *with the permission of* [emphasis mine] Prior Henry"—suggests that she needed Henry's approval to make the copy. The community's large book collection, which the canonesses helped to create, probably had little impact on their intellectual life. An intellectually stimulating environment evidently was not an essential prerequisite for scribal activity.

CONCLUSION

The traditional tools of paleography and codicology, when applied to surviving manuscripts from Admont and Schäftlarn, reshape our understanding of the nature of interaction between men and women within the twelfth-century monastery. From these books emerge extraordinary glimpses of ordinary women at work—alone, with other women, and with men.

Female scribes worked in a variety of institutional settings, and patterns of collaboration between men and women in the production of man-

uscripts reflect varying degrees of tolerance for contact between the sexes. At Admont, Irimbart and the nuns worked together to compose original sermons and biblical commentaries, and if Irimbart is telling us the truth, they did so within the bounds of very strict enclosure. But their collaboration was not limited to dictation; the nuns' scriptorium helped to transform the dictated words—starting with the wax tablets—first into draft manuscript, and then into final deluxe edition. Their approach to assembling manuscripts may have enabled scribes of both sexes to contribute to a single volume with minimal visual disruption and wasted parchment. Manuscript evidence seems to support Irimbart's claim that Admont's nuns were strictly enclosed: while collaboration between men and women was close, it remained indirect. The nuns remained in their enclosure, and the monks, including Irimbart, stayed out.

At Schäftlarn, however, there may have been contact between the sexes in the scriptorium. Although the statutes of the Premonstratensian order call for the strict enclosure of women, Sophia and Adalbertus apparently worked within a single workshop to produce at least two manuscripts. If Sophia was a lay sister, as the necrology suggests, we may see in these volumes evidence that nonprofessed women in the community were permitted some contact with men. Do the changes in this pattern, which seem to reflect reduced contact between male and female scribes, reflect changes in Schäftlarn's practice of claustration? The manuscripts leave us here to speculate.