

über die Videos, so reduziert sich dies im Katalog auf einige Stills aus den entsprechenden Videos sowie die Nennung von Regisseur, Sänger/Werbeagentur, Song/Produkt und Entstehungsjahr. Dafür erhielten die Autoren Ulf Poschardt, Beat Wyss, Klaus Theweleit, Diedrich Diedrichsen, Neil Feineman, Fréderic Beigbeder und Werner Lippert mehr als die Hälfte des handlichen Buches, um sich in diversen Aufsätzen generell zum Thema Musik- und Werbevideo zu äußern; Petra Wenzel hat eine (im Jahre 1827 mit Niépcés Erfindung einer Vorform der Fotografie einsetzende und bezeichnenderweise mit der Düsseldorfer Ausstellung endende) Synchonopse erstellt.

„Videos sind Laboratorien“, schreibt Ulf Poschardt in seinem Beitrag (S. 10), und man hätte sich gewünscht, daß die in Düsseldorf gezeigte Auswahl etwas mehr zur Einrichtung eines solchen Labors genutzt worden wäre; jedoch: Die 25 Jahre, die 100 Videos, der Stelenwald – sie verwiesen leider weniger auf ein solches Laboratorium als auf einen Ehrenhof, in dem der Jubilar nicht einmal mehr hinterfragt, sondern – stumm bestaunt – eingefriedet wird.

HENRY KEAZOR UND THORSTEN WÜBBENA

*Kunstgeschichtliches Institut der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität
Frankfurt am Main*

Thomas Coomans (ed.): Abdijmolens tussen Rijn en Schelde (Moulins abbatiaux entre Rhin et Escaut / Abteimühlen zwischen Rhein und Schelde), (*Clavis. Kunsthistorische Monografieën*, 19); Utrecht: Clavis Stichting 2003; 136 pp., 77 b/w plates and plans; ISBN 90-75616-07-4 (ISSN 1389–6210); € 22,50

The Rule of St Benedict stipulates that: „if it can be done, the monastery should be so established that all the necessary things, such as water, mill, garden and various workshops, may be within the enclosure, so that there is no necessity for the brethren to go about outside of it, since that is not at all profitable for their souls“. A mill therefore was an essential component of an abbey complex, especially if the abbey sought to free itself of lay intervention and wanted to be completely self-supporting. This importance is, however, not reflected in studies dealing with monastic architecture. On the whole these have been concerned with abbey churches and the edifices surrounding the cloisters, while workshops and mills, although of great importance for the economic viability of monastic establishments, have been largely neglected, even though there were few abbeys without them.

Having a mill within the abbey precinct required the presence of running water. The site of an abbey had thus to be chosen carefully if it was to concur fully with the requirements laid out in the Rule. Some abbeys were very strict in choosing suitable sites for new foundations, especially those of the Cistercian order who followed the Rule of St Benedict to the letter, while others had no mill within their enclosure. In most cases these abbeys owned various mills in the surroundings of the abbey. Some abbeys had mills within the precinct as well as without and it was the latter that sometimes made them handsome profits.

At the outset of the monastic movement, abbeys and monasteries were usually provided with extensive lands, possessions and privileges. Often they were also given mills. In order to bring into cultivation and exploit the donated lands more mills were constructed. Mills were highly technical devices and were expensive to build and therefore it was only the great landholders, both lay and ecclesiastical, who could afford such machinery. It is for this reason that monks are often said to have played an important role in the development and diffusion of the watermill. A mill, of course, was a lucrative commodity and even many of the Cistercian abbeys could not resist the temptation of making some profit out of their mills by placing them along the very boundaries of the abbey enclosure, where they could also serve those living in the surroundings. As time progressed the population as a whole became more prosperous and this resulted in more mills being erected by the laity. Gradually, as lay ownership of mills increased, the abbeys lost their ascendancy in the field of hydraulic engineering.

On the whole, abbeys founded in the high Middle Ages had to be fitted into an already-existing landscape and could not be too particular about choosing a site. As their lands were usually not too extensive either, there was no need to build the huge number of mills that the earlier monasteries had needed to do. Most mills had already been built. The later monasteries and abbeys therefore played a far less important role in the development and diffusion of the mill than their earlier counterparts had done. By the thirteenth century the number of watermills had reached its peak. There were only so many streams, and a stream could only support so many mills. For a mill to function properly, arrangements had to be made with farmers both up stream and down stream, as in order to have enough water to keep the mill running, a miller would collect the water in millponds by making a barrage or weir in the stream. This could lead to flooding of the land up stream, while the lands down stream could be laid dry. This is not to say that no new mills were built. In the thirteenth century the windmill made its first appearance and as a windmill just required a small mound to stand on, they were far easier to accommodate.

There are thus various questions pertaining to abbey mills that need answering. How many mills did a given abbey possess? Were all these mills for private use or were they built to make a profit? How was the site of an abbey chosen? Where were the mills situated, within the enclosure or without? How did mills come into the possession of the abbey? What sort of abbey are we dealing with, Benedictine, Cistercian, Premonstratensian or Augustinian? What did the abbey mills look like and how did they function? How important was the role of abbeys in the technical development of the water and windmills?

The present volume is concerned with the abbey mills between Rhine and Schelde (Escaut) and owes its conception, so the introductory chapter (that is published fully in three languages) tells us, to the restoration of the abbey mill at Gempe, situated near the village of Sint-Joris-Winge (Flemish Brabant, Belgium). The restoration of the mill was concluded in 2001. Today the Gempe mill, which in its present form dates to the eighteenth century, is once again in working order and as such is the

only functioning abbey mill in the areas described in the book. In spite of this, although the history of the abbey itself is considered in some detail, there is no description of the mill itself or of its machinery. Instead, the ins-and-outs of the history of the project are described in full detail.

The book consists of three main articles written by Ester Vink (in Dutch), Laetitia Vandenheede and Thomas Coomans (in French) and Harald Kühn (in German), as well as a short notice by Nico Jurgens (in Dutch).

Ester Vink is concerned with the region south of the Rhine in the present Netherlands and has made an inventory of all the mills mentioned in documents before 1350. This inventory, published as an appendix, shows that, compared to the lay ownership of mills, the number of mills owned by abbeys was negligible, i. e. no more than sixteen. This is not surprising as there were few abbeys in this region dating from before 1350 and most of these were relatively new foundations dating from the eleventh and twelfth centuries. They had had to be fitted into the existing infrastructure. Benefactors gave most mills owned by abbeys to them. This is probably the reason why none of the sixteen abbey mills were situated within or in the vicinity of the monastic precinct. Vink also follows the vicissitudes of the mills of the abbeys of Mariënweerd (Premonstratensian), Roermond (Cistercian nunnery), Kloosterrade (Augustinian) and Thorn (Benedictine) from 1350 until the dissolution of the monasteries in the sixteenth century. Of the six mills belonging to Mariënweerd, none have survived. The same holds true for the eight mills once in the possession of the Munsterabdij of Roermond. Kloosterrade had five mills in the present-day Netherlands and three more in present-day Germany. Of these only the Baalsbrugger mill on the river Worm has survived. Two others were demolished relatively recently, the mill at Eygelshoven in 1957 and the Brugmolen on the river Anstel in 1963. Thorn had ten mills, of which two have survived. I would have expected the surviving mills to be described, so as to give the reader some idea of what these mills look like and how they functioned.

Most of the mills in the region described by Vink were watermills; only a minority seems to have been windmills. On the basis of the stipulations set out in two late sixteenth-century building contracts Nico Jurgens has reconstructed one of the windmills belonging to the abbey of Mariënweerd.

The article by Laetitia Vandenheede and Thomas Coomans has a rather different approach as it deals with the watermills within the monastic precincts of the abbeys between Flanders and the Ardennes. The mills situated 'extra muros' are disregarded, as are the mills owned by other ecclesiastical institutions and the laity. Of the 105 abbeys known to the authors, 56 abbeys had a total of 70 mills within their walls: 40 of these mills belonged to a total of 30 Cistercian sites. From these figures it is clear that the Cistercians, more so than the monks of other orders, made an effort to comply with the Rule of St Benedict. Having said this, the authors move on to describe the specifics of the various orders, the abbey sites, the hydraulic requirements necessary to warrant the proper functioning of the mill, the abbey precinct and the typology and architecture of the abbey mill. Most of the mills preserved today, 24 in total, are in bad condition and the machinery is either gone or no longer functional. The article con-

cludes with several case studies concerning the sites of the abbey mills within the abbey precinct.

The last article, by Harold Kühn, is concerned with the watermills belonging to abbeys in the western Rhineland dating before 1300, not only those ‚*intra muros*‘, but also those ‚*extra muros*‘. Here we find important abbeys that go back a long time, abbeys that had amassed extensive lands and privileges and, as a result, owned a great many mills; Echternach owned some 40 mills, St Maximin in Trier 45 and Prüm 50.

The book is interesting and there is certainly much to be enjoyed, but it is not an easy read as much of the material presented is necessarily made up of inventories and statistics. However, the legibility of the book could have been greatly increased by changing the order of the articles. By starting in the Rhineland and ending with the southern part of the Netherlands the development would at least have been addressed chronologically. Also, I would have liked an introduction that was more to the point. Why address the specifics of raising funds for the restoration of the Gempe mill when the architecture and mechanism of the mill are not going to be discussed at all? Why mention the number of meetings the authors had and the visits made to various mills, when these mills are not described at all? And for that matter, why include the reconstruction of a windmill belonging to the abbey of Mariënweerd when the book deals almost exclusively with watermills? Would not a reconstruction of a watermill have been more useful? However, this having been said, the authors have shown that the little-studied abbey mills do deserve more attention than has hitherto been given to them and that there are all sorts of interesting questions pertaining to them. All in all, their work provides a solid basis for further research.

ELIZABETH DEN HARTOG

Kunsthistorisch Instituut

Universiteit Leiden

Martin Gaier: Facciate sacre a scopo profano. Venezia e la politica dei monumenti dal Quattrocento al Settecento (*Studi di arte veneta*, 3), Venedig: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti 2002; 610 S., 139 Abb.; ISBN 88-88143-14-9; € 37,-

Kirchenfassaden und Grabmäler, die von Einzelnen oder Familien gestiftet werden, etablieren sich im Lauf der Frühen Neuzeit als Hauptaufgaben einer ausgesprochen profanen Repräsentation am Kirchenbau. Beide Aufgaben zeichnet nach zeitgenössischen Verständnisdimensionen eine bemerkenswerte Ähnlichkeit aus. So bildet die Fassade als „faccia“ des Gebäudes nicht nur formtypologisch die Entsprechung von Innen und Außen ab, sie kann darüber hinaus auch regelrecht als „ritratto“ des Bauherrn gelten. Üblicherweise wird neben der Tatsache der Stiftungsverantwortung dieses Verhältnis der Angemessenheit zwischen der Erscheinung des Baus und dem Rang des Stifters durch die Stifterinschrift und die Heraldik des Bauherrn unmittel-