

Die meisten Autoren sind der Kirche fern, greifen jedoch zu theologischem Vokabular, um mit ihrem Thema zurechtzukommen. „Jedesmal, bei jedem Fall von Gewaltanwendung, muß die Frage der Angemessenheit an das sittliche Ziel des Sozialismus aufgerollt werden. Was entscheidet diese Frage im Menschen? Das moralische Gefühl“ (107). Martin Luther King ist unter den Verfassern wohl einer der wenigen praktizierenden Christen. Bei ihm scheinen die Fragen nach Martyrium und Selbsthingabe auf, etwa in seiner Feststellung zur Freiheit in Christus: „Der einzige wahre Revolutionäre, heißt es, ist einer, der nichts zu verlieren hat.“ Er spricht von einer „gewaltlosen Armee“ und einer „Freiheitskirche“ (126).

Im Anhang (161-173) präsentiert der Herausgeber Biogramme zu den Autorinnen und Autoren des Bandes (163-168) und verweist auf die frühere Publikation der Quellen (169-170). Der Abschnitt „Weiterführendes“ (171-173) liefert eine willkürliche Kurzauswahl von Literatur, Filmen und Theaterstücken. In letztgenannter Kategorie werden lediglich Brechts „Maßnahme“ und Sartres „Die schmutzigen Hände“ angeführt. Warum diese zwei? Der linke Theaterautor und Zeitgenosse von vielen Verfassern des vorliegenden Buches, Arthur Miller, schrieb 1953 „The Crucible“ über die Hexenjagd; das Werk entstand aus einem kommunistenfreundlichen Lager Nordamerikas als Gegenposition zu den Polemiken von Senator Joseph McCarthy, wäre also relevant. Viele weitere bedeutungsvolle Stücke ließen sich anführen. Zu Martin Luther King heißt es irrtümlicherweise, die von ihm besuchte Hochschule Morehouse College sei 1944 die „einzige Hochschule für Schwarze im Süden“ gewesen (164), wobei es Dutzende gab. Maos Biogramm (165-166) fehlt, wie jeder anderen auch, eine Literaturangabe und endet merkwürdigerweise mit 1966, als gerade seine blutige „Kulturrevolution“ begann.

ALKUIN VOLKER SCHACHENMAYR

Maximilian Sternberg, Cistercian Architecture and Medieval Society (Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 221. Brill's Studies on Art, Art History and Intellectual History 5). Leiden/Boston, Brill 2013. XI+ 298 Seiten, gebunden, 23,5 × 15,9 cm € 119. ISBN 978-90-04-25180-9.

This book seeks to study the networks around monasteries and their negotiations between religiously motivated introspection and quotidian relations with lay people and non-monastic institutions. In his introduction (1-12), Sternberg

begins not in the 12th Century but amidst the dialogue between Cistercian architecture and Le Corbusier's modernism that reached a relatively wide audience through Lucien Hervé's stunning book of photographs on Le Thoronet in 1956. Although the author is aware of the fascination and privileged aesthetic position of our Orders's architecture, he seeks to look deeper than the „contemplative and world-renouncing“ values associated with this aesthetic. He argues „that such modern fascination has done as much to obscure as to valorise [Cistercian architecture's] original meaning and functions“ (1).

In part one, he addresses iconologies of Cistercian architecture (15-72). He is keenly aware that notions of a distinctly Cistercian architecture are post-war phenomena informed by modernist tastes and communicated to a larger audience by theorists like Marie-Alain Couturier, O.P. and the above-mentioned photographer Hervé. These elective affinities between Modernism and Cistercian Style have received almost no critical attention (16). Sternberg addressed them with a background in theories of the city and in one passage even compares Bernard's Apologia to Adolf Loos' „Ornament and Crime“ (24). In earlier research, Sternberg pointed out that it was not the Modernist movement that discovered Cistercian aesthetics: the Romantics did, and they made Cistercian architecture more ascetic than it was in the Middle Ages (26-29). Further debunking myths, the author often reminds us that the so-called Cistercian Model is not at all universal; there are serious variations not only in abbeys' differing choirs but also the overall claustral complex (42). He is not convinced by the master narratives used to explain the Order's architecture (16), noting that since the 13th Century, „a great variety of lay people“ assembled frequently in the nave (174).

Part Three (113-204) is devoted to permeable boundaries in Cistercian topography. In order to explain his thinking, he cites Cassidy-Welch's traditional model of four underlying functions in the claustrum: Liturgy in the north wing, discipline in the east, domesticity in the south and labor in the west (182-183). In a further step, he analyzes the gatehouse, narthex and choir screen to show that in a Cistercian monastery, „inside“ and „outside“ make up one indivisible world (266) to which there are varying modes of access, degrees of permeability, accompanied by an array of symbolic functions.

Part four concerns Cistercians and the city (207-260). He devotes one chapter to Toulouse, one to Paris. The passages on Toulouse claim that Cistercian abbeys like Grandselve tried to keep pace with urban Cathedrals like St. Sernin (207).

Economic and educational dynamics were a part of this relationship, even the subcultures in which theatres and jongleurs flourished found entry into monastic communities (197). Sternberg finds allusions to troubadours in scenes portrayed in capitals: up to one third of such artists converted to a monastic way of life. Many of them entered Cistercian monasteries (217).

Cistercians, like the Cluniacs before them, were engaged in an open dialogue with the urban sphere, especially when it came to universities. In this vein, Sternberg devotes a substantial section to the Collège des Bernardins in Paris, „the most significant building to be erected by the Cistercian Order in a city in the Middle Ages“ (238). In Sternberg’s analysis, the architecture makes reference to the Papacy (Benedict XII was a Cistercian), the University of Paris and the mendicant orders. The academic urban architecture defines a new sort of Cistercian identity after the founding generations. In Paris, the white monks had to come to terms with Scholasticism, and were quite aware of the task at hand. It would be misleading to portray this intellectual encounter as a failure, since the Parisian College is „a phenomenon which casts considerable doubt on the received view that the rise of the medieval town led to the demise of Benedictine and Cistercian monasticism“ (235).

In his conclusion (261-266), Sternberg reminds us how important the urban imagination is for understanding the monastic compound; the idea of a monks’ city even appears in Aelred of Rievaulx’s writing (265).

This already valuable book gains even more through its excellent use of secondary literature and the profound bibliography (269-292); what a seldom moment when city planning theorist Lewis Mumford is listed in a Cistercian biography! An index (293-298) is included, as are dozens of black and white amateur photos.
