

Zitierhinweis

Buc, Philippe: Rezension über: Elizabeth Lapina, Warfare and the Miraculous in the Chronicles of the First Crusade, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015, in: Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 125 (2017), 2, S. 445-447, DOI: 10.15463/rec.1361963767

MITTEILUNGEN
DES INSTITUTS FÜR
ÖSTERREICHISCHE
GESCHICHTSFORSCHUNG

copyright

Dieser Beitrag kann vom Nutzer zu eigenen nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken heruntergeladen und/oder ausgedruckt werden. Darüber hinausgehende Nutzungen sind ohne weitere Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber nur im Rahmen der gesetzlichen Schrankenbestimmungen (§§ 44a-63a UrhG) zulässig.

entsprechend nur wenig Material. Deren abschließendes Plädoyer zielt denn auch gar nicht auf mediävistische Erkenntnisinteressen, sondern sieht aufgrund der gegenwärtigen Globalisierung für den „Westen“ den „Moment“ gekommen, „um sich auf ein Zwillingsmodell zu besinnen, das die Partnerschaft in den Vordergrund stellt und die gemeinsame Herkunft aller Menschen im Auge behält“ (S. 164). Dabei geht es freilich nicht mehr um das mittelalterliche Verhältnis von weltlicher und geistlicher Gewalt, sondern, was auch in mediävistischen Zusammenhängen keine neue Entdeckung darstellt, um die mit „dem Herztton des Zwillingsgeschwisters“ vermittelte universale Erfahrung, „dass es nicht bloß das Eigene und Fremde gibt, sondern eben auch das Eigene zusammen mit dem näherliegenden, vertrauteren Anderen“ (S. 166). Spätestens hier lässt sich die Frage nicht mehr vermeiden, ob der Verfasser vielleicht ein ganz anderes Buch hatte schreiben wollen als eines, das nur einen „anderen Blick auf die Universalgewalten im Investiturstreit“ eröffnen wollte.

Mainz

Ludger Körntgen

Elizabeth LAPINA, *Warfare and the Miraculous in the Chronicles of the First Crusade*. Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park 2015. 224 S. ISBN 978-0271-06670-7.

This is a flawed study with some strongpoints. The author sets out to discuss three sets of phenomena according to her present in the First Crusade or in the early twelfth-century chronicling of the same, with miracles forming a loose thematic link between the chapters, and the First Crusade's major battle, before Antioch in 1098, providing a focal point.

The first argument is that second-generation chroniclers – that is, those authors who, for instance Guibert of Nogent, were not participants in the expedition but reworked oral or written data – asserted their authority over the event by underlining the superiority of the spiritual interpretation that they were providing over the eyewitnesses. Their self-ascribed ability to set miracles in a wider providential framework trumped the details that participants could provide. The second argument is to provide a genealogy for one of the key miracle genres of the crusade, present in particular (but not only) at Antioch: the active participation in battle on the Christian side of armed saints (George, Mercurius, Demetrius, et al.). Lapina finds antecedents in Roman Antiquity (e.g., Castor and Pollux), but shows that the tradition of fighting saints passes more through Byzantium than through the Latin West. In East Rome, these warrior saints, however, usually had a defensive function, and fought to protect cities from pagan aggression. The Normans of Southern Italy, in contact with the Byzantine world and often aggressively seeking to expand into it when not providing mercenary military service to it, took this form of miracle and gave it an aggressive twist. They are the conveyor belt of this form of miracle from East Rome to the crusading expedition. Yet by no means did this entail a Norman acculturation to Byzantium, if by this one understands the adoption by a group that felt inferior of the tropes of a culture it considered superior. It was, suggests Lapina, a form of „holy theft“, a *furtum sacrum* à la Patrick Geary. By mobilizing traditional Byzantine saints to fight in their favor, the Norman crusaders and their ambitious leader Bohemund of Taranto (or their propagandists) proclaimed their hegemony over the former possessor of the militant saints and their militant miracles. It was a hostile appropriation. The Southern Italian Normans, moreover, saw themselves as the bearers of a manifest destiny. While their pagan ancestors, while plundering Francia and Anglo-Saxon England, had been the object of wrathful miracles operated by the saints, Christian Normans were now, in the second half of the eleventh century, the beneficiaries of this genre of supernatural intervention. From shrewd and wily enemies of Christendom, the Northmen became its shrewd and wily propagators. Miracles performed against pagan Normans were translated into miracles performed for Christian Normans against Muslims. With the fifth chapter, the book moves into Biblical typology,

reworking a contribution to a collective volume on the Maccabees, directed by Gabriela Signori. For some anti-Semitic commentators of the expedition, the use of the Maccabean exemplar as a prefiguration of the First Crusaders was distasteful, even anxiety-producing. How could the model of God's spiritual fighters be some carnal Jews? Thus some disparaged the freedom-fighter and enemy of heathendom Judas Maccabeus; others more subtly arrayed him with evil figures of history. The sixth and final chapter shows a switch in the basic geography of sacred history. For the Fathers of the early Church, the West was evil and dark, the East enlightened and enlightening. The First Crusaders, however, took the role of rejuvenators of the Holy Land. Coming from the West, they inverted the earlier „orientation“ to the East and its valence.

The thesis of the first chapter is not original, in the sense that it claims for the like of Guibert of Nogent a method that had been used earlier. Liudprand of Cremona's *Antapodosis* jumps to mind, but other authors underscored their or their narratives' heroes as endowed with a spiritual sight denied to *hoi poloi*. For the First Crusade itself, a participant, Raymond d'Aguilers, describing the June 15–16, 1099, massacre in Jerusalem, to him miraculous, alluded to the need to read it in the light of the Spirit.

The second chapter is quite convincing, both as to its information and to the logic of its connections. One will no longer be able to discuss the heavenly warrior saints who fought at Dorylaeum and Antioch without reference to Elizabeth Lapina's thesis. However, the third chapter is wholly built on straws. It adduces a „cluster“ or „series“ of three (!) miracles of armed saintly intervention against pagan Northmen, two from Francia, one from Anglo-Saxon England; relates these to the miracle in favor of the Christian Normans against Muslims in Malaterra's *De gestis Rogerii* (a close parallel to the Antioch apparitions); and posits the conscious transposition of the Normans from „scourge of God to chosen people“. The only author to mention both saintly action against pagan Northmen and (later) in favor of Normans versus Muslims is in Amatus of Monte Cassino (a source surviving only in a fourteenth-century French copy, so how faithful to the lost original is debatable). No single text, thus, proposes explicitly the transposition. The one conclusion that one can reliably draw from these and the other comparable miracles (like saintly interventions in Catalonia) is simply, with Carl Erdmann in 1935, that there was a trend in Latin Europe, starting with the ninth century, to imagine that the saints took militant and active as opposed to passive measures to fight for their protégés. The fourth chapter is the most problematic. The evidence that the chronicles felt „anxiety“, „threat“, or were „alarmed“ at the utilization of a Jewish type, the Maccabees, would be judged as extremely slight were it not, worse, that it is simply misinterpreted. No, there was not any sense „that sacralizing crusading violence carried the danger of transforming crusaders into Jews“ (p. 121). The proofs proposed for these alleged worries, under closer observation, fail.

Raymond d'Aguilers, recounting Peter Bartholomew's famous vision of the crucified Christ (one discussed recently by Jay Rubenstein and myself), clearly despised contemporary Jews. He also stated that the crusaders were superior to the Maccabees, Old Dispensation Jews. But one cannot bring the two together, and state that Raymond is a chronicler who „resist[s] the new trend of assimilating crusaders to“ the Maccabees (p. 113). The righteous Jews before Christ's incarnation, members of *vetus Israel*, have nothing to do with the Jews existing under the New Dispensation. They are inferior to the First Crusaders, members of the True Israel (*verus Israel*), in proportion to the service that the Old Testament renders to the New. That Raymond hates the Jews of his days, children of the Deicide, does not mean that he has sundered the prophetic and typological links between *vetus Israel* and *verus Israel*. The crusade chronicler Ekkehard of Aura reported visions identical in form with those described in Josephus' „Jewish Wars“, which had presaged Jerusalem's sack in 70 A.D. by the Romans under the command of Titus, Vespasian's son, themselves an echo of heavenly portents in 2 Macc. 5. With Ekkehard, the vision and the capture of the city became positive. But Flavius Josephus, who saw signs in the sky announ-

cing Jerusalem's destruction, was not, pace Lapina, on the side of the Jews (pp. 118–119). As his cognomen Flavius indicates, he had been taken into the Flavian emperors' clientage. And he had even predicted to the general Vespasian that he would become emperor. God was now with the Romans. There was thus no reversal when Ekkehard read celestial signs positively. And, this said in passing, the first exegete of the Maccabean books, Hrabanus Maurus, commenting 2 Macc. 5, had linked its celestial portents to those in Josephus, which for him presaged the Roman „Vengeance of the Lord“ of 70 A.D. The *Chanson d'Antioche* mentions that a sword ended in the possession of the crusaders. It names a string of earlier possessors, among whom Judas Maccabeus. Lapina states that his position in the series (Alexander, Judas Maccabeus, Vespasian, and Saracens) indicates that the epic views him in bad part. But there is no reason to posit, as she does, a strict alternating between good (and legitimate) and bad possessors of the miraculous sword. All the more as the series is richer: the *Chanson* names Ptolemy between Alexander and Judas, and speaks of other, unnamed possessors between Judas and Vespasian. Another argument for the transfer of Judas to the side of evil in the *Chanson* is that the epic „claims that Judas was one of the generals in Kerbogha's army ... Other generals included the heroes of the Old Testament, Samson, David, and Solomon“ (p. 119). Evident is the hypothesis she brushes aside – that the list is a farrago. If the presence in a list of Muslim generals of the name Judas Maccabeus indicates hostility to his figure as Jewish, should one then deduce that David and Solomon being named in the same list signifies that Christ's royal ancestor (and type) had become problematic? One will search in vain in twelfth-century exegesis for such „anxieties“ concerning David. And nowhere does the epic say that these David, Samson, and Judas are their Old Testament namesakes. Homonymy is not identity!

The one sound element in this chapter's thesis may be its analysis of Guibert of Nogent, who pulled apart and ruptured the dialectic between Old and New Testament by insisting on radical difference between the New Israel and the Old Testament Jews. But when all is said and done, he is the exception among First Crusade sources. The other sources preserved the established exegetical complexity.

It would have been better before bandying ideas of scriptural interpretation to gain an in-depth knowledge of actual medieval exegesis. This reviewer suspects a second-hand or badly mediated understanding of Gerard Caspary's seminal *Politics and Exegesis: Origen and the Two Swords* (Berkeley 1978). Pairs of exegetical counter-concepts are rarely simple, radical dichotomies (p. 98), no matter what Lapina's dissertation advisor, David Nirenberg, who she cites, may have written about the Gospel of John's influence on medieval exegesis. Lapina claims novelty. Some indeed in this book is novel, and likely right (the genealogy of the aggressive intervention of saints and its role in Norman manifest destiny). Some seems novel and possibly right (the exchange of the valences of East and West). Some is novel and possibly wrong, since badly proven (like the thesis of a conscious reversal of the roles of Normans as pagan victims of avenging saints into Christian beneficiaries of the same against pagan Muslims). Some is novel and certainly wrong (like the „anxieties“ felt by some Christian authors at the idea that the Maccabean exemplars were Jewish and thus brought the crusaders too close for comfort to Jews). Some is not novel (that chroniclers could appropriate to themselves history by setting it in a providential setting).

Wien

Philippe Buc

Chris WICKHAM, *Sleepwalking into a New World. The Emergence of Italian City Communes in the Twelfth Century*. Princeton University Press, Princeton–Oxford 2015. XII, 305 S., 7 Karten. ISBN 978-0-691-14828-1.

Die Monographie analysiert aus ungewöhnlicher Perspektive die Entwicklung, aus der in den Städten Nord- und Mittelitaliens während des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts neuartige Strukturen