IVAN G. MARCUS

From Politics to Martyrdom

Shifting Paradigms in the Hebrew Narratives of the 1096 Crusade Riots

Sans doute, notre Salomon n'est pas un habile chroniqueur, il n'est qu'un modeste conteur, qui rapporte simplement ce qu'il a entendu.[1]

IN THE SPRING OF 1096, in response to Pope Urban II's appeal for an armed pilgrimage to Jerusalem, mobs of French and local German Christians attacked Rhineland Jewish communities in Speyer, Worms, Mainz, Cologne, Trier and elsewhere. Both in the Hebrew and Latin narrative accounts, the most striking aspect of these events was less the gruesome slaughter and pillage by the Crusaders than the extraordinary way Jews killed their own families and then themselves in order to avoid baptism. Shocked almost beyond words, the twelfth-century German Churchman, Albert of Aix (Aachen) reported:

> The Jews, seeing that their Christian enemies were attacking them and their children, and that they were sparing no age, likewise fell upon one another, brother, children, wives, and sisters, and thus they perished at each other's hands. Horrible to say, mothers cut the throats of nursing children with knives and stabbed others, preferring them to perish thus by their own hands rather than to be killed by the weapons of the uncircumcised.[2]

In his account, Albert selected the available information about what had happened in the Rhineland and interpreted it from his perspective as a Churchman. Thus, he goes on to relate that when the Crusader

PROOFTEXTS vol. 2 pp. 40–52
0272-9601/82/0021-0040 $01.00 © 1982 by The Johns Hopkins University Press

rabble was itself decimated in Hungary, that disaster was a sign of God's judgment. The Christians who had violated Church law by forceably converting, not to speak of murdering, Jews were themselves justly punished. Although Albert correctly sensed that Jewish mothers preferred to kill their own children "rather than be killed by the weapons of the uncircumcised," he did not fully understand the meaning of the Jewish reactions to the attacks.

Three Hebrew narratives[3] of the events of 1096 do provide such a Jewish perspective. They were written in the early twelfth century shortly after the events they portray, and are based in part on eyewitness and other oral and written reports. The three texts make use of some of the same facts which Albert knew but view them through a specifically Jewish cultural prism. Although Albert expresses shock at the ways Jews killed their own families to avoid Christian contact, the Jewish narrators are principally concerned with interpreting the meaning of those acts of unprecedented martyrdom in traditionally acceptable modalities. The martyrs' actions were such a daring innovation at the time that they prompted an act of literary imagination no less bold. The three Hebrew narratives are literary responses to those events. Whereas the martyrs themselves sought by their actions to justify the ways of God, the narrators who chronicled their actions had, by use of archetypal imagery, to justify the martyrs. In so doing they fashioned rich and complex narratives which invite literary analysis.

Of the three texts, the longest and most complex is ascribed with some probability to an otherwise unknown author, Solomon ben Samson (SS); the second, which contains liturgical poems (piyyutim) with name-acrostics of the distinguished German-Jewish scholar Rabbi Eliezer ben Natan, is most likely his work (EN); and the third, shorter than Solomon's account, is anonymous (A). Although each text is unique in some respects, the three have much material in common and also follow a similar pattern of organization: Each narrator describes first how different Jewish communities were attacked by Crusader mobs and then how the Jews in each responded to the attacks. The three also share a literary heterogeneity: the accounts consist not only of chronological narrative segments, containing specific references to individuals, the dates and places of each attack, but also of a liturgical prose framework.

In view of the number and complexity of these texts, it is not surprising that scholars have been more interested in some aspects of them than in others. Some have tried to isolate the "sources" of each account in order to resolve the textual problem of how the three are related to each other.[4] Others have analyzed the accuracy of the historical facts—names, dates, places—found in the chronological narrative portions.[5] Still others have interpreted the literary motifs in the liturgical framework[6] or considered the narrators' ideological biases.[7]

Although these studies offer important insights into one or more aspects of the narratives, none has attempted a literary reading in which the complete narratives are considered as products of coherent religious imaginations. The classification of the texts as medieval chronicles is one reason for this failure. That term usually denotes texts which contain documentary historical data which are embedded in a theological narrative framework. But the notion that medieval chronicles consist of an almost mechanical combination of "facts" and a "religious narrative framework" is a distortion: Such texts cannot be treated as though the "facts" are preserved in narrative like fossils in amber. Most medieval narrators were not interested in what happened for its own sake. Instead, a monk or a royal biographer or a hagiographer usually made use of what he considered to be facts—especially miracles—in order to demonstrate the wonders of God or of His royal or ecclesiastical servant. What appears to be facts in a medieval chronological narrative, then, should be considered a highly edited version of the "deeds" (*gesta*) which the narrator learned from traditional accounts, hearsay or eye-witness reports. The events actually reported qualify for inclusion only when they fit the narrator's preconceived religious-literary schema.[8] Medieval chronicles are, in this sense, fictions: imaginative reorderings of experience within a cultural framework and system of symbols.

Approaching Hebrew Crusade chronicles as literary works, as fictions of a particular Jewish religious imagination, requires appreciation of their stylistic modalities: In particular, the shape or structure of the entire narrative—the combining of chronological accounts with liturgical prose segments which accounts for the shape of the narrative; the particular symbolic imagery used; and the generic choice of prose rather than liturgical poetry. All are clues for understanding how the narrators express in specific cultural symbols a Jewish interpretation of the events of 1096.

The Solomon ben Samson narrative, to which I shall give the most attention, consists of a highly articulated five-part structure: two different kinds of narrative are framed by three liturgical interpretations of the narratives. Each community's experience is structured, in effect, as a drama in which a liturgical prologue introduces the first act which then narrates the political events which took place when a particular community confronted the Crusader threat; a liturgical entr'acte separates the political narrative in Act One from the lists of martyrologies in Act Two. Finally, a liturgical epilogue concludes the action by addressing the ultimate meaning of the acts of martyrdom. By constructing each community account in this highly stylized way, the narrator affirms that a fundamental shift took place in the world-view of the Jews he is describing: a shift from politics to martyrdom. The narra-

tor's plan is to justify the martyrs' behavior by describing how they resorted to killing only after exhausting all conventional religious and political alternatives. The narrator makes special use of the liturgical framework to signal to the reader that all aspects of the Jews' behavior were justified.

Moreover, by describing the shocking acts of killing and suicide as a reenactment of the Temple cult,[9] as a symbolic rebuilding of the Temple of Jerusalem in Mainz, the innovative behavior of the martyrs is legitimated by being masked in archetypal symbolism. By invoking the symbols of the Temple cult, the narrator justifies the physical boundary which the martyrs' acts of killing and suicide erected between Jewish bodies, defined as Holy Things (*Kodoshim*), and Christians, characterized in the most graphic imagery of impurity and pollution. Only the members of the Holy Community (*Kehillah Kedoshah*) can be permitted to touch, i.e. to sacrifice, the Holy Things. Hence, it is justifiable for the Jews to try and kill themselves and thereby avoid any physical contact with the Crusader pollutants.

The narrator's effort to legitimate the innovative acts of martyrdom is also reflected in his use of genre, but here two different considerations undercut one another. On the one hand, the narrator adopted a quasi-liturgical mode, perhaps with the hope of perpetuating the account in the permanent liturgy of the community, the German-Jewish rite. On the other hand, the narrator's need to justify the martyrs by bearing witness to their actual deeds led him to record the facts as he knew them in the form of a sequential narrative. But the descriptive detail essential to the prose medium made the liturgical parts unassimilable into the liturgy, which is almost always cast in the most general language of "Israel" and "God," not of particulars, such as the "Jews of Mainz" and the "Christians of France and Germany." Had the story been written as liturgical poetry, as are parts of Eliezer ben Natan's text and other post-Crusade poems, such versions might have been incorporated into the prayerbook. Perhaps the narrator thought that the formal constraints of the poetic form would distort the "telling" or perhaps he viewed the piyyut, itself an innovative form in comparison with the fixed parts of the liturgy, to be an inappropriate genre for providing traditional legitimation for acts of daring and innovation.

The essential clue to the chronicler's message is the internal shaping of the narrative, especially the division into two "acts," the first political and the second martyrological. These narrative segments differ in several fundamental ways. Whereas the political narrative portrays leaders who are figures of authority in the Jewish community and in the Christian power structure, the martyrologies are all portraits of individual members, regardless of their power and authority, of a par-

ticular Jewish community. While the action in the political narrative takes place very much in this world, the martyrologies describe a drama which unfolds between individual Jews and God and which concerns the eternal reward anticipated in the world to come. Lastly, though the political narratives describe Jewish strategies for dealing with Christian power which are conventional, the martyrs' acts of cultic homicide and suicide are radically unanticipated.

Let us consider the presentation of the political events. Modeled in part on the Book of Esther, the initial response of Mainz Jewry is both to abstain "from food and drink for three consecutive days and nights" (Esther 4:16; SS: NS, 1; H, 25; E, 22) and also to intervene politically by an appeal to Gentile power. Thus, upon learning about the earlier attacks on Speyer and Worms, Mainz Jewry organizes a special council to meet the emergency in political terms: "'Let us elect elders so that we may know how to act'" (SS: NS, 2–3; H, 26; E, 24). The confrontations depicted in the political narratives are between Jewish and Christian political leaders, not between individuals who lack authority. Adopting standard political practices, the elders bribe the bishop, the political authority, in return for promises of protection.

With the mobs still far off, a new danger arises when Duke Godfrey of Bouillon threatens to massacre Jews on his way to Jerusalem. To meet this larger challenge, an appeal to the highest political protector is called for, and Rabbi Kalonimos ben Meshullam, the leader (*parnas*) of Mainz Jewry,

> dispatched a messenger to King Henry (IV) in the Kingdom of Apulia. The king was enraged and sent letters to all of the ministers, bishops and governors of all the provinces of his realm as well as to Duke Godfrey . . . commanding them to do no bodily harm to the Jews and to provide them with help and refuge. (SS: NS, 3; H, 26–27; E, 25)

Throughout the political sections, the narrator depicts a conflict between leaders in authority: the communal elders bribe Bishop Ruthard "who took the entire community into his inner chamber" (SS: NS, 5; H, 29; E, 28); or bribe Count Emicho, the leader of the Crusader mob. When political action fails, the Jewish leaders, weakened from pious fasts, try taking up arms in military defense, but outnumbered and overpowered, again their efforts fail.

In contrast,the martyrology sections describe highly detailed portraits of individual Jewish men and women who defiantly hurl abuse at Christian symbols before enacting precisely orchestrated rites of sacrificial killings. In the political sections, the characters are predictable; they seem to be reading from prepared scripts and playing assigned roles. The martyrs, on the other hand, are fully realized and individuated characters whose responses to events are presented as spontaneous and *ad hoc:*[10]

> Who has seen or heard of an act like the deed of the righteous and pious young Rachel . . . (who) said to her friends, "I have four children. Have no mercy on them." . . . With bitterness she said, "Do not slaughter Isaac before his brother Aaron, or (Aaron) will see his (older) brother's death and run away. . . ." (But) a friend took (Isaac) and slew him. . . . When Aaron saw that his brother had been slaughtered, he cried, "Mother, do not slaughter me," and fled, hiding himself under a box. . . . When this pious woman had finished sacrificing her three (other) children to their Creator, she raised her voice, calling, "Aaron, Aaron, where are you?" She drew him out by his feet from under the box where he was hiding and slaughtered him before the Exalted and High God. Then she put them all on her arms, two children on each side. . . . (SS: NS, 9; H, 34; E, 35–36)

Or,

> The pious Isaac returned to the synagogue to set it aflame and he lit the fire at all the exits. He proceeded from one end to the other, his hands stretched to Heaven to his Father in Heaven praying to God out of the flames in a loud voice. The enemy shouted at him through the windows, "Wicked one, escape from the fire; you can still save yourself." They extended a pole toward him to help him escape from the fire, but the saint did not want to take hold of it and died in the flame, an innocent, just and God-fearing man. And his soul has found rest in the quarters of the righteous in Eden. (SS: NS, 12–13; H, 37–38; E, 41)

Along with the profound eschatological preoccupation here, one should notice the pronounced absence of evoked recent historical precedents. Here, none is found, and the typological antecedents which are offered (the Akedah;[11] Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah;[12] Rabbi Akiva) are evoked in order to show how far they have been outstripped by present events. The gap between tradition and experience is unconcealable. The message is clear: the martyrologies as they occurred were unprecedented: "Inquire and seek: was there ever such a mass sacrificial offering from the time of Adam?" that is, from the beginnings of created time (SS: NS, 8; H, 32; E, 33).

The prominent role played by women is one of the more striking aspects of the innovative behavior described in the martyrologies. As Albert of Aix noted, women killed their own children and then themselves. Moreover, the narrator gives credit to women for being in the vanguard of the martyrs. Thus in Speyer, "a distinguished pious woman there . . . was the first among all the communities of those who were slaughtered" (SS: NS, 2; H, 25; E, 22). In the imagery in which the martyrdom is cast, women along with men play the role of the male Temple priests in performing the sacrificial cult. Thus, in the martyrdom narratives, women and men are equalized as priests, and this is but one additional innovation in these accounts. In marked contrast, convention obtains in the political narratives: men rule.

Taken together, then, the differences between the political story and the martyrologies amount to an overwhelming contrast. The question that must be asked is what is the meaning of two such divergent conceptions of reality and how can they credibly apply to the same actors? We can be helped in answering this question by terms offered by discussions in the history of science and anthropology. The notion of paradigms is key. Culturally conditioned models or paradigms, according to Thomas Kuhn, provide different ways of processing experience.[13] Paradigms enable the same people to reorder the world they experience in different ways. Because paradigms are products of specific cultures, they have interested such anthropologists as Victor Turner. One of Turner's studies[14] offers suggestive implications for understanding the two-act dramas which we have described in Solomon's account of the 1096 Crusade riots. Turner analyzed Thomas Becket's murder in the cathedral by the agents of King Henry II of England in light of a basic question: How was it that Thomas, formerly Henry's loyal Chancellor, became alienated from the king after Thomas became Archbishop of Canterbury? Using Kuhn's idea of shifting paradigms, Turner suggests that Thomas "saw" the world in two different ways when he was Henry's Chancellor and when he became Archbishop. Mentally, culturally, and symbolically, Thomas recreated his world when he shifted from one role to the other. Henry did not understand Thomas' new role, and the values and relationships it dictated and took Thomas' behavior to be a betrayal of his former friend's loyalty to him.

Applied to the two stages of the Hebrew Crusade narratives, Turner's analysis suggests that the narrators, if not the protagonists themselves, shifted paradigms during the Crusaders' attacks. Aggressively striving to avoid being defeated by the Christian mobs, the Jews first used political means to check the assaults. When these efforts failed, they adopted a new posture which involved symbolically recreating the Temple in order to deny the Christian mob a victory through forced baptism. Thus, before the Jews "saw" that political action was futile, they behaved like medieval Jews and sought protection from their political rulers; after they interpreted political and military failure as the judgment of God, they reordered their world-view according to a new paradigm, the Temple cult. The same people lived in two cultural worlds because they processed experience through two different cultural grids. The political narratives follow the Esther paradigm of political intercession in the Gentile court. When it becomes clear that there would be no Purim in Germany, the Temple paradigm takes over. Political leaders are replaced by lists of individual martyrs; the court is now the Temple altar; conventional collective Jewish-Christian relations become extraordinary acts of individual defiance which testify to the truth of Judaism and the falsehood of Christianity.

It is by means of the theological-liturgical framework which introduces, interrupts and concludes the two-act drama, that the narrator signals the meaning of each act and justifies the shift from one to the other. The first liturgical section introduces the political narrative by anticipating the defeat "in this world" and offering valid theological reasons why the political and military measures will fail. A minor motif is the cliché that the suffering is a divine punishment for past Jewish sin, but this is immediately dismissed as inadequate:

> No prophet, seer or man of wisdom was able to understand how the sin of the people infinite in number was deemed so great as to cause the destruction of so many lives in the various Jewish communities. The martyrs endured the extreme penalty normally inflicted only upon one guilty of murder. Yet, it must be stated with certainty that God is a righteous judge, and we are to blame. (SS: NS, 3; H, 27; E, 25)

The more credible theodicy is the proposal that the suffering was a divine trial of the righteous, not a punishment of the guilty. Like Job, the righteous of Mainz are divinely tested in order to see if they will remain loyal to Him. Thus, when Solomon explains that the mob attacks resulted from a call to pilgrimage issued by the Pope, he refers to him as "Satan," the "Accuser" in the Book of Job who challenges God to subject the righteous man to a supreme trial.[15] Similarly, in Mainz, the righteous suffered because

> This was the generation that had been chosen by Him to be His portion, for they had the strength and the fortitude to stand in His sanctuary, and fulfill His word, and sanctify His Great Name in His world. (SS: NS, 2; H, 25; E, 22)

The suffering was so great, so excessive if viewed as a punishment, that it can be explained only as a trial:

> How has the staff of might been broken, the rod of glory—the sainted community comparable to fine gold, the community of Mainz. It was caused by the Lord to test those that fear Him, to have them endure the yoke of His pure fear. (SS: NS, 4; H, 28; E, 26)

The second liturgical section continues the motif of providing a theodicy but adds that the martyrs themselves were justified in their unprecedented acts because they acted only after "seeing" that political failure was God's judgment: "The people of the sacred covenant saw that the Heavenly decree had been issued and that the enemy had defeated them . . ." (SS: NS, 6; H, 31; E, 31). The martyrs, Eliezer ben Natan reports, "hastened to fulfill the will of the Creator . . . for lovingly they accepted Heaven's judgment" (EN: NS, 39; H, 75; E, 83). And the anonymously written account also notes:

> A venerable student, Baruch ben Isaac was there (Mainz) and he said to us, "Know that his decree has been issued against us in truth and honesty, and we cannot be saved. (A: NS, 52; H, 98, E, 107)

While the theological transitions between the political and martyrological narratives explain why the martyrs were justified, the concluding theological sections explain the meaning of the acts of martyrdom as aspects of God's justice. Contrary to facts as they seem, the narrators declare that the Crusaders will be punished, the innocent victims will be avenged and God's justice demonstrated:

> "God of vengeance, O Lord, God of vengeance, shine forth" (Psalms 94:1). . . . Do to them as they have done to us. Then will they understand and take to heart that . . . for falsehood have they slain our saints. (SS: NS, 16-17; H, 42-43; E, 48)

The cry for vengeance is a cry for ultimate justice: "The murderers are marked for eternal obloquy; those murdered . . . are destined for eternal life . . . Amen" (SS: NS, 14; H, 40; E, 44).

In addition to prayers for vengeance which affirm the ultimate triumph and truth of Judaism over Christianity, there is a second closing motif which assigns a positive role to the martyrs' deaths in the future. The narrator prays that

> the blood of His devoted ones stand us in good stead and be an atonement for us and for our posterity after us, and our children's children eternally like the Akedah of our father Isaac when our father Abraham bound him upon the altar. (SS: NS, 17; H, 43; E, 49)

Common to the theological-liturgical framework is the theme of justice and the affirmation not only that God is just but that the martyrs' acts were justified. The Jews of the Rhineland did not sin but were tested because they were especially righteous; they committed acts of killing and suicide only after "seeing" that it was God's will that their political and military actions fail; and their acts are described as acts of supreme loyalty, like Abraham's willingness to sacrifice Isaac and are praiseworthy because they will ultimately result in just punishment for the Christian perpetrators and less suffering for Jews in need of vicarious atonement.

The narrator also tries to justify and legitimate the martyrs' innovative acts of homicide and suicide by interpreting them as a symbolic reinactment of the Temple sacrificial cult. In this way, the categories of purity and impurity, holy and profane are introduced and with them a justification for the martyrs to draw a boundary around themselves as Holy Things. Whereas the political narratives depict Jewish-Christian relations as a fluid boundary—the Jews have their assigned place within the Christian town, protected by the Christian ruler—the martyrologies describe an attempt to avoid any contact whatsoever with Christians.[16]

Jacob Katz has correctly observed that in the martyrdom narratives the Jews, like the Christian Crusaders, act out their sense of religious

superiority against members of the other religious community.[17] Far from being described as passive, the martyrs, no less than the political leaders of the Jewish communities, initiate their deaths as symbolic acts of defiance and self-affirmation. They go out of their way to hurl invective upon invective at their Christian attackers, and the imagery denotes the view that Christians are impure and must not be permitted to contaminate the Holy Ones, that is, the martyr-sacrifices. Thus, martyrs decide to kill themselves and refuse "to gainsay their faith and replace the fear of our King with an abominable stock, bastard son of a menstruating and wanton mother. . . (SS: NS, 7; H, 32; E, 32). The language is hostile and aggressive. Jewish women "taunted and reviled the Crusaders with the name of the crucified, despicable, and abominable son of harlotry, saying, 'In whom do you put your trust? In a putrid corpse?'" (SS: NS, 9; H, 33–34; E, 35).

In light of the impurity and falsehood of Christianity, the martyrs are justified in erecting ritualized boundaries between would-be victims and aggressors. The martyrdom becomes enacted as a form of religious polemic, performed as highly stylized "ritual dramas," in Victor Turner's phrase. Natalie Zemon Davis has pointed out that in Protestant and Catholic urban religious riots in sixteenth-century France, the streets became extensions of religious debates.[18] Religious "polemic" reverted to a symbolically specific form of its literal meaning, "warfare." The narrators describe the encounters between Rhineland Jews and Crusaders as a case of the "rites of violence."

But the ritualization of those "polemics" in the streets of Mainz is culturally specific to Judaism. Although the Akedah image is pervasive, it is less generalized than the symbolism of the Temple cult, of which the Akedah might be considered a failed anticipation. Abraham was ready to sacrifice Isaac on Mt. Moriah, on which Solomon later succeeded in erecting the Temple.

Mainz is compared to Jerusalem throughout the narrative. In one respect, the fall of Mainz is comparable to the destruction of the Second Temple: "For since the day on which the Second Temple was destroyed, their like had not arisen, nor shall there be their like again . . ." (SS: NS, 8; H, 32; E, 33). Mainz was forsaken, just as God "forsook the sanctuary of Shiloh—the Temple in Miniature—which He had placed among His people who dwelt in the midst of alien nations" (SS: NS, 4; H, 27; E, 26). The verse "And the daughter of Zion was shorn of all her splendor" (Lamentations 1:6), we are told, "refers to Mainz" (SS: NS, 6; H, 30; E, 29), and on and on.

More spectacularly, the narrator describes the martyrdom at Mainz and the other lesser communities as a rebuilding of the Temple of Jerusalem. The accounts of the martyrs are told in language which applies to the Temple cult. Thus Mistress Rachel "spread her sleeves to receive the blood, according to the practice in the ancient Temple sacri-

ficial rite" (SS: NS, 9; H, 34; E, 35). Mistress Skolester's son, Isaac, tells his mother, after being forceably baptised, "'Mother, I have decided to bring a sin-offering to the God of Heaven. Perhaps I will thereby achieve atonement.'" To do so, he takes his children into the synagogue at night and "there he slaughtered them, in sanctification of the Great Name. . . . He sprinkled some of their blood on the pillars of the Holy Ark . . ." (SS: NS, 12; H, 37; E, 40). Near Cologne, a father tells his son,

> "Yehiel, my son, my son, stretch out your neck before your father and I will offer you as a sacrifice to God. I will recite the benediction of ritual slaughter and you will respond, 'Amen.'" (SS: NS, 19; H, 45; E, 52)

Similarly, Samuel ben Gedalia, Yehiel's friend, calls to Menahem, the sexton of the synagogue of Cologne, and asks him to sacrifice him: "'By your life, take your sharp sword and inspect it carefully so that there be no flaw in it and slaughter me, too, for I cannot bear to see the death of my friend'" (SS: NS, 19; H, 45; E, 52).

In this way, the narrator replaces the Esther paradigm by the Temple imagery and, to a lesser extent, by the Akedah. Both archetypes serve to anchor the martyrs' innovative behavior by masking it in the most ancient archetypes of Jewish piety: Abraham's demonstration of loyalty to God and the Temple cult. By clothing the martyrs in the symbols of the Priests, the narrators justify the boundaries which the martyrs erected between their lives and Christian contamination:

> The last survivor shall slaughter himself with his knife at his throat, or shall thrust his sword into his stomach so that the impure ones and the hands of wickedness will not be able to defile us with their abominations. (SS: NS, 21-22; H, 48; E, 56)

Another effort the narrators made to legitimate the martyrs' radically innovative behavior did not succeed. Although the transitions in the narratives are written in liturgical language, the texts did not become part of the liturgy in a lasting way. Only actual liturgical poems could be incorporated into the prayerbook, not narratives about specific events framed in liturgical sections, however moving. The factual parts were needed for a specific theological purpose: By telling exactly what happened, the narrators bore witness to the martyrs' justification for what they did. But by including "the facts," the narrators inadvertently caused their texts to be excluded from the permanent liturgy.

The account which Solomon wrote, finally, conveys a message of consolation about the future. His narrative is designed to leave a feeling of renewal as well as a memorialization of destruction. As noted earlier, the concluding liturgical passages express a hope that the sacrifices of the martyrs may serve as vicarious atonement for Jews in the future. But there is a more immediate message of hope as well. As arranged, the narrative focuses not only on the destruction of the rabbinic elite of

Mainz, but also on continuity in Speyer which mainly survived in 1096. Although some fifty per cent of Solomon's account dwells on the martyrdom of Mainz, it begins with the survival of most of Speyer Jewry and contains an appendix about the founding, Crusade experience, and rededication of the Speyer synagogue in 1104.[19] Moreover, that brief local account relates that Speyer had been founded in 1084 after a fire broke out in Mainz and Jews fled there. The point is clear: Thanks to an act of God, there will be continuity in Speyer, despite the losses suffered elsewhere. "It was the Lord's doing to grant us a vestige and a remnant by the bishop's hand" (A: NS, 48; H, 95; E, 101).

Once again, historical accuracy is conveyed for reasons of religious ideology, not because the narrators were interested in the past for its own sake. It is a coincidence that the narrator reports accurate historical information about the political as well as the martyrological events. This is evident in the details about where the attacks occurred and how Jewish leaders responded, and it is also reflected in the final impression the Solomon ben Samson account leaves the reader: Speyer offers German Jewry some hope for a future. Without explicitly saying so, Solomon or a later editor expressed hope in that the destruction of Mainz/Jerusalem was accompanied by the survival of Speyer/Yavneh.

To be sure, the supreme irony of the narrative lies not in its inadvertently containing accurate historical information, but rather in the way it demonstrates the truth of Judaism and the falsehood of Christianity. The narrative shows that the Crusaders, who had set out to restore Christian hegemony over Jerusalem, never got there;[20] the Jews, whom the Crusaders tried to destroy en route, were even capable of rebuilding the Temple in Mainz—their own Jerusalem!

Department of Jewish History
The Jewish Theological Seminary of America

NOTES

1. N. Porges, "Les relations hébraïques des persécutions des Juifs pendant la première croisade," *Revue des Etudes Juives* 25 (1892): 189.

2. Quoted in Edward Peters, ed., *The First Crusade* (Philadelphia, 1971), p. 103.

3. The standard editions of the Hebrew texts are A. Neubauer and M. Stern, eds., *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1892), with German translation by S. Baer; and A. M. Haberman, ed., *Sefer gezerot Ashkenaz veZarfat* (Jerusalem, 1945), which includes liturgical poems from the period. Shlomo Eidelberg, ed. and trans., *The Jews and the Crusaders: The Hebrew Chronicles of the First and Second Crusades* (Madison, 1977), is a complete English translation. These are abbreviated in the body of the text as NS, H, and E, respectively.

4. The most recent are Robert Chazan, "The First-Crusade Chronicles," *Revue des Etudes Juives* 133 (1974): 237–54 and idem, "The Hebrew First Crusade Chronicles: Further Reflections," *AJS Review* 3 (1978): 79–98. The earlier textual studies by Bresslau, Porges, Aronius, Elbogen, Haberman, Sonne and Baer are cited in Chazan's first article and in Joseph Hacker, "On the 1096 Persecutions" [Hebrew], *Zion* 31 (1966): 225, n. 1.

5. For example, see Shlomo Eidelberg, "The Solomon Bar Simson Chronicle as a Source of the History of the First Crusade," *Jewish Quarterly Review* N.S. 49 (1959): 282–7; Chazan, "Hebrew First-Crusade Chronicles."

6. Shalom Spiegel, *The Last Trial,* translated by Judah Goldin (Philadelphia, 1967).

7. Especially suggestive are Yizhak Baer, "The 1096 Persecution" [Hebrew], *Sefer Assaf* Jerusalem, 1953), pp. 126–40; Jacob Katz, "On the Persecutions of 1096 and 1648/9" [Hebrew], *Yizhak Baer Jubilee Volume* (Jerusalem, 1960), 318–37, and Chazan's two studies cited in note 4.

8. See Roger D. Ray, "Medieval Historiography through the Twelfth Century," *Viator* 5 (1974): 33–59. On the Hebrew chronicles, see Haim Hillel Ben-Sasson, "Towards an Understanding of the Goals of Medieval Jewish Historiography" [Hebrew] *Historionim ve'askolot historiyot* (Jerusalem, 1963), 29–49.

9. See Baer, "1096 Persecution," p. 136. That the Temple is the central symbolic image in these narratives is an insight of Professor Alan Mintz who kindly shared his reading of these texts with me, a chapter from his forthcoming book.

10. See Chazan, "Further Reflections," pp. 94–96, who stresses the clash of wills and the character portraits in the narratives. I have modified this by restricting the detailed portraiture to the martyrs, not the politicos, and I think it somewhat misleading to characterize the texts as a whole as "this-worldly" without some qualification (p. 95). The narrators never doubt that God permits the events to unfold as they do.

11. Genesis 22.

12. Daniel 1:8–21.

13. Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (2nd ed.; Chicago, 1970). See also Ian G. Barbour, *Myths, Models and Paradigms* (New York, 1974), pp. 119–70.

14. Victor Turner, "Religious Paradigms and Political Action" in his *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors* (Ithaca, 1974), pp. 60–97.

15. Job 1–2.

16. See Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger* (London, 1966).

17. See above, n. 7.

18. "The Rites of Violence," in her *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (Stanford, 1975), pp. 152–87.

19. On this short text, see Robert Chazan, "A Twelfth-Century Communal History of Spires Jewry," *Revue des Etudes Juives* 128 (1969): 253–57.

20. Chazan, "Further Reflections," p. 88, correctly stresses that the Crusaders' failure to reach Jerusalem in the narratives may be more the result of the narrators' bias than of their knowledge about what happened in 1099.