

or Sicilian thrones had to confront the “official” version of Staufer history in the *Pantheon*, the most widely circulated of Godfrey’s works. It was read in Castile to buttress the claims of Alfonso X, the grandson of Philip of Swabia, to be emperor; but in the Plantagenet realm, when Henry III’s sister Isabella married Frederick II and later when her brother Richard of Cornwall was elected as the German king, the *Pantheon* was read merely for its information about the empire. As the candidate of the papacy and the Welfs, Richard could not associate himself with the Staufer. The same was true of Charles of Anjou in Sicily. Václav Žurek shows that Godfrey provided a model for dynastic legitimization in the Bohemia of Emperor Charles IV, who stressed his descent from Jupiter and Charlemagne.

Stefan Burkhardt indicates that the *Pantheon* was more widely read in the thirteenth century in Italy than elsewhere because it provided information about imperial symbolism that was useful to the communes, the Venetian doge, and the papacy. Although Godfrey’s glorification of the Staufer was of little relevance in Germany after 1250, Len Scales maintains that political theorists who were critical of the Staufer, most notably Alexander of Roes and Lupold of Bebenburg, utilized Godfrey’s concept of the *imperialis prosapia* and Charlemagne’s double Frankish ancestry to defend the Germans’ exclusive claim to the empire, which was threatened by both the papacy and the French. Godfrey’s imperial ideology was completely irrelevant in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Poland. Instead, Grisca Vercaemer’s investigation of the glosses in two manuscripts shows that Polish readers were most interested in the biblical, classical, and legendary material in the *Pantheon*. Finally, Lidia Negoi points out that Stephen of Bourbon and Humbert of Romans used the *Pantheon* as a source for exempla in their handbooks for preachers, and that Vincent of Beauvais, Jacobus de Voragine, and, in particular, the Aragonese Dominican Jaume Domenech (d. 1385) in his *Compendi historial* mined the *Pantheon* for information in compiling their own universal histories. In this way, Godfrey’s work was transmitted to a larger audience.

Inevitably, there is considerable repetition in this highly informative collection of articles about a long-neglected figure. I noted only a few minor slips: Alfonso X claimed Swabia through his mother, not his wife (70–71), and Richard of Cornwall was the first cousin, not the nephew, of Emperor Otto IV (77). The authors indicate only in passing that Godfrey was indebted to Otto of Freising, a topic that deserves further exploration. Although Otto stressed the elective character of the imperial dignity, precisely because he needed to explain Barbarossa’s election and the unprecedented exclusion of Conrad III’s son from the throne, he also famously described Frederick in *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa* 2.2 as a member of a renowned family, “the Henrys of Waiblingen . . . that . . . was wont to produce emperors.” Why Otto associated his nephew with Waiblingen is unclear, but around 1230 Burchard of Ursberg, borrowing from Otto, wrote that Frederick “prided himself that he descended from the royal lineage of the Waiblingens, who, as is

known, sprang in a two-fold way from two royal houses, namely, the Merovingians . . . and the Carolingians” (*Chronicon*, ed. Matthias Becher [2007], 146). Godfrey’s *imperialis prosapia* may not have been quite as original.

JOHN B. FREED,
Emeritus
Illinois State University

DAVID M. PERRY. *Sacred Plunder: Venice and the Aftermath of the Fourth Crusade*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015. Pp. x, 233. \$69.95.

The history of the Fourth Crusade and its most dramatic and fateful event, namely the conquest of the Byzantine capital Constantinople and the subsequent looting of its churches, palaces, and public monuments in April 1204, has attracted the attention of students and scholars of history for centuries, leading to a rich corpus of academic works—not to mention books of more popular reach—on a variety of important issues. Such issues range from the crusade’s political repercussions across Europe, to questions and concerns of religious and ecclesiastical nature, to the cultural and artistic impact in the West of the arrival of numerous works of late Roman and Byzantine art, which included small and large-scale sculptures in gold, silver, ivory, and marble, as well as painted books and panels, richly decorated with enamels and precious stones.

In *Sacred Plunder: Venice and the Aftermath of the Fourth Crusade*, David M. Perry is concerned with a different set of objects and objectives associated with the Fourth Crusade and the sack of Constantinople. His objects, however, are even more precious and valuable than the above-mentioned *spolia* removed from the capital’s palaces, sanctuaries, and public spaces: namely the relics of Old and New Testament saints and the Virgin Mary, and especially those of the Passion of Christ. His interests are tied to a broader contest over memory and meaning that followed the short historical episode that began with Pope Innocent III’s call for a new crusade in 1198 and ended with the pillaging of the largest city of Christendom in 1204. He aims to trace “the ways in which that contest shaped the emergence, development, and cultural influence of a distinct body of hagiographical texts known as *translatio* narratives” (2). As such, Perry’s study forms part of a recent trend in the history of scholarship on the Fourth Crusade, which is particularly concerned with questions of memory and its construction in the aftermath of the events of 1204. Perry’s focus on *translatio* narratives allows him to analyze similarities and differences in the ways specific beneficiaries of notable relic transfers attempted to valorize their newly acquired treasures and to exempt them from the kind of scrutiny and criticism leveraged by Innocent III against the participants of the Fourth Crusade for looting churches and dispersing church property in the Byzantine capital and beyond.

The book contains three main parts, entitled “Contexts,” “Texts,” and “Outcomes,” each of which is further subdivided into two distinct chapters. The book closes with a short epilogue. While the book’s subtitle, *Venice*

and the *Aftermath of the Fourth Crusade*, suggests a more focused study of the role of the Most Serene Republic and its secular and ecclesiastical leadership in the acquisition, transfer, and memorialization of relics from Constantinople, Perry begins his analysis with a broader examination. Chapter 1 discusses the initial aspirations that governed the division of booty in the so-called March Pact and the realities of the looting of churches and the acquisition of relics in the aftermath of the conquest of 1204. He subdivides the latter into three distinct phases: a more chaotic, largely undocumented first phase of relic acquisition that occurred in the days immediately after the city's conquest; a second, more orderly phase of relic acquisition and distribution during the following years, when the leadership of the crusade started to establish itself in the capital and began to assert control over its mobile and immobile properties; and a third and last phase, in which relics continued to be acquired in Constantinople and disseminated to recipients in Western Europe during more than five decades of Latin control over the capital's churches and their treasuries between 1204 and 1261. What follows in chapter 2 is a succinct analysis of the papal response (or rather responses) to the news of the conquest of Constantinople and the establishment of a Latin Empire and Patriarchate. Perry's argument here is that Innocent III quickly "employed accusations of sacrilege and other sinful behavior during the postconquest looting as a source of new leverage and as a means of explaining the sudden loss of divine favor," thus establishing the crusaders' actions in the immediate aftermath of the conquest as "the locus of the conflict over memory and meaning of the Fourth Crusade" (47).

Chapters 3 and 4 (part II) are dedicated to an examination of nine narrative sources commissioned by individuals and institutions that benefited from the sack and translation of relics from Constantinople to various locales across Europe, namely at Soissons, Halberstadt, Langres, Gaeta, Amalfi, Venice, Cluny, and Paris. Presenting the narrative structure and highlights of these *translatio* accounts (chap. 3), as well as offering an analysis of their narrative techniques and diverse approaches to commemorative hagiography (chap. 4), Perry argues that they "collectively offer an interpretation of the Fourth Crusade that celebrates the very behavior condemned by the papacy and other critics" (77), thus forming a hagiographic corpus that provides a powerful counter-narrative to the papal critique of crusader conduct. In claiming divine providence at work in the behavior of those who were instrumental in the acquisition of relics in Constantinople and their transfer to Western Europe, these narratives ultimately sought to authenticate and legitimize the received relics.

Having examined the broader historical context for the production of *translatio* narratives of the Fourth Crusade in France, Germany, and Italy as well as the textual evidence itself, in chapters 5 and 6 (part III) Perry more exclusively investigates Venetian hagiographical responses to the Fourth Crusade. He considers these responses indicative of a broader cultural transformation of Venice during the thirteenth century and emblematic of its imperial aspi-

rations. Putting two prominent Venetian *translatio* narratives of the Fourth Crusade, namely the *Translatio Symonensis* and the *Translatio Pauli Martyris*, into historical dialogue with earlier local *translatio* accounts, Perry investigates the fascinating history of Venetian mythmaking and identity formation during the thirteenth century and beyond, showing how common merchants, high- and low-ranking clerics, and members of the Venetian nobility, including doges themselves, capitalized on existing local traditions of memorializing relic thefts and translations to the lagoon city in order to use them as a means to both interpret Venice's past and define a path for its future. Extending his analysis from the translation of relics and their incorporation into the sacred geography of the lagoon city to the appropriation, imitation, and incorporation of Byzantine architectural *spolia* and sculptural artifacts into the built fabric of the church of San Marco, Perry concludes his study with a focused analysis of the role of myth in the construction of Venetian civic and religious identity. In this process, hagiographic narratives as much as "the movement of sacred and other material objects functioned as a signifier for the transformation of culture" (159).

In a short epilogue, Perry brings the book's focus back to his broader concern for the contest over memory and meaning in the aftermath of the Fourth Crusade. Citing the Fourth Lateran Council's canon 62 as Innocent III's ultimate effort to "shut down relic trafficking and to legislate the concept of *furta sacra* out of existence" (183), Perry concludes that the pope's use of a relic of the True Cross from Constantinople during the closing ceremonies of the Fourth Lateran Council may be taken as a powerful sign of Innocent's conscious assertion of papal control over the relics looted in Constantinople in 1204. Despite such efforts, however, "sacred theft" and the subsequent translation of relics remained an operative possibility in Venice for centuries to come.

Indebted to Comte Paul Édouard Didier de Riant's monumental *Exuviae Sacrae Constantinopolitanae* (1877–1878; repr., 2004), as well as the work of Donald E. Queller, Thomas F. Madden, and Alfred J. Andrea, Perry's book does not only form a valuable contribution to the scholarship on the Fourth Crusade and the history of relic translations from Constantinople to Western Europe, but also enhances our understanding of Venetian responses to the arrival of Constantinopolitan relics in the lagoon and the history of Venetian mythmaking and identity formation in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Among the few factual infelicities that require correction is the claim that Henry of Ulmen brought the famous Byzantine *staurotheke* of the proedros Basil, looted from Constantinople, to Limburg an der Lahn (38): the reliquary arrived in Limburg only in 1835, as a gift of Duke William of Nassau. (Henry had originally donated the reliquary to the convent of Augustinian nuns at Stuben on August 9, 1208.) The book is otherwise meticulously researched, well written, and carefully argued, providing a valuable resource for scholars investigating related subjects in the future.

HOLGER A. KLEIN
Columbia University