

Citation style

Sapir Abulafia, Anna: review of: Cornelia Herbers-Rauhut (ed.), *Amulo von Lyon, Liber de Perfidia Iudaeorum*. Herausgegeben und übersetzt von Cornelia Herbers-Rauhut, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2017, in: *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*, 55 (2020), 1, p. 133-135, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36191/mjb/2020-55-1-8>, downloaded from Website



copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

taine (335–356) abschließend das Thema ›Joachim Camerarius on Witches, Witchcraft, and Criminal Responsibility, Or, How to Philologize with a Witches' Hammer›.

Der von B. sorgfältig redigierte Band wird durch ein Personenregister abgeschlossen. Thomas Wilhelm

Amulo von Lyon, *Liber de Perfidia Iudaeorum*, herausgegeben und übersetzt von Cornelia Herbers-Rauhut (MGH, Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 29), Wiesbaden 2017 (Harrassowitz Verlag), CLXIII + 142 S.

In terms of recognition for his scholarship, Amulo of Lyon (d. 852) has had a rather rough deal at the hand of historians. Although he was the author of an extensive and well-researched book, his reputation as a scholar has always been overshadowed by his eminent predecessor Agobard of Lyon and by the deacon who served at Agobard's court and his own, Florus of Lyon. Indeed, the book which is clearly his own work has at times been ascribed to Florus. Cornelia Herbers-Rauhut has finally redressed this situation by editing and translating Amulo's ›Book on the Perfidy of the Jews› as well as providing an extensive introduction of some 150 pages covering Amulo's career and the relationship between his treatise and the works produced by Florus as well as the sources and reception history of the *Liber de Perfidia Iudaeorum*. In the introduction she shows conclusively that Amulo authored the *Liber*, using a remarkable range of sources. Particularly exciting is that H.-R. has managed not just to work out what sources Amulo used; she has worked out precisely which manuscripts he would have physically consulted. This was possible because of the knowledge we have of the well-stocked ninth-century library of the cathedral of Lyon and of the precise whereabouts of those manuscripts into today's collections. This means that we now know what version of many texts Amulo had in front of him.

Amulo's sources were varied. Besides the Vulgate, he used patristic materials, legal material, and, remarkably enough, some Jewish writings as well. Chapters 25 and 40 contain snippets of the *Toledot Yeshu*, a Jewish parody of the Gospels, which seems to have started circulating in an oral form by the beginning of the second century. In chapter 39 Amulo accuses Jews of calling Jesus *Ussum Hamizri*, which he translates as *dissipator Aegyptius*. *Ussum* probably stood for the Hebrew *Kosse* which means magician. The *Toledot Yeshu* says that Yeshu was a magician; the Gospels have Jewish opponents of Jesus accuse him of practising magic; the Talmud contains this accusation as well. In one of these Talmudic passages it is said that Jesus led people into sin.

The Hebrew word for that can also mean ‹disperse›. Following Bat-Sheva Albert, H.-R. argues it is this which caused Amulo's confusion about the meaning of *Ussum/Kossem*. Whether this was his own mistake or the misconception of the Jewish person(s) he might have consulted is the question. To me the latter seems by far the most likely scenario.

As for the very many anti-Jewish rulings which Amulo cites from Roman law, and a number of Church councils, he would have consulted Florus of Lyon's compilations, *De coertione Iudaeorum* (‹On restraining the Jews›) and *De fugiendis contagiis Iudeorum* (‹On avoiding contagion by Jews›). Agobard had done the same for his letter *De iudaicis superstitionibus* (‹On Jewish superstitions›). For both archbishops Florus' collections were a time saver. But H.-R. demonstrates that it was not the case that they followed Florus slavishly. It seems likely that Amulo also consulted the manuscripts Florus had used for himself.

In terms of reception, the most important part of Amulo's book is that concerning legal matters (chapters 42–60). This is because some sixteen anti-Jewish rulings from Roman law and previous councils which Amulo incorporated into chapters 47, 49, 50, and 55–58 were absorbed into canon 73 of the Council of Meaux-Paris of 845/6. These rulings included past decrees which prohibited Jews from holding public office for fear they would misuse their authority to the detriment of Christians, which prohibited the construction of new synagogues and forbade Jews to appear outdoors between Maundy Thursday and Easter, which prohibited Jews from having Christian slaves and forbade both clerics and lay Christians to eat with Jews. This last ruling which originated at the Council of Agde (506) went on to say that it was shameful for Christians to partake of food prepared by Jews if Jews would not reciprocate by eating all foods prepared by Christians. This would make Christians seem inferior to Jews. This canon would be much repeated in later canon law collections, ending up in the mid-twelfth-century *Decretum* (*Omnes*, C. 28 q. 1 c. 14). H.-R. helpfully presents a table (pages CX–CIV) in which she places side by side the wording of the introductions to the rulings in canon 73 of the council of Meaux/Paris and the wording of the introduction to the rulings in Amulo's *Liber*. It is a pity that she did not also include the opening words of the canons, e. g. *Omnes* (the canon from Agde forbidding Christians to share meals with Jews) because this is the way the material is referred to in canon law collections and secondary literature on the topic. Having said that, the table shows conclusively that the Council used Amulo to put together canon 73 and that it was not Amulo who copied the text from the Council's rulings.

The title of Amulo's book makes it plain that Amulo had no love for Jews. As H.-R. and others have pointed out, Amulo felt it was imperative that Jews

should be separated from Christians in everyday matters. Amulo's battle against Jews followed on from Agobard's efforts to persuade Louis the Pious to change his pragmatic, accommodating policy towards Jews. The anti-Jewish rulings cited above all attempt to prevent everyday interaction between Jews and Christians as well as to make everyday life mirror the theological view that Christianity had superseded Judaism and that Jews should serve Christians and not the other way around. That is why rulings forbidding Jews to occupy positions of power over Jews were repeated so often. That is why, in my view, canons forbidding Jews to hold Christian slaves remained relevant even if actually Jewish slave holding of Christians had diminished, *pace* Herbers-Rauhut (LXXXV–LXXXVIII). The issue was who was serving whom, as a slave or, as medieval canon law developed, as a servant. The fact that so many of these canons were so frequently repeated shows how infrequently they were adhered to in practice.

Amulo's *Liber de perfidia Iudeorum* is an excellent addition to the MGH series. The edition and translation by H.-R. will, no doubt, be widely consulted by students of Carolingian and Jewish history. Anna Sapir Abulafia

Matthias Standke, *Freundschaft in Ordensgründerlegenden. Funktionen legendarischen Erzählens in lateinischen und volkssprachlichen Texten des Mittelalters* (Quellen und Forschungen zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte 91), Berlin / Boston 2017 (De Gruyter), X + 360 S.

Lange Zeit wurde es Legenden in der germanistischen Mediävistik zum Nachteil ausgelegt, dass ihre Literarizität nicht als eigenständiges Phänomen, sondern nur als Aspekt ihrer religiösen Funktion zu beschreiben ist, woraus vielfach eine literarische Anspruchslosigkeit und ein vermeintlicher Schematismus des Genres abgeleitet wurde. Einen Paradigmenwechsel brachten seit Anfang der 2000er Jahre kultur- und gesellschaftstheoretisch orientierte Untersuchungen, die von der These ausgingen, das Erzählen und die spezifische Literarizität von Legenden seien von der Auseinandersetzung mit der radikalen Differenz zwischen Immanenz und Transzendenz bestimmt. Unter diesem Gesichtspunkt erwies sich legendarisches Erzählen als vielfältig und in Teilen sogar als höchst komplex. Allerdings kommen neuere Untersuchungen nun nicht umhin, sich mit der These, Legenden bewältigten im Erzählen stets den Hiat zwischen Immanenz und Transzendenz, auseinanderzusetzen, und es ist zur Gretchenfrage geworden, in welchem Maß man sie sich zu eigen macht.

Dieser Herausforderung stellt sich auch die Dissertationsschrift *Freundschaft in Ordensgründerlegenden* von Matthias Standke. Sie untersucht ausweislich der Einleitung (1–72), «welche Narrative und Semantiken [...] ein gleichzei-