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David Harrison Horton
The Carolingian emperors were relatively tolerant towards the Jewish communities within their realm. They exempted the Jews from many feudal obligations and gave them charters that protected the role of the Jews as merchants within the empire. These charters also protected the Jewish community from undue persecutions of the Church. The privileges guaranteed within these charters drew criticism from many of the leading churchmen at the time.

The anti-Jewish campaign of Agobard, Bishop of Lyons from 814 to 840, has received a fair amount of scholarly attention, whereas the ensuing campaigns of Amulo, Bishop of Lyons from 841 to 852, and the bishops assembled at the Council of Paris-Meaux from 845 to 846 have not. This study places the anti-Jewish campaign of Agobard and the subsequent campaigns of Amulo and the Paris-Meaux councils in their historical context and analyzes their theological and political consequences for Carolingian society.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The arguments of Agobard and Amulo display very little originality in their content. The majority of their material was drawn from earlier anti-Jewish traditions that were formulated well before the ninth century. Their attitudes towards the Jews were a culmination of the theologies of Paul and Augustine, the decisions meted out in both Roman and canon law, and papal policy. Agobard and Amulo were trying to restore the observances of past laws and canons in regards to the Jews. Thus, they weighted their arguments against the Jews with appeals to the aforementioned authorities.

The Pauline Epistles mark the beginning of the separation of Christianity from Judaism. The letters of Paul collectively deny two of the cornerstones of the Jewish faith: The selection of Israel as the chosen people of God, and that faithfulness to the Law will bring salvation.¹

Paul denies Israel's claim to be the elect of God solely by the

merits of their ethnicity in Romans 9.6-8 and he expands the scope of the meaning of Israel in Galatians 3.29. Paul thought that both Jew and Gentile had to join a third entity, a true Israel, in which membership required belief in Jesus. In Romans 3.22 and throughout his Epistles, Paul makes it clear that membership into this elect group is equally open to both Jews and Gentiles.

Paul's attitude towards the Law was that the covenant surrounding that Law had been fulfilled and that the coming of the Messiah had made certain aspects of the Law obsolete. Paul's theology questioned the efficacy of Jewish ritual laws such as observing feast days, keeping the Sabbath, and circumcision. Paul addresses circumcision specifically in Galatians 5.6 and accuses those Christian

---

2"It is not as though the word of God had failed. For not all Israelites truly belong to Israel, and not all of Abraham's children are his true descendants; but 'It is through Isaac that descendants shall be named for you.' This means that it is not the children of the flesh who are the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted as descendants." All biblical citations are from The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version.

1"And if you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to the promise."


5"The righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction." See also Rom. 3.29, Rom. 10.12, Gal. 3.26, and Gal. 3.28.

6"For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything; the only thing that counts is faith working through love."
missionizers preaching circumcision of cowardice. These particular laws were meant to separate the Jews from the Gentiles. According to Paul, this distinction was no longer necessary given the above argument on Israel's election. The abolition of the Law did not mean an abolition of morality. Paul thought that the laws governing adultery, murder, stealing, and coveting as comprised within Mosaic Law formed "the universal moral norms" and were "authoritative for the church." If all that is necessary for salvation is a strict observance of the Law, then a Messiah would have been irrelevant.

In Paul's scheme for salvation the Jewish "hardening" to the message of Jesus played an integral part in the salvation of the Gentiles. When the message of the Gentiles is complete, all of the true Israel is to be saved by the Deliverer in accordance to the covenant made by God in Isaiah 59.20-1. As noted by Sanders:

The eschatological scheme has been reversed; Israel will be saved not first, but as a result of the Gen-

---

7Gal 6.12, "It is those who want to make a good showing in the flesh that try to compel you to be circumcised--only that they may not be persecuted for the cross of Christ."

8Schreiner, "Abolition and Fulfillment," 59.

9Gal. 3.23-4, "Now before faith came, we were imprisoned and guarded under the law until faith would be revealed. Therefore the law was our disciplinarian until Christ came, so that we might be justified by faith."

10Rom. 11.25, "A hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the full number of the Gentiles has come in."

11"And he will come to Zion as Redeemer, to those in Jacob who turn from transgression, says the Lord." Compare to Rom. 11.26, "And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, 'Out of Zion will come the Deliverer; he will banish ungodliness from Jacob'."
tile mission, through faith in Christ. The figure of the olive tree says it very well. Some of Israel has been broken off, and this allows time for the completion of the Gentile mission; but if the Gentiles are grafted into the olive tree, 'all the more' will the natural branches be regrafted (Rom. 11.24). In any case Jew and Gentile may be 'in' the olive tree only on condition of faith. 

The campaigns of Agobard and Amulo were deeply influenced by Augustinian doctrine. Amulo quoted profusely from Augustine in his work Liber contra Iudaeos. Amulo also played an essential role in the debate of predestination in the mid-ninth century, for which he edited a collection of Augustine's views on predestination and divine grace.

Augustine (d. 430) rooted his theology in neo-Platonic logic. His apologetics employed neo-Platonic reasoning to defend Christianity against those groups which Augustine deemed as enemies of the Church. Although his defense was not singly aimed against the Jews, it did much to establish the role of the Jew in the Christian view of salvation.

Augustine thought that the Law had been superceeded by the coming of Jesus. In his work Of True Religion, Augustine explained that the Hebrew people were placed under the yoke of the Law by

---

12 E. P. Sanders, Paul, the Law and the Jewish People, 195.


14 Amulo, B. Augustini Sententiae: De praedestinatione et gratia Dei, et de libero hominis arbirio, PL 116:105-140.
fear. Jesus's coming perfected this piety from fear-based to love-based. In so doing, Jesus rendered the Law unnecessary to observe in practice, although it remained valid to Christians as a moral guide and for allegorical interpretation. For Augustine, it was evident that "the moral precepts under the Old Law are lower and in the Gospels higher." Augustine also believed that the Jews had lost their preeminent status with God by refusing to accept Jesus as their prophesied Messiah. In The City of God, Augustine correlated the dispersion of the Jews under Vespasian with God's punishment for their refusal to recognize Jesus.

Augustine also held the eschatological belief in the universal consummation of the Church. During the day of Judgement, the Jews would see the suffering figure of Jesus and finally recognize him as their Messiah. This recognition would bring about instant repentance, and acceptance of the Jews into the Church. Augustine's doctrine however does not allow the Jews who were directly responsible for the act of deicide to participate in the promised salvation.

The campaigns of Agobard and Amulo also appealed to secular

---

16 Augustine, Of True Religion, 30.
18 Augustine, City of God, 960.
19 Augustine, City of God, 961.
authorities in the course of their arguments. They pointed to the laws of Christian Roman emperors as examples of how Christian rulers should respond to the Jews within their realms.

The influence of Roman law far outlasted the power the Empire. Many of the barbarian nations that appeared in the aftermath of Rome’s collapse set up and continued to live under derivative laws. Christianity became the official state religion under Theodosius in 395. In 438, Theodosius II collected the laws that had been promulgated since the time of Constantine and compiled them into what is known as the Theodosian Code. Additions, called novellae, were made to this code until 468.

Bachrach states that the laws pertaining to the Jews in the code served two distinct functions: (1) to regulate both Jews and non-Jews in their relations with each other, and (2) to distinguish the Jews from other Roman citizens under the law. 10

Judaism was a recognized religion in the Roman Empire, and Jews were considered citizens of the empire. The Jews were afforded imperial protection under laws that forbade Christians from disrupting Jewish services and bringing forth lawsuits against the Jews on the Sabbath and Jewish holy days. 11 Christians were


forbidden to seize or set fire to synagogues. If Christians had seized a synagogue and preformed Christian rituals therein, the Jews were to be given property to build another synagogue of comparable size. Jews were forbidden from burning crosses during their Amam festival [Purim], but allowed to practice their other rituals without hindrance. Jews who had insincerely converted to Christianity for legal reasons were allowed to return to Judaism.

Roman Law also limited the scope of Jewish religious expansion. Jews who were caught converting Christians to Judaism were to be tried under the crime of treason with a sentence of capital punishment. Jews were allowed at times to own Christian slaves as long as they did not missionize to them and allowed the slaves to practice their faith. At other times, these Christians slaves were to be freed or turned over to the Church. The circumcision of Jewish slaves was forbidden, with the punishments ranging in severity from the loss of the slave, perpetual exile, or capital punishment. Christians who converted to Judaism were to lose all

\[11\] Coleman-Norton, Roman State, 2:622 and 2:624.

\[13\] Coleman-Norton, Roman State, 2:622.

\[14\] Coleman-Norton, Roman State, 2:510.

\[15\] Coleman-Norton, Roman State, 2:576.

\[16\] Coleman-Norton, Roman State, 2:529 and 2:579.


their property to the fisc.\textsuperscript{29} Jews and Christians were expressly forbidden to intermarry. Those who did so were charged with adultery.\textsuperscript{30} Lastly, Jews were forbidden to hold public office or perform military service or prison guard duty.\textsuperscript{31}

Agobard and Amulo were especially interested in the perpetuation of the stricter Jewish slave laws which forbade Jews from owning Christian slaves. The charters that Louis the Pious gave to the Jews conformed to the milder restrictions against Jewish slave ownership.

The letters of Agobard and Amulo also appeal to the authority of canon law. Agobard’s shorter letters mainly allude to canon law. He assumed his ecclesiastical audience was knowledgeable in canon law. Amulo’s \textit{Liber contra Iudaeos} was used as a reference guide to the canons which dealt with the Jews.

Clovis’s conversion to Christianity (ca. 495) paved the way for the expansion of the Catholic Church’s influence in Gaul.\textsuperscript{32} The Merovingian bishops quickly laid down a coherent and restrictive policy concerning the Jews. This policy limited the scope of both Jewish and Christian interaction on four separate levels. It restricted social, sexual, and marital relationships between the


\textsuperscript{30}Coleman-Norton, \textit{Roman State}, 2:416. The accusation of this charge was open to the public whereas the normal charge of adultery was only open to close relatives of the accused.


\textsuperscript{32}For the latest scholarship on Clovis’s conversion see William M. Daly, “Clovis: How Barbaric, How Pagan?” \textit{Speculum} 69 (1994): 619-64.
Jewish and Christian communities. It limited Jewish participation in military and public services. It restricted Jewish religious observances, and it limited Jewish rights to own Christian slaves.

The Merovingian bishops limited social interaction between Jews and Christians by repeatedly forbidding Christians to dine with Jews. They also forbade intermarriages between the two communities. The bishops of the Council of Mâcon (581-3) made a special effort to guard the chastity of nuns by limiting those who could enter a convent to old men of proven virtue, and only then were these men permitted to enter into the common room. The bishops tried to ensure the chastity of nuns even further by making sure that no Jew would ever have access to a convent.

The Merovingian bishops echoed Roman law in their attempts to bar Jews from public and military service. At issue for the bishops was the fear that the Jews would use their position to missionize to Christians, or to require Christians to repeat anti-Christian remarks in exchange for lighter taxes, tolls, or judgement in cases. The bishops were also afraid that Christians would be seen as subjected to the Jews who, according to Augustine, were to remain second class citizens until Jesus's second coming. The Council of


35 CCSL 148A:223.

Paris (614) permitted a Jew who had attained a high post to retain it, provided that he and his family immediately converted to Christianity.  

The bishops of the Council of Orleans (538) and the Council of Maçon (581-3) repeated the edict of King Childebert I (d. 558) by forbidding the public appearance of Jews during Easter week.  The bishops of the Council of Maçon also required that the Jews show respect to the Christian clergy and required that a Jew remain standing in front of a priest unless invited to sit by that priest. The bishops of the Council of Narbonne (589) forbade the Jews to employ psalmody during their burial services. The canon states that this law was promulgated so that the Jews would maintain their ancient customs. The bishops of this council also forbade all non-Christians to work on Sunday.

The Merovingian councils were also very concerned for the Christian slaves owned by Jews. The canons, like Roman law, allowed at times for Jews to own Christian slaves as long as they did not missionize to them and allowed them to practice their religion. At other times, Jewish ownership of Christian slaves was strictly

39 CCSL 148A: 255.
40 CCSL 148A: 254.
forbidden. The bishops of the Council of Orleans (541) permitted a Christian slave to be purchased by another Christian from a Jew as long as the Jew was given the full value for the slave. The manumission price for Christian slaves was set at twelve sous by the Council of Macon (581-3).

Amulo appealed to papal authority only once in his anti-Jewish tract. He reproduced a portion of a letter from Gregory the Great to the Merovingian kings Theoderic and Theodebert stating Gregory's disbelief that Jews were allowed to own female Christian slaves in their realms.

Gregory the Great's (d. 604) concern for the Jews was both theological and pragmatic. He had to blend the established role of the Jew in Christian salvation history with a policy that would and could be followed by even the most zealous bishops. In doing so, Gregory became the founder of the papal tradition concerning Jewish policy. His "Constitution on the Jews" became the authoritative text for every successive pope for handling issues which involved the Jews.

Gregory thought that in the same way that humanity is shared by both master and servant, who are different under the law, so too were the Jews and Christians who shared a common tradition but varied in

41CCSL 148A:226.
42CCSL 148A:139.
44CCSL 148A:226.
45PL 116:177.
Gregory saw Christianity as the valid of the two, and therefore he saw Judaism as deficient. Gregory employed the term "perfidia" to describe this perceived Jewish deficiency, "a faith wrong because truncated, a distorted faith—indeed a disbelief."\(^{47}\)

Gregory saw the figure of John who hesitated to enter the tomb of Jesus before Peter as a figure of the Jew. Gregory saw Peter, who arrived second but entered first, as a figure for the Gentiles who immediately recognized and embraced the truth of Christianity. Gregory's theology follows the Pauline and Augustinian belief that the Jews will come to recognize the validity of the Christian faith.

Gregory worried that Judaism would have an ill effect on the Christian community, especially on the uneducated. However, he conceded to the Jews all the rights that had been given to them under Roman law. He adamantly opposed forced baptism and the efforts of bishops that attempted to undermine Jewish efforts to congregate and practice their religion.

Agobard argued that his campaign was in keeping with the above authorities, and that he was only trying to enforce laws that already had been established. Amulo made a detailed list of these secular and canon laws in order to enlighten and persuade an assembly of bishops to join his anti-Jewish campaign.

---


\(^{47}\) Synan, Popes, 37.
CHAPTER II

AGOBARD

The Carolingian Empire was comparatively tolerant towards the Jews. Charlemagne encouraged Jewish immigration to his kingdom and established policies to increase their role as merchants. His successors left these policies intact, much to the consternation of some leading churchmen, who perceived these policies as encouraging the ever-increasing threat of judaizing. This fear of Jewish influence on Christian society was moved to the forefront when a palace ecclesiastic and friend of Louis the Pious converted to Judaism in 838.

Agobard, the Bishop of Lyons from 814 to 840, was one of the more ardent anti-Jewish figures of the ninth century. His anti-Jewish campaigns soon placed him in direct confrontation with the Magister Iudaeorum, the royal official charged with the handling of Jewish concerns. Agobard blatantly disregarded imperial orders and continued his campaigns of letter writing and missionizing. Agobard was an outspoken critic of the regime and a constant irritant to the emperor. Agobard went into exile after playing an active role in the 833 revolt against Louis the Pious. Agobard was replaced by the more tolerant Amalarius of Metz in 835 until his return in 838.

Blumenkranz states in Histoire des Juifs en France that the Jewish community had been established in Lyons from the end of the
second century, or beginning of the third century, with individual Jews arriving as early as 39 C.E. By the ninth century, "we find the important communities of Vienne, Lyons, and Châlon-sur-Saône." ¹ These last two were situated in the ecclesiastical province of Lyons (Lugdunensis Prima). ² The growth of the Jewish community is attested to by Agobard himself who complains that the Jews have been allowed, contrary to church law, to build new synagogues. If Agobard's claims to have baptized fifty-three Jews were correct, "then the Jewish community of Lyons may have contained hundreds of Jews," making it one of the largest in Europe at this time. ³

Agobard left behind six works that specifically deal with his concerns about the Jews of Lyons and their effect on the Christian population. Five of these survive in a single manuscript copy. This would imply that they met with limited success, but the arguments that he presented in these works reached a wider audience in his successor, Amulo of Lyons, and in later church councils such as those of Paris-Meaux from 845 to 847.


Agobard was born in 769 presumably in Northern Spain. He left Spain in 782 and came into Gallia Narbonensis in the company of a certain abbot Atala. It is uncertain whether Agobard was at this time an oblate or an orphan of the almost constant warfare in the area. Due to the uncertainty of the area, Atala was granted permission to settle near Narbonne and establish a monastery there dedicated to St. Polycarp. Agobard settled in a monastery situated on the Aniane River not very far from Atala. It is here that he spent the next ten years learning the fundamentals of a Benedictine-based education.

A doctrine closely related to the Nestorianism condemned by the Third Ecumenical Council three centuries prior firmly established itself in Spain at this time and began to spread into the southern Frankish territories. The Adoptionist heresy centered around Archbishop Elipandus of Toledo and Bishop Felix of Urgel in the Pyrenees to the north. In 792, Felix of Urgel was summoned by King Charles to Ratisbon and forced to denounce his Adoptionist views. He abdicated his see, was sent to Rome as a prisoner, and was fully

---

4 All dates and information on Agobard's early life are drawn from Annales Lugdunensis, MGH, Scriptores, I, 110. This work is a collection of biographical marginalia apparently written from Agobard's hand.

5 The charter has been edited in MGH, Diplomatum Karolinorum, I, 458-60, doc. 305.

restored to his see only after an act of contrition. Felix relapsed into his heresy only two years later and was formally condemned by a council in Frankfort.7

Agobard left Septimania in 792 and came to Lyons. Cabaniss assumes that Agobard had already "been admitted to Minor Orders and also to Subdiaconate and Diaconate" by the death of Bishop Ado in 798.8 Leidrad, the palace librarian and recently appointed missus, was given the see almost immediately with Hilduin, Ado's nephew, performing the administrative duties in the interim.9 Leidrad was faced with the hefty task of restoring the physical and spiritual constitution of his new see. Lyons had been raided twice by Muslim forces during the eighth century. Charles Martel had repulsed the invaders during his famous campaign against the Spanish Muslims, but

7Allen Cabaniss, Agobard of Lyons: Churchman and Critic (Syra­cuse: Syracuse University Press, 1953), 5-6.
8Cabaniss, Agobard, 7.
9Missi were occasionally used by the Merovingians, but Charle­magne was really the first to rely on them with any regularity. There were two forms of missi: the missi ad hoc, or special missi, charged with a specific and limited mission, and the ordinary missi, who were charged to uphold the king's authority and orders in a given region. Charlemagne initiated several reforms in 802 to respond to accusations of abuse among the missi. After this time, missi were selected from the ranks of the nobility who were considered well-off enough to be beyond corruptibility. Generally, the missi were paired in groups of two, one ecclesiastic and one layman, and charged with the territory near their bishopric or estate. For more details on the institution of missi, see François Louis Ganshof, Frankish Institutions Under Charlemagne, trans. Bryce Lyon and Mary Lyon (New York: The Norton Library, 1968), part 1. For an account of Leidrad and Theodulph's (Bishop of Orleans) mission together see Versus Teudulfi episcopi contra iudices, MGH, Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini, I, 493-520.
did very little to rebuild the city. Lyons was in shambles. "What was most influential in the barbarism perhaps ... was the long absence of nearly all the benefices, and in particular those of the archbishop of Lyons and Vienne, which Charles Martel, for lack of other resources, had given to his officers in payment for their services."10

In late 799 or early 800, Charles the Bald sent Leidrad to summon the relapsed Felix of Urgel to a council at Aix-la-Chapelle to debate his Adoptionist teaching with Alcuin, the Carolingian luminary. This was hardly an even match. Felix once again acknowledged his error and repudiated his see. This time, however, he was placed in the custody of Leidrad and taken to Lyons to insure the sincerity of his repentance.11 It was at this time that Agobard became acquainted with the notorious heretic.

Agobard was ordained in 804.12 Leidrad appointed Agobard co-bishop of Lyons in 808 in response to the almost incessant and conflicting duties of being a metropolitan bishop and a missus to Emperor Charles.13


11See Ado, Ex Adonis Viennensis chronico, MGH, Scriptores, II, 320.

12Annales Lugdunensis, 110.

13There is some debate over the exact position held by Agobard prior to Leidrad's death. In Ex Adonis Chronico, 320, Agobard is called "chorepiscopus" with the editor offering an alternative reading of "coepiscopus". The implications of the chorepiscopus
There were immediate complications and criticisms of Leidrad's pragmatic system: "But canon law is such that there are not to be two bishops in one city, nor must a successor be elected while the bishop lives." The decision of Emperor Louis the Pious and those assembled at the Synod of Soissons to recognize Agobard as Bishop of Lyons after Leidrad's death in 816 is more or less academic. Agobard was actively fulfilling the position after Leidrad had retired to the monastery of St. Médard shortly after Charlemagne's death in 814.

Charlemagne's death had an obvious impact on everyone within the Carolingian Empire. To ensure the integrity of the realm after his own death, Louis the Pious had his territory divided among his three heirs. The division of a kingdom prior to the death of a king was a long established tradition used by the Merovingians and later adopted by the Carolingians. Pepin the Short had divided his

---

14 Ex Adonis chronico, 320.

15 For the council records see Joannes Dominicus Mansi, ed., Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio (Florence and Venice, 1759-98; repr., Graz, Austria: U. Verlagsanstalt, 1960), 14:143-144. The account is also cited in Ex Adonis chronico, 320.
territory between Charlemagne and Carloman. Fortunately for Louis the Pious and the integrity of the Frankish realm, he was the only surviving heir to Charlemagne and thus took possession of it in its entirety. Lothar, the eldest son of Louis the Pious, was to assume the imperial title. His name appears as co-emperor with Louis the Pious's after his coronation in 817. Pepin and Louis the German were each allotted their own territories, Aquitaine and Bavaria respectively, to govern within this new constitution.

Louis's remarriage to Judith in 819 was not seen as an impending threat to the new "unitary imperial regime, guided by Christian idealists" by either the Church or nobility. Even the birth of Charles the Bald passed without much notice or care. The political tensions of his birth would not be recognized until the later 820s when Louis the Pious decided to give in to Judith's demands that Charles receive a share of the empire.

Agobard took to the pen to ensure the orthodoxy of the Christian community within his diocese and the empire shortly after attaining his see. He wrote a treatise against the popular belief in

---

16 Charlemagne disinherited Carloman's heir after his death in 771 to take possession of the entire Frankish realm. Einhard whitewashed this usurpation of power by saying that "Charlemagne was elected King with the consent of all the Franks," The Life of Charlemagne, in Two Lives of Charlemagne, trans. Lewis Thorpe (New York: Penguin Books, 1969), 57.

weather-makers in his diocese in 815.  Immediately following the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (817), which defended the practice of the ordeal by the cross, Agobard penned two tracts denouncing trial by ordeal as unorthodox and against reason. When Felix of Urgel died in 818, a manuscript maintaining Felix's continued belief in the Adoptionist heresy was discovered. Agobard immediately penned a lengthy anti- Adoptionist treatise to quell any resurgence of this heresy in his diocese.

It is in his Letter on the Baptizing of Hebrews that we first have mention of Agobard's aggressive preaching to the Jewish population of Lyons. The letter was written sometime around 820. Agobard appeals to Emperor Louis the Pious to permit his continued preaching in the synagogues and to uphold the conversion of fifty-three Jewish children which he performed without the consent of

---

18 Agobard, Contra insulam vulgi opinionem de grandine et tonitruis, PL 104:147-158.

19 Agobard, Adversus legem Gundobadi et impia certamina quae per eam geruntur, PL 104:115-26, and De divinis sententiis digestus cum brevissimis adnotionibus contra damnabilem opinionem putantium divini judicii veritatem igne vel aquis vel conflictu armorum patefieri, PL 104:249-286.

20 Agobard, Adversum dogma Felicis Urgellensis, PL 104:29-70.

21 Agobard, Ex epistola episcopi ad imperatorum de baptizatis Hebraeis, MGH, Epistolae, V, 239.

22 The editors of MGH date the document before 835. Bernhard Blumenkranz offers an earlier date of "peut-être vers 820" in Les auteurs chrétiens latins du moyen âge sur les juifs et le judaïsme (Paris: Mouton et Co., 1963), 155. The earlier date seems the more logical, because Agobard would have wanted to explain his position before being called to court in 823.
their parents. Agobard explains his missionizing to Jewish-owned slaves. The converting of Jewish-owned slaves posed a severe legal problem for the Jews, who were forbidden by law to own Christian slaves. The letter met with little result and in 823 Agobard was called into the emperor's court to explain his actions. Agobard was called into an audience with the emperor, and then dismissed in humiliation without having uttered a word.

Upon his return to Lyons, he penned *On the Baptism of the Slaves of the Jews* addressed to Adalard, Wala, and Helisarcharus. He reminds these palace officials that they spoke to the emperor just prior his ignominious experience at court. Although Agobard could not hear what they had said, he hoped that they would again take up the issue of the baptism of Jewish-owned slaves with the emperor for him. Agobard expresses his dilemma concerning the emperor's orders not to baptize Jewish-owned slaves:

And they are brought up among us, they speak our language among us, they hear about our faith, they see the celebration of our rites, and they are goaded by this to the love of Christianity, and thus they desire to become members of Christ in the body of the Church. And they run towards the Church, requesting baptism. Are we to deny this or to offer it [baptism], when we are able.

---


14 Agobard, *De baptismo mancipiorum Iudaeorum*, CCCM 52:115.

15 Agobard, *De baptismo mancipiorum*, CCCM 52:115-17.

16 CCCM 52:115.
He explains that the Jews in fact lose nothing from his endeavors as he offers to pay them the regulated manumission price for each slave that he converts:

We do not say this so that the Jews should lose money, which they would give up in kind. Rather we offer the value according to prior statutes, and they do not accept it, believing an official of the palace to favor them, and they claim the aforesaid to favor them better than others. 27

Whatever the effect the letter had on those addressed, it is evident that it did little to change Louis's mind. Sometime before 825, the Magister Iudaeorum was sent to Lyons bearing official imperial instructions. Agobard simply refused to accept these instructions as authentic.

It is most likely at this time when the Lyonnais Jews David, Joseph and their peers received the imperial charter stating among other privileges that:

They also have the right to buy and sell foreign slaves within our empire, and no one of the faithful may presume to baptize their foreign slaves without their consent and willingness. 28

Agobard addressed his Against the Impious Command Concerning the Baptism of Jewish Slaves to Wala and Hilduin the Archchaplain shortly thereafter. 29 Once again, Agobard relied on the ecclesiastical advisors within the palace to make his case with the

27 CCCM 52:116. The manumission price for Christian slaves was set at 12 sous by the Council of Macon (581-3).

28 MGH, Formulae, 310, doc. 31. See appendix B for the complete translations of the Jewish charters issued by Louis the Pious.

29 CCCM 52:185-89.
emperor for him.

Agobard begins his defense with a specific case:

I have written to your integrity a brief note, making known to you that a certain female, who was carried over from Judaism to Christianity by the grace of Christ, because of the faith in Christ which she has received, endures grave persecutions, which you can learn by the few words of this woman. ³⁰

Roman law and its Burgundian derivative, under which Agobard lived, forbade Jews to molest those who had converted to Christianity. ³¹

He expresses his disbelief and amazement that the emperor could have issued a command so blatantly opposed to canon law regarding the baptism of Jewish-owned slaves:

The Jews carry around a certain charter which they boast was given to them by the emperor, in which is contained [the order] that no one should baptize a slave of a Jew without the willingness of his lord. That a decision so contrary to the rules of the Church should come forth from the presence of the most Christian and most pious emperor is not to be believed by us at all. ³²

Agobard goes on to explain that the Apostles did not stop along the way to ask permission to baptize possible converts. He uses Timothy 2.3-6 as a proof text to show that the soul of a man has but one master, God, and it is beyond the limits of a temporal lord’s power

---

³⁰ CCCM 52:185.


³² CCCM 52:185.
to deny his slave the right to baptism. Agobard states that the soul of a person is free from the servitude of the corporal being, and asks his fellow ecclesiastics:

Thus since they, who come to baptism through knowledge of the Creator in the interior man [soul], who is free from all conditions of servitude, are renewed, what reason can there be that slaves be prohibited from obtaining it [baptism] without the permission of their lords, and not be permitted to serve God, unless they receive freedom from men? Agobard reduces the conflict to the maxim: "If indeed we observe this command, by neglecting church laws, we offend God. If we follow them [church laws], we fear the indignation of the emperor." The response was a letter from the palace to the Viscount of Lyons ordering him in the name of the emperor to aid the Jews against Agobard. As Evrard, the Magister Iudaeorum, had previously warned, to missi, Gerricus and Fredericus, were sent to the palace. Conveniently, Agobard was not in Lyons while the missi were there. He was out trying to settle a controversy that had erupted in some of the monasteries in the surrounding region.

Agobard wrote an Exhortatory Epistle on Avoiding Eating and

---

33 "This is right and is acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, who desires everyone to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God; there is also one mediator between God and humankind, Christ Jesus, himself human, who gave himself a ransom for all—this was attested at the right time."

34 CCCM 52:187.

35 CCCM 52:188.
Associating with Jews to Nibridius of Narbonne in 827. It is clear that by this time Agobard had realized that the support and help he had been expecting from the palace ecclesiastics were never to come. Agobard started a grass roots movement against the Jews and the policies of the palace. This letter was an attempt to gain the support of another bishop who was faced with the same dilemma of an active and thriving Jewish community.

Agobard begins his letter by explaining the measures that he has taken in his diocese to ensure that the Christian community of Lyons remain free from the influence of the Jewish community:

Therefore, let the reverend seniority of your paternity know that in this present year, while I made the rounds among the people of my diocese with the necessary care, and corrected any vices which appeared among them, according to the powers which God bestowed on me, by the principle of truth, I declared to everyone and taught them according to the law of God and the decrees of the holy canons, that they, as true worshippers of the Christian faith, should segregate themselves with all diligence from the fellowship of infidels, not only of the gentiles, who scarcely dwell among us, but of the Jews, who appear to be scattered in this city of ours and in several other neighboring cities. 

Agobard wanted other bishops to follow suit by enforcing those canon laws which forbade Christians from socializing with Jews. Agobard lists five ill effects of Christians associating with Jews:

---

36Agobard, Epistola exhortatoria de cavendo convictu et societate Judaica, MGH, Epistolae, V, 199-200.

37CCCM 52:232.

Christians observe the Sabbath and work on Sundays; these Christians do not observe the established fasts; and female Christians were being kept as domestics by the Jews and "are prostituted to the domination, desire, or deception of them [their Jewish masters]."39 Agobard made sure to stay well within his rights as a bishop, and only desired to restrict the actions of Christians within his diocese. He explains to Nibridius that his campaigns have won him the indignation of the imperial officials in Lyons, who disgrace divine law while trying to maintain temporal control over his diocese:

Certain missi and especially Evrard, who is now the Magister Iudaeorum, have attempted to destroy and ruin this religious work of ours under the upholding of the emperor's edicts. We have not submitted to these [edicts] even for a moment, so that the true divine law and venerable constitution of the holy fathers should remain among us by an immovable and unshattered observation. 40

We know from the preamble of the Council of Paris in 829 that another council was convening in Lyons at that time.41 The acts of this council are not extant, but we do have two letters addressed to the emperor which are its apparent product.

The first is On Jewish Superstitions and Errors which was co-authored by Agobard, Bernard of Vienne, and Foaf of Châlon-sur-Saône.42 It should not seem surprising that these particular

---

39 CCCM 52:232.
40 CCCM 52:233.
41 Mansi, Sacrorum conciliorum, 14:531.
42 CCCM 52:199-221.
bishops would focus their attention on the separation of the two religious communities given the active Jewish communities in their dioceses.

The bishops say that it is imperative that Christians avoid associating with Jews, even more so than with heretics. While a heretic at least exposes a grain of truth in the errors that he professes, a Jew will spout nothing but blasphemies and lies. One such lie is that God has a physical body complete with functioning organs, like a man, but his hands are not fully developed because he does not use them to create. Much like a terrestrial king, He presides on a throne in a palace where He thinks of many vain and superfluous ideas. Those ideas that do not become actualized become demons. Other errors include the Jewish belief that both the Hebrew alphabet and Mosaic Law predate creation.

The Jews also say that Jesus was hung for telling many lies and being a sorcerer. The final and condemnatory offense was that Jesus had promised that Tiberius's daughter would have a virgin birth and, instead of a child, she gave birth to a stone. While hanging, Jesus's head was split open by a rock throne by an onlooker and he died from that wound. His body was buried very near an aqueduct and his body floated down river:

\[\text{CCC} 52:206.\]
\[\text{CCC} 52:206.\]
\[\text{CCC} 52:206.\]
\[\text{CCC} 52:206.\]
They say that Pilate then promulgated a law of this kind to them: It is clear, he said, that he, who was slain by you through envy, was resurrected, just as he had promised, and that he is not to be found in the tomb or in any other place. And on account of this, I order you to worship him. Let whoever refuses to do so know that his future lot will be in Hell.

The bishops use 1 John 2:22-23\(^48\) to demonstrate that the Bible:

> It is clearly declared that the Jews are not only liars, but also Antichrists, who, since they deny the Son acknowledge the Father in vain; by not acknowledging the Son, they do not deserve to have the Father.\(^49\)

The bishops hoped that this letter would enlighten the emperor to the dangers of the Jewish community on the orthodoxy of Christians. They also hoped that the emperor would restore the authority of past canons and abandon his tolerant policies towards the Jews. The bishops included a list of past canons in the letter. The included canons were the Council of Laodicea’s (380) canons 37 and 38 which forbade Christians from celebrating festivals with the Jews, the Council of Agde’s (506) canon 40 and the Council of Epaon’s (517) canon 15 which forbade Christians from dining with Jews,\(^50\) the Council of Clermont’s (535) canon 6 which forbade intermarriage

\(^47\)CCCM 52:207.

\(^48\)"Who is a liar but the one who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist, the one who denies the Father and the Son. No one who denies the Son has the Father; everyone who confesses the Son has the Father also."

\(^49\)CCCM 52:214.

\(^50\)CCCM 52:202.
between Christians and Jews, the Council of Orleans’s (538) canon 33 which forbade Jews to appear in public during Easter week, and the Council of Maçon’s (581-3) canons 13-17 which forbade Jews from holding offices over Christians, forbade Jews from appearing in public during Easter week, forbade Christians from dining with Jews, forbade the selling of Christians as slaves to the Jews and established the manumission price for Christian slaves at twelve sous, and forbade Jewish missionizing to Christians.

It is difficult to discern from this letter the extent of Agobard’s participation. Until this letter, Agobard only alluded to particular canons and never mentioned Jewish practices or beliefs. The Jewish Life of Jesus that is cited in this letter is different from the one that Amulo cites in his Liber contra Iudaeos and might suggest that this section was authored by one of the other bishops who had that particular edition circulating in his diocese. There are also appeals to Church Fathers as authorities. Agobard’s previous letters only appealed to the Bible as authoritative.

Agobard attempts to justify his continued missionizing to Jewish-owned slaves in the second letter, On the Insolence of the Jews. He repeats his concerns about the continued judaizing occurring among the Christian servants of the Jews. He states that

---
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these servants have become accustomed to recognizing the Sabbath and working on Sunday. Agobard also reports that these same servants are accustomed to eating meat all throughout Lent. Agobard complains that the Jews offer to sell only the meat that they find unfit for their rituals to Christians. He also warns that the Jews will retrieve wine which has fallen to the ground and put it back into the vat for later sale to unsuspecting Christians. This call for a boycott on Jewish goods has led Zuckerman to consider Agobard's entire anti-Jewish campaign in terms of economics. This interpretation does not take into account the mounting political tensions between the Church and the palace, or Agobard's repeated plea for the separation of the two religious communities.

It irritates Agobard that not only have the Jews been allowed to retain their Christian slaves in violation of the law, but that the Jews have been permitted to construct new synagogues. He also complains that the Jews are flaunting their good relations with the palace by showing off the charter given to them by the emperor, which Agobard still maintains is not genuine, and by showing off the clothes that ladies of the palace have sent to the wives of the Jews. It is observations such as these that lead Dominique de Colonia to the conclusion that the Jews had bought the emperor's protection and favor with presents to Judith and had in fact bribed

\[55\text{Zuckerman, "Political Uses."}\]

\[56\text{CCCM 52:194.}\]

\[57\text{CCCM 52:194.}\]
the Magister Iudaeorum, Evrard, "who sold them his services dearly." While there is no record of any such transactions, a ninth-century Jewish text does mention that Jewish merchants regularly went "to the palace of the Franks to place their goods." De Colonia's assertion might help to explain Agobard's complaint:

Your missi Gerricus and Fredericus came, preceded by Evrard, but they did not accomplish all your business, but acted on another's behalf; and they showed themselves terrible to Christians and gentle to Jews, especially in Lyons, where they carried out a role of persecution against the Church, which they aroused to many groans, sighs, and tears.

Agobard warns that the Jews curse Christ daily, a fact that is attested by Jerome and many Jews. Agobard seems to be referring to the Amidah in which Jews asks God for eighteen benedictions and one malediction. This malediction asks for the destruction of the enemies of the Jewish faith which would have included Christianity at this time. If the emperor would only listen to what secular and ecclesiastical authorities have been saying in accordance with the Apostles and the Old Testament on the subject of the separation of the two religions, he would see:

What horrible enemies to the truth they must be considered, how much worse than all unbelievers as the Scriptures teach, and how much less worthy than those of all unbelievers are their thoughts concerning God

58 De Colonia, Histoire littéraire, 2:105.
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and heavenly matters.  

He ends his letter with an example of just how dangerous it is for the Jews to own Christian slaves:

And when the preceding letter had been written, there came a man fleeing Spaniards of Cordoba, who told us that he had been abducted by a Jew of Lyons twenty-four years earlier as a small boy, and sold. He also told us that he had escaped only this year in the company of another man who likewise was abducted by another Jew in Arles six years ago. When we sought and found acquaintances of him, who was from Lyons, some said that some had been abducted by the same Jew, others had been bought and sold, and in the current year another boy was abducted and sold by another Jew. We also have discovered that many Christians have been sold by other Christians to Jews for purposes too shameful to write.

This effectively marked the end of Agobard's active campaign against the Jews of Lyons. The turbulent political situation between the heirs of the 817 constitution and the emperor demanded everyone's attention. The first revolt over the issue of Charles the Bald's inheritance occurred in 830, with many of the clergy openly taking sides in the conflict. After Louis's restoration to power at the Diet of Limwegen, he awarded Agobard for his apparent neutrality in the conflict by giving him Leidrad's old office as the abbot of St. Médard. Agobard became a prime figure in the ecclesiastical opposition to the emperor in the second revolt. Afterwards, he penned his Chartula and Liber Apologeticus in defense of Lothar and

---

61 CCCM 52:194.
the new constitution.  

Ironically, it was at Agobard's own St. Médard where:

in addition to that for which the emperor has already done penance, an irrevocable public penance, with his arms laid aside, should again be judged to satisfy the church. . . . Thus adjudged, although absent, unheard, not confessing, not tried, they (the bishops) compel the emperor, before the body of St. Medard confessor and Saint Sebastian martyr, to lay aside his weapons and place them on the altar. Then, clothed in dark-colored vesture, they thrust him under keep with a large guard.  

Upon Louis's restoration to power in 834, Agobard fled into Italy with Lothar. Louis intended to depose Agobard at the Diet of Cremieux in 835:

Here the emperor caused to be aired the case of the vacant churches of Lyons and Vienne, since the former bishop, Agobard, although under command, would not come, and Bernard of Vienne, who had indeed intended to be present, had again taken flight. This matter, of course, remained unsettled because of the absences of the bishops.  

Louis was unable to depose Agobard because it required his presence and admission to being unsuitable for the position.  

---


65 The Astronomer, Son of Charlemagne, 112.

66 This practice was later ignored as Bishop Guy of Beauvais did not appear when summoned and "was declared deposed by default" by Archbishop Hugues of Lyons in 1085. See Guibert of Nogent, Self and Society in Medieval France: The Memoirs of Abbot Guibert of Nogent, ed. John F. Benton (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1970), 73-74.
absence, Louis gave Amalarius of Metz control of the see of Lyons. Florus, the head deacon of Lyons, and Agobard quickly set out to campaign against Amalarius. Upon the condemnation of Amalarius at the Council of Kiersy, Agobard was able to return to his position in Lyons and reconcile with the emperor.
The birth of Charles the Bald to Judith, the second wife of Louis the Pious, in 823 did not signal the destruction of Carolingian unity to contemporary writers. As noted by Janet L. Nelson, they scarcely mentioned the birth at all.\(^1\) It was not until Louis the Pious made clear his intentions to give in to Judith's demands and award Charles his own territory to govern within the Carolingian realm, that the implications of Charles's birth became apparent.\(^2\) During the Revolt of 833, Louis was made to don the sackcloth of the penitent, Judith was exiled and incarcerated, and Charles was taken into custody at the royal monastery of Prum. The fact that Charles the Bald was not tonsured is problematic because it "would have meant his intended exclusion from the ranks of the throne worthy."\(^3\) The author of the Reginonis chronicon attributes the turmoil to "the many fornications of his [Louis's] wife, Judith."\(^4\)

Upon Louis the Pious's return to power, he gave Charles the

\(^1\) Nelson, "Reign of Charles the Bald," 1.
\(^3\) Nelson, "Reign of Charles the Bald," 2.
\(^4\) Reginonis chronicon, MGH, Scriptores, I, 567.
Bald positions of power in order he gain the necessary experience to maintain his kingdom after his father's death. In 837, Charles was given a realm made up of the territory between the Seine and the Meuse in the heartland of Francia. Charles's duties and domain expanded in 838 with a further grant of Neustria and the territory between the Seine and the Loire. After his brother Pepin's death in December 839, Charles was given control over Aquitaine, the traditional testing ground for future Carolingian kings. His ascension to the throne of Aquitaine was disputed by Pepin's son, Pepin II, and Charles the Bald spent a great deal of time and energy trying to stabilize the region.

Louis the Pious understood that Charles the Bald was going to need a strong supporter for him to maintain his royal claims. Louis the Pious summoned Lothar to Worms in May 839 to make him the guardian of Charles and his territories. Lothar agreed to the planned division of the empire and, for the moment, all boundary disputes were settled. It is interesting to note that Louis the German, who had rebelled again in 838, was left only with Bavaria as his domain.

After Louis the Pious's death in 840, Lothar immediately reneged on his 839 agreement to protect the integrity of Charles the Bald's territory and tried to reclaim all the territory that had been assigned to him in the constitution of 817. As had happened during the revolts, the nobility, including the ecclesiastics, immediately divided into camps. Louis the German realized that the safety of his realm was also in question and worked with Charles to ensure that Lothar would not monopolize the entire empire. On February 16, 842,
Charles the Bald and Louis the Pious proclaimed the famous Oath of Strassburg and publicly cemented their alliance against the advances of their brother.\(^5\) The Treaty of Verdun in 843 firmly if only temporarily established the division of the empire, with Charles the Bald situated in what would later become France.

Lothar's advances were not the only concern of Charles the Bald for the continued security of his realm. There were numerous Viking attacks during the early part of his reign. The Vikings sacked Rouen in 841, Quentovic in 842, and Nantes in 843. This problem was compounded by the Breton dux Nominoe who reneged on his allegiance to Charles the Bald of 841. Nominoe allied himself with the Vikings hoping to extend his control into the Frankish territory. There were many other Franks in the lower Loire valley eager to join this alliance. The Vikings employed another tactic in 844 and sailed down the Garonne all the way to Toulouse. The following year, the Viking warlord Ragnar sailed up the Seine as far as Paris with a large fleet. Charles eventually had to pay the Vikings 7000 pounds to keep them from damaging his kingdom. This move was criticized by writers outside the kingdom, but generally praised or overlooked by those within.\(^6\) The Vikings were not the only invaders at this time. The

\(^5\)For the text of this oath see Carolingian Chronicles: Royal Frankish Annals and Nithard's Histories, trans. Bernhard Walter Scholz with Barbara Rogers (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1970), 161-63. This oath contains the first evidence of French and German as emerging popular languages.

\(^6\)See Fragmentum chronici Fonanellensis, MGH, Scriptores, II, 302 and Ex miraculis in Normannorum adventu factis, MGH, Scriptores, XV part 1, 10-16 for accounts of Viking activity. The writer of Ex
Muslim warlord Musa advanced from the Pyrenees far into Septimania in 841/2 causing a substantial loss to that area.

Even within his kingdom, Charles the Bald faced an overwhelming amount of diversity and tension. His territory comprised many different ethnic groups: The Visigoths in Septimania and the Spanish March, the Burgundians of northern Burgundy, the Franks of Austrasia and Neustria, and the Gallo-Romans of Aquitaine. "So in terms of its human geography, Charles the Bald's kingdom was a ragbag of old sub-kingdoms and peoples, distinguished from their neighbors by race or language or traditions or law or long political separation."7

Charles had won a major victory with the Treaty of Verdun. The treaty totally excluded any mention of the claims of Pepin II to the territory of Aquitaine. Pepin II and his followers were not easily discouraged, and, in June 845, Charles the Bald met with him at the monastery of Fleury (St. Benoit-sur-Loire) to negotiate peace. The price was the lordship of Aquitaine under Charles's overlordship. Charles did however manage to keep the city of Poitou for himself. These turbulent times are best typified by Nithard's observation:

\[
\text{In the times of Charles the Great of good memory, who died almost thirty years ago, peace and concord ruled everywhere because our people were treading the one proper way, the way of common welfare and thus the way of God. But now since each goes his separate way,}
\]

\[\text{miraculis attributes the raids to the sins of the Franks. For the career of Ragnar Lodbrok see T. D. Kendrick, A History of the Vikings (London: Methven and Company, 1930), 203-204.}\]

dissension and struggle abound. Once there was abundance and happiness everywhere, now everywhere there is want and sadness. Once even the elements smiled on everything and now they threaten, as Scripture, which was left to us as the gift of God, testifies: and the world will wage war against the mad.

In order to maintain the support of the nobles, Charles the Bald had drawn heavily on ecclesiastical property to reward his loyal followers; especially hard hit was the church of Rheims. Lothar courted the clergy for their support by promising to be less burdensome than his brother. The Church realized that its resources were eroding under the policies of Charles the Bald, and tried to curb this practice during several reform councils called in the early part of his reign. They also tried to initiate other political policies in the canons of these councils which would increase the Church's power at the expense of royal authority.

The prelates at the Council of Paris-Meaux in 845 attempted just that. Hoping to take full advantage of the still ill-established Charles the Bald, the bishops produced an enormous number of canons, eighty in all, that they hoped Charles the Bald would enact as law within his kingdom. Among their demands, the canonists demanded an end of entrusting abbeys to laymen. They demanded that

Nithard, Carolingian Chronicles, 174. This passage echoes the concept of the covenant lawsuit of Hosea 4.1-3: "Hear the word of the Lord, O people of Israel; for the Lord has an indictment against the inhabitants of the land. There is no faithfulness or loyalty, and no knowledge of God in the land. Swearing, lying, and murder, and stealing, and adultery break out; bloodshed follows bloodshed. Therefore the land mourns, and all who live in it languish; together with the wild animals and the birds in the air, even the fish of the sea are perishing."
those who were installed in this manner immediately be withdrawn and banned from donning the habits of a monk.

Canon 73 of this council called for the revival of the observation of old canons and decrees concerning the Jews stemming from the time of the emperor Constantine. The canon reproduces the law of Constantine which forbade Jews to circumcise their Christian and all other non-Jewish slaves.\(^9\) It reproduced sections of the Theodosian Code which states that no Jew should hold a high office or position above a Christian, nor should Jews be allowed to build new synagogues.\(^10\) The canonists also included the decree of the Merovingian King Childebert which states that Jews should not be allowed to show themselves during Easter week.\(^11\) The bishop include in their list synodal decrees which had been promulgated outside of the Frankish realm. These include the Visigothic decree which prescribed that children of converted Jews should be taken from their parents and placed in Christian homes to ensure their Christian upbringing.\(^12\) The bishops also made mention of the prohibitions against Christians consorting and eating with Jews. The bishops also include an extract from Gregory the Great's epistle to the Merovingian kings Theoderic and Theodebert and Queen Brunchild expressing Gregory's dismay that Jews were allowed to own Christian

\(^{9}\)Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum*, 14:837.

\(^{10}\)Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum*, 14:837.

\(^{11}\)Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum*, 14:837.

slaves within their territories. The bishops also wished to re-enact the canons and laws regarding the Jewish ownership of slaves, including the re-establishment of the manumission price for converted slaves at twelve sous. As noted by Zuckerman, the canon functioned on four separate levels. The first was to ensure that the Jews could not hold public offices such as judges, toll collectors, and the like so that the Jews would be unable to hold authority over Christians. This also would further separate the Jews from the secular rulers. Secondly, the canon prohibits the Jews from holding Christians in servitude to them, and restricts the pagan slave trade. Thirdly, the canon acted to prevent the spread of Judaism by prohibiting Jews from converting Christians. Fourthly, the canon imposed a segregation, prohibiting social and especially marital relations between adherents of the two religions.

It is most likely that Amulo wrote his letter entitled Liber contra Iudaeos just prior to the bishops including canon 73 in their list of demands on Charles the Bald. The letter functioned on three separate levels. The first was a theological attack against the Jews and Judaism. The second was a defense of Christianity to the arguments made in Jewish polemics. Lastly, it was a reference to

---

13Mansi, Sacrorum conciliorum, 14:837.
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the prior canons and laws enacted against the Jews.

The text itself is anonymous and has been previously attributed to Rabanus Maurus. However, evidence within the text suggests that it is Amulo that is in fact its author. There are several references to the anti-Jewish campaigns of his predecessor, Agobard, coupled with the fact of his attendance at the Paris-Meaux councils, would make him the more likely candidate.

The text has also traditionally been thought to have been sent to Charles the Bald himself. Evidence within the text would suggest that it was drafted rather for an ecclesiastical audience. It is dubious whether Amulo would have used such terms as "your unanimous fraternity and fraternal unanimity" in a letter meant for any other audience than a group of bishops such as those convened at Paris-Meaux. Chevellard has suggested that a separate letter had been sent to Charles the Bald prior to the Diet of Epernay in the hopes of

---


18 Ferdinand Lot and Louis Halphen have called into question whether Amulo actually attended this council in their work Le règne de Charles le Chauve, Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, vol.175 (Paris: Librarie Honoré Champion, 1909; repr., 1975), 41. That Amulo would have attended this council should not seem surprising, being that a portion of his see fell under the jurisdiction of Charles the Bald. The fact that his name appears on the roll for the councils should establish his presence there barring any new evidence to the contrary.

19 PL 116:141.
gaining the king's support for the canon. Although a second letter to the king would have been a logical tactical move, there is no evidence for such a letter.

The date for the work is beyond question. The author gives us the date 846 in chapter nineteen of the text, which coincides and links its writing with canon 73 of the Paris-Meaux councils.

Amulo opens his letter with a brief statement of purpose:

How harmful to the faithful and dangerous to the teachers of the Church are the hateful teachings of the Jews and their association among Christians is unknown to many, not only to the ordinary and common-folk, but even to the nobles and distinguished, learned and unlearned alike, and especially among those whom the aforementioned people dwell and associate.

The action he prescribes is that the council of bishops seek to bring about the observances of divine authority, the decrees of the Holy Fathers, and the religious edicts of the ancient princes "through your [the bishops's] unanimous fraternity and fraternal unanimity, to the distinction of all who have been united in us to guide towards the Lord."

Amulo, much like his predecessor, warns that all of the faithful need to consider and weigh carefully the perfidy and blasphemies of the Jews. He calls upon such authorities as Revelation

---

20 P. Chevellard, Saint Agobard archévêque de Lyon: Sa vie et ses écrits (Lyons: P. N. Josserand, 1869), 399, n. 44.
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2.9 to establish the nature of the perceived evil that he is hoping to correct. He refers to Augustine's *Of True Religion* to further elucidate the danger of the Jews. In this work, Augustine lists the Jews along with the pagans, Manichaens, Sabellians, and Arians as the enemies of the Church. Amulo tells us that the Jews in fact are nearer to the pagans than the heretics:

Because obviously it is characteristic of heretics to believe some truth and some falsehoods about the Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, but it is characteristic of the Jews to believe all falsehoods about Him. They do not believe Him to be God in any way, and believe Him to be only a man of common birth, which is to say, the procreation of a man and a woman, which until now they have deemed [Him] to have come. But they profess one God, Creator of everything, which not even the worshippers of idols are wont to deny.

Amulo stresses the necessity of avoiding consorting with the enemies of Christ by employing Jesus's words of Luke 11.23. He emphasizes this idea with an anecdote taken from Against Heretics of Irenaeus, which tells of John and Polycarp:

There are those who heard from him that John, the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe at Ephesus, and perceiving Cerinthus within, rushed out of the bath-

---

24 "I know your affliction and your poverty, even though you are rich. I know the slander on the part of those who say that they are Jews and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan," PL 116:142.

25 PL 116:143.

26 "Whoever is not with me is against me, and whoever does not gather with me scatters," PL 116:144.

27 Irenaeus (d. ca. 200) was the first Bishop of Lyons and venerated as a martyr. For questions surrounding his martyrdom see Irenaeus, *Proof of the Apostolic Approach*, Ancient Christian Writers, no.16, trans. Joseph P. Smith (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1952), 114, n. 3.
house without bathing, exclaiming, "Let us fly, lest even the bath-house fall down, because Cerinthus, the enemy of the Truth, is within." And Polycarp himself replied to Marcion, who met him on one occasion and said, "Dost thou know me?" "I do know thee, the first-born of Satan." 18

Amulo explains that while Cerinthus was a heretic, and not a Jew, he too proclaimed many of the errors of the Jews such as that Jesus had not been resurrected and that one should be circumcised.

Amulo states that the Jews observe the law and the traditions of the Pharisees, but have neither the protection of God nor the angels to look over them, and that the Jews blaspheme Jesus in their synagogues. Amulo explains to the bishops that there are two schools of Jewish thought, the Scribes and the Pharisees. Both of these are to be regarded as "teachers of fables and superstitions." 19 He explains that just as quoted in Luke 11.52, 10 the perversity and impiety of those teachers and the Jews in general is such that: "Having abandoned the truth of the Law and prophets, continuously up until this day, they observe traditions and follow errors." 31

Not only do these errors include the mocking of Jesus and the Apostles, but they also include the deliberate exclusion of Psalm 19 in

---

18Irenaeus, The Writings of Irenaeus, trans. Alexander Roberts and W. H. Rambaut (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1869), 1:262-64. The editor of Liber contra Iudaeos failed to denote this as a direct quote from the work of Irenaeus.

19PL 116:146.

30"Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, because you have taken away the key of knowledge. You do not enter yourselves, and you prohibit those who were entering," PL 116:146. My translation.

31PL 116:146.
their religious services because of its reference to the Christ’s coming. Moreover, they do not recognize the foretelling of Jesus’s Passion in the texts of the Old Testament. Instead, the Jews have fashioned for themselves two messiahs:

One of them they say to be just like the promise of God, from the House of David, whom they maintain was born in Judea the very night when the house of God in Jerusalem [the Temple] had been destroyed by Vespasian and Titus; and I do not by what means he [the messiah] had been brought to be in Rome, where even to this day, he is said to be in caves and hidden crypts: and in such a workhouse, he has been constrained by chains, weighed down by shackles, and injured over his entire body.

The Jews are assured that the wounds of the messiah Ben David will bring them remission from their sins and fulfill the prophecy of Isaiah 53. Amulo states that this messiah is included as part of their traditions and appeared to the great Jewish teacher Joshua Ben Levi:

---

31 Amulo says that the Jews make puns of the words Apostle and apostate. See PL 116:146.


34 "But he was wounded for our transgressions, crushed for our inequities; upon him was the punishment that made us whole, and by his bruises we are healed," PL 116:148.

35 Joshua Ben Levi (2nd century C. E.) was the head of the academy at Lydda, and was briefly a representative of the Nasi and spokesman for the Palestinian Jewry. He was well known for his piety and later became the central figure of stories concerning Elijah’s visits to him and his conversations with the Angel of Death. A later legend has him visiting both Heaven (Gan ’Eden) and Hell (Gehinnon). The story was popular in the Middle Ages. See Isaac Landman, ed., The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia (New York: The Universal Encyclopedia, Inc., 1942), 6:208-9, and Angelo S. Rappaport, Myth and Legend of Ancient Israel (New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1966), 1:110, 1:116, 1:131, 2:388, 3:223-25.
Moreover, he appeared first in dirty clothes. When he was seized by him, not knowing who he was, he asked why he was so unclean and uncultivated. Suddenly, he changed himself into another figure, and appeared as a handsome old man, holding a precious stone of sapphire in his hand. When this was done, he [Ben Levi] marveled at it, and sought to find out who in the world he was. He answered him: I am the messiah who endures many punishments for you. I will release you from your captivity and everyone will receive a sapphire stone such as the one you see me holding.

Thus fulfilling the prophecy of Isaiah 54.11. The Jews hope that this messiah will appear in the clouds in the sky at the end and free them from their captivity.

The second messiah comes from the tribe of Ephraim. Amulo attributes the imaging of this messiah to a misreading of Jeremiah 31.9:

After the revocation of their captivity, when the most cruel people, Gog and Magog, come over them, they hope that this one will wage war against them, and in this war, he will die and will be gravely lamented by all the people of the Jews.

---


37 "O afflicted one, storm-tossed, and not comforted, I am about to set your stones in antimony, and lay your foundations with sapphires," PL 116:148.

38 A Jewish sect known as the Ephraimites believed that the messiah, the son of Ephraim, will precede the messiah, the son of David. For more on the Ephraimites see Louis Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1928), 6:2.

39 "With weeping they shall come, and with consolations I will lead them back, I will let them walk by brooks of water, in a straight path in which they shall not stumble; for I have become a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn," PL 116:148.

Amulo also charges that the Jews falsify the text of the prophetic Scriptures so that they can conceal the foretelling of Jesus's coming and Passion. They are to suffer eternal captivity because they killed Jesus and continue to refuse to recognize him as their true messiah. "When the Lord comes to judgement, they will see the wounds which they inflicted on Him, and understand themselves to be damned for so much impiety." Amulo reiterates the hopes that the Jews have in their messiah Ben David who suffers for their sins in a hovel in Rome. Amulo states that this messiah is not the true savior because he did not suffer the prophesied Passion and Crucifixion.

The Jews feel that their captivity will end soon and that their "pseudochrist" will never die. He will rise from his remote location and suddenly appear in the sky, thus signifying their release. In fact, the Jews disclaim Jesus as messiah because of his death.

Amulo then explains that the second messiah, Ben Ephraim, originates from confusing the first-born of Zechariah 12.10 with the first-born of the Jeremiah 31.9 prophecy. Amulo states that the first-born referred to in Zechariah is the first-born of Exodus 4.22-23. Amulo states that nowhere in the prophetic Scriptures is

---

41PL 116:150.

42"And I will pour out a spirit of compassion and supplication on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so that, when they look on the one whom they have pierced, they shall mourn for him, as one mourns for an only child, and weep bitterly over him, as one weeps over a firstborn," PL 116:155.

43"Then you shall say to Pharaoh, "Thus says the Lord: Israel is my firstborn son. I said to you, "Let my son go that he may worship me." But you refused to let him go; now I will kill your first-
there any messiah mentioned outside of the House of David. In ad­dition, Amulo cites Psalm 77(78).67-68 as proof against any messianic claim of the tribe of Ephraim. Amulo explains to the bishops that the Jews’s desire for the end of their captivity has produced other false messiahs. He draws from the works of Rufinus, Emperor Julian, Theodosius, and Jerome to illustrate the extent of their false beliefs and hopes.

Amulo then directly attacks two of the most notable Jewish teachers, Josephus and Philo. He explains that they too are guilty of the same depravities and falsehoods that he has attributed to the Jews. He finds it worrisome that these two authors are held in especially high esteem even among educated Christians. He quotes Augustine from his work Response to Faust the Manichaean:

Philo, a man most liberally erudite, was one of the Jews who scoff at the Passion of Christ, which we acknowledge. The Greeks do not hesitate to put his words on a level with Plato. He endeavored to interpret some portions of Scriptures, not for the sake of understanding Christ, in whom he did not believe, but so that it might become apparent how much difference it makes if you refer everything to Christ, on account of whom these things were truly said thus, or if, leaving Him aside, you follow indiscriminate conjectures with indiscriminate mental subtlety.

Amulo finds Philo’s interpretation of Noah’s Ark as an emblem for the born son,” PL 116:156.

"He rejected the tent of Joseph, he did not choose the tribe of Ephraim; but he chose the tribe of Judah, Mount Zion, which he loves," PL 116:156.


body and specifically his commentary on Genesis 6.16 especially offensive. 47

Amulo redirects the focus of the letter explaining that its urgency is "not only for the suppressing of their madness, but also for the strengthening of the truth of our faith." 48

To begin his defense of Christianity, Amulo addresses the Jews's belief that Jesus was hung like a thief in disgrace. The Jews repeat Deuteronomy 21.22-23 in their argument against the validity of Jesus's Passion. 49 Amulo again extrapolates from Augustine's response to Faust the Manichaean to retort:

Thus the disgrace of Christ's Cross is shameful to us, which we bear against all human disgrace on a more prominent part of the body, which is to say, on the brow, because conscientiously and anxiously, we search with succor for the grace of God, in the manner that

47 "What is the meaning of the words, 'a door at the side'? For (Scripture) says, 'Thou shalt make a door at the side.'

Not vulgarly does that door at the side (of the ark) represent the human structure, which He decently mentioned, saying it was 'at the side,' through which the excreta are removed to the outside. (This is) very excellent, for, as Socrates used to say, whether taught by Moses or moved by the things themselves, the Creator, valuing the decency of the body, turned to the rear of the senses the orifices of the passage of the canals, lest we should feel disgust at ourselves, when in purging ourselves of the bile carrying waste, we see this shameful sight. Wherefore He surrounded and enclosed that passage by the back and hinder parts as by high swelling mounds; and also for other uses have the buttocks been made soft, " Philo Judaeus, Questions and Answers on Genesis, trans. Ralph Marcus (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961), 77-78.


49 "When someone is convicted of a crime punishable by death and is executed, and you hang him on a tree, his corpse must not remain all night upon the tree; you shall bury him that same day, for anyone hung on a tree is under God's curse. You must not defile the land that the Lord your God is giving you for possession," PL 116:158.
Amulo states that the actual nature of Jesus's death was dignified and not ignoble, because he willingly underwent his Passion, and it was "the barbarity of their persecution that is not free from blame." Amulo likens Jesus's death to the resurrected figures in the New Testament who were said to be merely sleeping, and not dead. In this way, Amulo explains how it is that Jesus was able to avoid the fate of Adam and all men thereafter as laid down in Genesis 3.19 and other Old Testament passages.

Amulo duly lists the phases of the Passion and explains to his audience their spiritual significance. One example of this is his explanation that when the spear of the Roman soldier pierced Jesus's side:

It is obvious that through the opening of the side, the door was thrown open to us, from which we may enter into life, and may be incorporated in Christ through the water of baptism and the blood of redemption.

Amulo then returns to the theme of original sin which he had previously discussed. These biblical passages along with the authority of the Holy Scriptures and the observations from sound discernment of the Catholic Fathers have been accepted, from which both their confusion and our edification grows.

---

50 PL 116:158.

51 PL 116:160.

52 "By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread until you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; you are dust, and to dust you shall return," PL 116:160.

53 PL 116:161. This comments upon John 19.34, "Instead, one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear, and at once blood and water came out."
established earlier in the text. His conception of original sin is that:

Our damnation is doubled, manifestly in guilt and in punishment. In guilt, just as it is written, "Cursed be anyone who does not uphold the words of this law by observing them" [Deut. 27.26]. In punishment, just as it was said in the first man, "For in the day that you eat of it you shall die" [Gen. 2.17]. This damnation came down to the human race from this man.

Jesus was excepted from guilt because he did not sin. He undertook the undue punishment of death so that he could release mankind from the punishment for their sins. "God mercifully arranged this for our salvation before the creation of the world. He foretold this through his prophets." Jesus was outside of the damnation of Adam due to his divine nature. Amulo uses this to show that the damnation of being hung in a tree is clearly not applicable in this case. The Jews "do not receive the promised benediction" because they refuse to recognize and honor the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus as their salvation.

Amulo states that the Jews have an odious name for Jesus, "Ussum Hamiziri" which he says means "Dissipator Aegyptius" in Latin. Amulo believes that they use this name:

Because of a well-known magician of Egypt and pseudo-

---

54 See PL 116:159.
55 PL 116:163.
56 PL 116:163.
57 PL 116:164.
58 PL 116:168.
prophet who once deceived many of them [Jews] so that he destroyed them, and of which Tribunus asked Paul in the Acts of the Apostles [21.38], "Then you are not the Egyptian who recently stirred up a revolt and led the four thousand assassins out into the wilderness?"  

He also believes that the Jews call him this name to link Jesus to the cult of Baal which Amulo describes as "a religion foreign to God."  

To nullify further the divinity of Jesus, the Jews say that:  

When he was deposed from the cross and buried in the tomb, in order that all might know that he was dead and not resurrected, he again was removed from the tomb [by their forefathers], and dragged through the entire city, and cast forth in this manner; and because of this, his tomb stands empty to this day, and is squalid with stones and full of the filth which they are accustomed to cast into it.  

As noted earlier, this account originates from a different toldoth tradition than the one used by Agobard, Bernard of Vienne, and Foaf of Châlon-sur-Saône. The redaction used by Amulo also contains the Pandera legend. Amulo states that the Jews:  

Acknowledge him to be the son of an impious man, which is to say, I do not know from which race, whom they name Pandera: with whom, they say that the mother of God committed adultery, and after that He, in whom we believe, was born.  

Amulo begins a tirade against contemporary Jews with the state-

---

59PL 116:168.
60PL 116:168.
62PL 116:169. See Mead, Did Jesus Live, 258-80 for a later but complete version of the Toldoth Jeschu.
ment: "Therefore we excite the zeal of God in us, as much as we are able, against such enemies to the truth and rabid dogs against Christ." He reminds the bishops that Scriptures dictate that they must not be patient with blasphemers. Then Amulo puts forth a list of complaints that echo the earlier polemic of Agobard. Among these are the complaints that many Christians defy canon law and have relationships with Jews that are too close; the Jews keep Christian servants; these servants work on Sunday but observe the Sabbath; Christians say that the Jews preach better; and contrary to divine will, the polluted wine of the Jews is sold to Christians. This wine can even be found being used in church services.

Amulo warns that the poor and the simple are easily swayed by the arguments of the Jews, and that the danger is much more dire than that. He relates the story of a palace ecclesiastic who was won over by their treachery:

A palace deacon, nobly raised and disciplined in the services of the Church, and well-disposed to the prince, was seduced by them, so that he was enticed and pulled away by their diabolical persuasions. He abandoned the palace, his country and family, [and] completely abandoned the Christian realm, and now is in Spain associated with the Jews among the Saracens. He was persuaded to deny Christ was the Son of God by the godless, to profane the grace of baptism, to accept carnal circumcision, to change his name so that he who was once Bodo, now is called Eleazar. Thus he

---

63PL 116:170.

64The Jewish services very likely used the vernacular language that was developing at this time, in contrast to the Latin mass of the Church.

amounted to a complete Jew both in superstition and dress. Today, bearded and married, he blasphemes Christ and His Church with others in the synagogue of Satan.\textsuperscript{66}

Amulo restates the purpose of his letter, saying that he desires that Christians should separate themselves from the Jewish contagion, as prescribed by canon law, and that the kings should follow the old canons and laws. He devotes the last eighteen chapters to listing both the ecclesiastical and secular examples that he believes ought to be followed.

He begins his list by drawing on Augustine's \textit{Tracts on John the Evangelist} and chapter three of Daniel to illustrate that the Jewish slave owners punish the corpses and kill the souls of the slaves under their possession.\textsuperscript{67} He also reiterates Augustine's conception of the Jew as the worst of heretics.\textsuperscript{68} He reminds the bishops that all Jews are damned for the killing of Jesus, and that they are known to have falsified the text of Scriptures.\textsuperscript{69} He urges Christians to


\textsuperscript{67}PL 116:172-73.

\textsuperscript{68}PL 116:173.

\textsuperscript{69}PL 116:178-80.
follow the example of Hilary who refused to even say hello to Jews. He relates a story from the *Life of St. Ambrose* in which a synagogue had burnt down and Ambrose, although ordered to, refused to rebuild it, and how this same synagogue was later converted over to Christian use to the glory of the Church.

Amulo also lists the relevant laws that had been promulgated by past rulers. He states that the *Theodosian Code* did not allow a Jew to hold public office, nor did it allow Jews to build new synagogues. He lists the law of Emperor Constantine stating that if a Jew were to circumcise a slave, that slave was to be freed. He reminds the bishops of the edict of the Merovingian king Childebert which stated that the Jews were not to appear in public during Easter week, and hails the policies of the Visigothic kings Reccaredus and Sisebut, the later having attempted to convert all his Jews to Christianity. Amulo also places in this list the critique of the Frankish kings Theoderic and Theodebert, who, to the amazement of Gregory the Great, allowed Jews to own female Christian slaves within

---

70 PL 116:180.
71 PL 116:180-81.
72 PL 116:174-75.
73 PL 116:176.
74 PL 116:176.
their realms.\footnote{76}{PL 116:177.}

Amulo also reminds the bishops of the Church's prior stances concerning the Jews by listing some of the canons that pertain to them. Among them are: The Council of Epaone's (517) canon 15 which states that clerics must not dine with Jews;\footnote{77}{PL 116:181-82.} Agde's (506) canon 40 which says that all clerics and laity are to avoid eating with Jews;\footnote{78}{PL 116:182.} Maçon's (581/3) canon 13 stating that Jews are not to be judges or tax collectors over Christians, canon 14 which states that Jews are not to be in public during Easter, canon 15 which states that no Christian is to eat with Jews, and canon 16 which establishes the manumission price for a slave at twelve sous;\footnote{79}{PL 116:182-83.} Laodicea's (380) canons 37 and 38 which forbid Jews from receiving communion;\footnote{80}{PL 116:183.} and Clermont's (535) canon 6 which forbids the intermarriage between Christians and Jews.\footnote{81}{PL 116:183.}

The laws and canons listed by Amulo are echoed in canon 73 of the Paris-Meaux councils. There is little room for doubt that Amulo's work is directly related to the councils and that it formed the basis for the councils anti-Jewish canon. It also becomes evident that Amulo was the main proponent behind its inclusion in the

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{76}{PL 116:177.}
\item \footnote{77}{PL 116:181-82.}
\item \footnote{78}{PL 116:182.}
\item \footnote{79}{PL 116:182-83.}
\item \footnote{80}{PL 116:183.}
\item \footnote{81}{PL 116:183.}
\end{itemize}
His campaign, much like Agobard's, was to no avail. In June of 846, Charles the Bald called an assembly at Epernay in which the bishops presented their efforts of the prior councils. Of the eighty canons put forth by the bishops of the Paris-Meaux councils, Charles the Bald only accepted nineteen, Amulo's canon not among them, and then hastily dismissed the bishops. Charles the Bald's action drew heavy criticism and evoked this reaction from the writer of the *Annals of St. Bertin*:

Charles held a general assembly of his people in June. He convened it, breaching custom, at a villa belonging to the church of Rheims, called Epernay. At this assembly the most necessary admonition of the bishops of the realm about the affairs of the church was treated as if it did not matter a straw: practically never, since Christian times began, can reverence for bishops be found to have been so totally disregarded.

---

82 Zuckerman has argued that the driving force behind the anti-Jewish canon was in fact Hincmar of Rheims, who dominated the rest of the council, via Amulo of Lyons. The theory is that he used this opportunity to establish a good rapport with Lothar. This theory is corroborated by evidence of a letter sent from Hincmar to Amulo concerning the Jews: "Amolo Lugdunensi de placito, quod habuerat cum rege regnique primoribus, et de Iudeorum in hoc regno statu," *Die Briefe Des Erzbischofs Hinkmar Von Reims*, MGH, Epistolae, VII, 4. Without the actual letter being extant, this argument amounts to mere speculation. It seems unlikely that Hincmar would choose an anti-Jewish platform as his means to open diplomatic relations with Lothar. See Zuckerman, *A Jewish Princedom*, 289-315.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

Many scholars have examined the anti-Jewish campaign of Agobard from various angles with little consensus as to the motivation. The two most interesting recent views on the subject have come from Zuckerman and Bachrach. Amulo's subsequent campaign has received far less attention.

Zuckerman views Agobard's campaign solely in terms of economics. He builds his argument on the fact that Charles Martel's conquest of Burgundy in 733 physically and financially devastated the Lyonnais Church. Charles Martel gave the abandoned ecclesiastical properties to his supporters as payment. Zuckerman supposes that, as he had done in Narbonne, Charles Martel had given the newly conquered land as allods to the Jews of the Lyonnais region. The allods would have been of a hereditary nature, and exempt from the tithes of the Church. Agobard's campaign to convert the slaves of the Jews would then be seen as a method to deprive the Jewish landowners of a sufficient workforce to cultivate their land, in which case, the land would revert to the crown, and then possibly back to the Lyonnais Church. Zuckerman also points to Agobard's call for a boycott of Jewish goods as corroborating evidence for his landownership—

---

1Zuckerman, "Political Uses", and Bachrach, Early Medieval.
economically based interpretation for the entire campaign. Zuckerman presupposes his argument that a separate political entity existed in the South of France under Jewish rule as a result of the Jews's aid to Pepin in the siege of Narbonne in 759. The lack of eighth- or ninth-century evidence for such a state makes its existence dubious at best.

Zuckerman's argument does not hold up to criticism. The first and most obvious problem with his argument is that there is no evidence of Charles Martel giving any of the land in Burgundy to any Jew, let alone a thriving community of Jews. Jewish ownership of land in the Lyonnais region could be easily understood if we recall that a Jewish community had been settled in and around Lyons dating from the Roman period. That a community so well rooted in the area should continue to inhabit the area after the change of political guard should not seem surprising.

Another issue raised by Zuckerman is slave law. Jewish law dictates that a Jew must convert a slave within a twelve month period, or he must sell the slave to a gentile. Any violation of this law was subject to a ten-fold penalty on the value of the slave. Therefore the Jews had an obligation and financial incentive to missionize and convert their slaves. Agobard's campaign could just as easily be seen as an effort to counter the very active missionizing of the Jews to their pagan slaves.

---

1See Zuckerman, A Jewish Princedom.

Another problem with Zuckerman’s thesis is the image that he paints of an impoverished and dying Church of Lyons: "Surprisingly, there is no evidence of the kind of concern for Lyons which Charlemagne exhibited in the form of generous grants to churches in other areas."\(^4\) Charlemagne sent Leidrad down to Lyons with the express purpose of rebuilding the church both literally and figuratively. By Leidrad’s own account, the Church of Lyons had been improved remarkably from its prior condition. This does not take into account that Lyons was one of the beneficiaries of Charlemagne’s will, or that Leidrad was a trusted official and personal friend of Charlemagne.\(^5\)

Bachrach sees Agobard as a churchman:

battling for the souls of Christians and pagans who were Judaizing and being converted to Judaism through the persuasive preaching, generous hospitality, economic prosperity, and coercive powers of the Jewish community in the Lyonnais.\(^6\)

While he also acknowledges that there were economic consequences to Agobard’s campaign, Bachrach sees them mainly as a side effect to a program of missionizing and maintenance of the Christian faith in his diocese.

Bachrach calls upon historians to remember that Agobard spent his formative years in Septimania and the Spanish March. These areas

\(^4\)Zuckerman, "Political Uses," 37.


\(^6\)Bachrach, Jewish Policy, 99.
were called a "brothel of blaspheming Jews" by Archbishop Julian of Toledo. He suggests that Agobard's experiences with the thriving Jewish communities of his childhood influenced his later conception of the Jewish community of Lyons. The suggested influence of the Spanish Church and its restrictive Jewish canons are corroborated in part by Lesné's reconstruction of the library of the Church of Lyons. In it, there were two copies of the Visigothic Code along with a copy of the Theodosian Code, a Breviary of Alaric, and a compilation of the canons of the church councils in Gaul.

These views deal with Agobard's anti-Jewish campaign as an isolated issue and do not take into account the bishop's other activities and writings. Agobard's writings include a tract on law in which he speaks out against trial by ordeal and calls for a unified secular law code for the Carolingian Empire. He wrote a response to the confession of Felix of Urgel to curtail the popularity and spreading of the Adoptionist heresy in Lyons.

7Bachrach, Jewish Policy, 102.
9Agobard, Adversus legem Gundobadi. Also see Agobard, De divinis sententiis. For his stance on trial by ordeal see S. Grelewski, La réaction contre les ordalies en France depuis le IXe siècle jusqu'au Decret de Gratien: Agobard, archevêque de Lyon et Yves, évêque de Chartres (Rennes, France: Imprimerie du Nouvelliste, 1924). The law code that Agobard wanted to see installed for the realm was the Salian law code.
10Agobard, Adversum dogma Felicis.
wrote a tract against the widespread belief in rain-makers in his diocese.\textsuperscript{11} He spoke out against the use of art and symbols for worships.\textsuperscript{12} He asserted the Church's prerogative over the Church's holdings, and demanded the restoration to the Church of all usurped property.\textsuperscript{13} As noted by Cabaniss, the root of the problem was that "Frankish law explicitly forbids such lay usurpation, but violators claim that local synods cannot legislate unless legates of Rome or the emperor are present."\textsuperscript{14} Agobard maintained that if the decisions reached by the local synods were in accordance with the Bible then they were to be received and obeyed. Agobard also maintained that "the emperor, of course, is not at fault, but his predecessors were" for the current dilemma, and hoped that the emperor would see and correct the error.\textsuperscript{15}

Agobard's anti-Jewish campaign is consistent with an over-all view of his entire body of work. Agobard saw the increased missionizing activity in Lyons as a threat to the orthodoxy and orthopraxy of his community. He saw that his efforts to missionize to the same slave population that the Jews were missionizing were

\textsuperscript{11}Agobard, \textit{De Grandine et Tonitruis}.

\textsuperscript{12}Agobard, \textit{Contra eorum superstitionem qui picturis et imaginibus sanctorum adorationis obsequium deferendum putant}, PL 104:199-228.

\textsuperscript{13}Agobard, \textit{De dispensatione ecclesiasticarum rerum}, PL 104:227-250.

\textsuperscript{14}Cabaniss, "Agobard of Lyons," 57.

\textsuperscript{15}Cabaniss, "Agobard," 57.
being blocked by the emperor himself. He saw the issue of Christian brotherhood being denied by those who would deny a slave to be baptized. He saw that his authority as bishop of his community was being overruled by secular authority, and he saw the Magister Iudaeorum as a symbol of the persecution of his church. For Agobard, it was clear that the emperor was overstepping his boundaries in issuing rights that were against canon law and the prerogatives of the Church.

The economic implications are there. Agobard did call for a boycott of Jewish goods. This can also be explained as a reaction to the market day being moved to Sunday to accommodate for the Jewish Sabbath. It could also be seen as a reaction to Christians buying foods that were ritually prepared by the Jews, thus limiting Christian participation in Jewish rituals. It could likewise be seen in general terms of limiting Christian exposure to the Jewish community which, theoretically, they would encounter rarely otherwise.

The Jewish community was growing and thriving, as evidenced by the construction of new synagogues in Lyons. The Jewish missionizing efforts were successful enough for Agobard to admit that his parishioners preferred the preaching of the rabbis to their Christian counterparts. Agobard's anti-Jewish campaign could be seen as a hard fought battle to stop the spread of the "Jewish contagion" in his diocese. It could also be seen as a heated political fight to decide who had primacy in areas where there were evident religious consequences.
Agobard's writings reflect a concern for the role of the Church in Carolingian society and the abuses that existed both within and without his diocese. The Jewish community posed several problems for Agobard, and he started his letter writing campaign in answer to them.

It is important to remember that Agobard's letters were just that—letters to prominent officials within the empire. He hoped to enlist their aid in curbing policies that he saw as dangerous to his church and community. Except for On Jewish Superstitions and Errors which was co-written with other bishops of the Council of Lyons of 829, the letters are short and assume that the reader was already familiar with the legal and theological arguments against the Jews and the emperor's pro-Jewish policies. Agobard rarely appealed to canon law in these shorter letters, preferring to rest his case on the authority of the biblical prooftexts that line these letters.

Amulo's subsequent campaign to get the bishops of the Paris-Meaux councils to include a canon that encompassed the whole of Agobard's arguments in the body of canons is evidence of the continued success of the Jewish community of Lyons. Amulo saw the opportunity to present the issue to a comparatively weaker Charles the Bald in the hope that he would rectify the errors committed by his father concerning the Carolingian Jewish policy. It is also possible that Amulo thought that his rapport with Charles the Bald was good enough that this canon would be passed. This relationship is outlined in a letter of Lupus of Ferrières dating from February of
The king therefore requests that he win from you, without loss to your position, the authority which was granted by the Pope at Rome (Zacharius) to his forefathers, whether kings or emperors, a power which has never to this day been abolished by the metropolitans of the church of Lyons over which, under God, you preside. If you do not refuse this request, he says that he will cause your ministry in his kingdom to win the respect which it has always deserved and to achieve its desired purpose.\textsuperscript{16}

Amulo may have thought that his recognition of Charles the Bald's prerogative in part of his see, which was notoriously loyal to Lothar, would result in the king's recognition of the bishop's authority over religious matters.

That Amulo's \textit{Liber contra Iudaeos} was the backbone to canon seventy-three of the Paris-Meaux councils is almost beyond doubt. He referred his arguments to such authorities as the Bible, secular law and past canons, much like canon seventy-three. There is one significant difference between the two: Canon seventy-three not only praises those Visigothic rulers who had established harsh policies towards the Jews, but also included canons drawn from the equally harsh Toletan councils. These are noticeably absent in Amulo's text. Although this does not refute Bachrach's suggestion, it does call into question the degree of influence that the Spanish Church had on

\textsuperscript{16}Lupus of Ferrières, \textit{The Letters of Lupus of Ferrières}, trans. Graydon W. Regnos (The Hague: Martinus Nijoff, 1966), 66. This letter is a request by Charles the Bald for recognition of his authority over the part of the Lyonnais diocese which fell under his jurisdiction. The see which Charles the Bald wanted to install his official was Autun. We also know from another of Lupus's letters that Charles the Bald confirmed the constitution of a synod and the decrees written by Amulo in reaction to a certain Godelgarius, p.56.
the anti-Jewish campaigns of Agobard and Amulo.

The policy laid down by Charlemagne and extended in scope by Louis the Pious concerning the Jews had definite economic advantages for the empire. The Jews were facilitated in their role as merchants by charters issued to ensure their rights to act as such. We know from a later life of Charlemagne that the image of Jew as merchant continued later in the dynasty.¹⁷ These policies were not in keeping with the long established traditions of the Church concerning the Jews. The polemics of Agobard and Amulo are a response to this breach of tradition.

¹⁷Notker the Stammerer, Charlemagne, in Two Lives of Charlemagne, trans. Lewis Thorpe (New York: Penguin Books, 1969). This anecdotal biography of Charlemagne was written around 884 and mentions Jews twice. The first time Charlemagne asks a Jewish merchant to help deceive a bishop by selling the bishop a painted mouse to show him the extent of the extent of the bishop’s pride, pp. 108-9. The second mention shows that a Saracen ship has been mistaken for a Jewish merchant ship, p. 158.
Appendix A

Chronology of Events
799 Leidrad made Bishop of Lyons.
804 Agobard chorepiscopus of Lyons.
814 Leidrad retires to St. Médard.
815 Leidrad's death (December 28).
816 Agobard made official Bishop of Lyons.
822 Diet of Attigny, Louis the Pious does first public penance.
823 Agobard at imperial court in regards to Jewish activity.
825 General charter of privileges sent to Jews of Lyons.
829 Council of Lyons.
830 First revolt. Diet of Nimwegen, Louis re-established.
831 Agobard made Abbot of St. Médard.
833 Second revolt. Diet of Compiegne, Louis does second public penance and imprisoned at St. Médard.
834 Louis restored. Agobard flees to Italy with Lothar. Amalarius of Metz in control of Lyonnais Church.
835 Diet of Thionville, Florus's protest against Amalarius.
838 Council of Kiersy, condemnation of Amalarius and return of Agobard to Lyons.
840 Agobard's death. Louis the Pious's death.
841 Amulo made Bishop of Lyons.
842 Oath of Strausburg (February 16).
843 Treaty of Verdun.
846 Final session of Paris-Meaux councils (February). Assembly at Epernay (June).
Appendix B

Jewish Charters
Let it be known to all bishops, abbots, counts, estates managers [gestaldiis], deputies, delegates, frontier officers, and also our itinerant missi and all our faithful, now and in the future, that we have admitted and retain under our protection these Hebrews, Rabbi Domatus and Samuel his nephew. Wherefore we decree and command through our present charter that neither you nor your subordinates nor your successors may presume to disturb the aforementioned Hebrews through any unlawful occasions or bring forth false accusations. Nor may you presume to remove or diminish anything of their belongings which they are seen to be legally invested at the present time. Nor may you presume to exact from the aforesaid Hebrews duties on commerce [teloneum], the requisition of horses for itinerant officers [paravereda], compulsory housing [mansionaticum], tolls [pulveraticum], traffic tax [cespitaticum], mooring duties [ripaticum], harbor dues [portaticum], bridge-toll [pontaticum], dues on traffic [trabbaticum], or dues for fishing [centicum]. Likewise, we have granted them that they may make exchanges from their belongings and may sell their property to whomever they should wish, and that they are permitted to live according to their law, and to hire Christian men to do their work, except on feast days and Sundays. They also have the right to buy foreign slaves and to sell

---

1. This is to compensate for damages done to fields and meadows.
2. This toll was probably collected at a stop bar.
them within our empire. If a Christian should have a claim or suit against them, he is to summon three worthy Christian witnesses, and similarly three worthy Hebrews for his testimony, and with these he is to make his case. And if they should have a claim or suit against a Christian, they are to produce three Christians for their testimony and with them make their case. Also these same Jews have advised Our Highness of certain men, who, contrary to the Christian religion, urge slaves of Hebrews to disdain their lords and to be baptized under the pretext of the Christian religion, so that they may be freed from the servitude of their lords. The holy canons by no means supports [such actions], on the contrary, they judge that perpetrators of such actions are to suffer the severe sentence of anathema. Therefore we decree that you may neither presume to do otherwise to the aforementioned Hebrews, nor permit or indeed command your subordinates to do it to anyone; because whoever shall perpetrate this, and should be brought to us, will not be able to escape without danger to himself and the loss of his belongings. And we want this to be known to you, so that from now on, because we have admitted the abovementioned Hebrews under our guardianship and protection, anyone who should conspire in their death or should kill any of them, while they were faithful to us, is to know that he is to pay ten pounds of gold to the office of our palace. And we decree that in no way are the aforesaid Jews to be tried by ordeal, neither by fire, nor by hot water, nor even by scourging, but it is permitted to them to live and act [ducere] according to their law.
Let it be known to all bishops, [abbots, counts, estate managers, deputies, delegates, frontier officers, and also our itenerant missi and all our faithful]¹ that we have admitted and retain under our protection these Hebrews at hand, David, and elder of David,⁴ and Joseph, and ... with their peers, living in the city of Lyons. On this account, we decree and command through our present charter that neither you nor your subordinates nor your successors may presume to disturb the aforementioned Hebrews through any unlawful occasions or bring forth false accusations, or dare to remove or diminish anything of their belongings, which they are seen to have from lawful gain, or with which they are seen to be lawfully invested at the present time in whatever places, or or to bring forth false accusations at any time whatsoever. Nor may they presume to exact from the aforesaid Hebrews duties on commerce [taloneum], the requisition of horses for itinerant officers [paravereda], compulsory housing [mansioaticum], tolls [pulveraticum], traffic tax [cespaticum], mooring dues [ripaticum], toll on wheeled traffic [rotaticum], harbor dues [portaticum], dues on traffic [trabbaticum],

¹The text reads "et cetera". I have filled in this phrase with the opening found in MGH, Formulae imperiales, 309-10, doc. 30.

⁴The text reads "nunnum Davitis." Footnote number 1 in MGH, Formulae imperiales, 310 states that Grengler has read nunnum to mean prolem or descendant of David. Bachrach uses this definition in his paraphrasing of the text in Jews in Barbarian, 68-9. This reading implies a high position among the Jewish community of Lyons, such as elder or exilarch.
bridge-toll [pontaticum] or payment for the right to pasture
[herbaticum]; but they are to be permitted to live peacefully under
our guardianship and defense and to serve faithfully the interests of
our palace. Likewise, we have granted them that they may make
exchanges from their belongings with whomsoever they should wish, and
they are permitted to live according to their law and to hire Chris-
tian men for their work, except on feast days and Sundays. They also
have the right to buy and sell foreign slaves within our empire, and
no one of the faithful may presume to baptize their foreign slaves
without their consent and willingness. If a Christian should have a
claim or suit against them, he is to obtain three suitable Christian
witnesses and similarly three suitable Hebrews for his testimony
against them. And if they should have a claim or suit against a
Christian, they are to produce Christian witnesses for their testimo-
ny, and they are to make their case with them. If any of them,
Christian or Jew, should desire to hide the truth, the count of that
place is to make each of them speak the truth by firm inquest accord-
ing to the law. And if there should arise or emerge against them any
cases concerning their affairs or slaves that cannot be resolved
within the locality without severe and unfair expense, those cases
are to be suspended and held over until they reach our
presence, so that they may receive there final sentence according to
the law. And we want this to be known to you all, so that now,
because we have taken the above mentioned Hebrews under our guardian-
ship and protection, that as long as they be faithful to us,
whoever should conspire in their death, or who has killed anyone of
them, is to know that he is to pay ten pounds to the office of our
palace; and no one may presume to submit the oft-mentioned Hebrews to
scourging, unless they should be proved, according to their law, to
have violated or invalidated the edicts that we have issued to be
observed by them, and in which it is similarly laid down for what
wrongs they are to be punished by scourging.

Number Three: MGH, Formulae imperiales, 325, doc. 52. after 825

Let it be known to all bishops, abbots, counts, deputies,
delegates, and the rest of our administrators that this Hebrew, named
Abraham, living in the city of Saragosa, coming into our presence,
has commended himself into our hands, and we have received and retain
him under our declaration of protection. On this account, we have
ordered this our present charter to be made for him, through which we
decree and command that neither you nor your subordinates nor your
successors may presume to disturb the aforementioned Hebrew through
any unlawful occasion or to bring forth false accusations or to
diminish or remove anything of his belongings or his merchandise at
any time, nor to exact duties on commerce [toleneum], the requisition
of horses for itinerant officers [paravereda], compulsory housing
[mansionaticum], tolls [pulveraticum], business dues [salutaticum],
or dues on traffic [trabaticum]; but it is permitted to him to live
peacefully under our guardianship and protection and to serve the
office of the palace faithfully without any unlawful opposition from
anyone. Also it is permitted to him to live according to his law and to hire Christian men to do his work, except on Sundays and feast days. And if a Christian should have a claim or suit against him, he is to summon three worthy Christian witnesses and similarly three worthy Hebrews for his testimony and with them make his case. And if he [Abraham] should have a claim or suit against a Christian, he is to call in three worthy Christians for his testimony and with them make his case. If anyone of them, Christian or Jew, should desire to obscure the truth, the count of that city is to make each one tell the truth through true and just inquest according to the law. Also it is permitted to him to buy foreign slaves and to sell them nowhere else but within our empire. Also if there should arise or has arisen against him or his men, who look to the law through him, any cases that it will not be able to be decided without heavy and unfair expense within his land [patriam], they are to be suspended and held over into our presence. There it will receive final sentence according to the law. So that this charter is believed to ge genuine by all and maintained diligently, we have ordered that it be signed in our customary fashion and sealed from our seal.
Appendix C

Table of Contents to Amulo's
Liber contra Iudaeos,
PL 116:141-84
Ch. 1. The danger of consorting with Jews for both the learned and the unlearned (col. 141).

2. The bishops must fight evil (col. 141).

3. All the faithful must consider and weigh carefully the perfidy and blasphemies of the Jews (col. 142).

4. Augustine's *De vera religione*. Enemies of the Church are the pagans, Jews, Manichaeans, Sabellians, and Arians. Augustine places the Jews with the heretics. They are worse than heretics and closer to pagans. Jews do not believe Jesus to be God, but a common man. They deny the virgin birth (col. 142).

5. More on Augustine's *De vera religione* (col. 143).

6. Jews as enemies to Christ. Mentions Irenaeus of Lyons and his anecdote of St. Polycarp. Jews went back to old festivals and sacrifices after the crucifixion (c. 144).

7. Jews observe the law and traditions of the Pharisees, but do not have the protection of God or the angels. Jews blaspheme Jesus in their synagogues (col. 144).

8. Two schools of Jewish thought, Scribes and Pharisees (col. 145).


10. Jews do not use Psalm 19 in their services (col. 146).


12. The Jews have two messiahs. The first is from the house of
David born when the Temple was destroyed and taken to Rome where he constantly works in a slavehouse. This messiah appeared to Joshua Ben Levi (col. 148).

13. Second messiah is from the tribe of Ephraim. This messiah will come at the end of their captivity and wage war against Gog and Magog, but will die in the battle and will greatly lamented by the Jewish people (col. 148).

14. Example of the falsified Hebrew text of the Bible versus Jerome's translation. The Jews are damned at the judgement for their impiety (col. 149).

15. The Jews are suffering eternal captivity for the killing of Christ (col. 150).


17. The messiah Ben David is not the true messiah because he did not suffer the prophesied crucifixion (col. 151).


20. The Jews believe that their captivity will end soon. Their pseudochrist (Ben David) will never die. He will appear suddenly in the clouds from his remote location (col. 153).

21. Jews denounce Jesus because he died, as opposed to Ben David who will never die (col. 154).


24. Attack on Josephus and Philo the Jew, who corrupt the meaning of the Scriptures. Church Doctors only adopted from these writers the parts of their work which corresponded to the true meaning (col. 156).

25. Jews say that Jesus was hung like a thief (col. 157).

26. Jews repeat Deut 21:22-23 to show that Jesus was damned. Augustine's Reply to Faustus the Manichaean (col. 158).

27. Jerome's translation of the Bible was not *ad verbum* but *ad sensum*. Original sin (col. 158).


33. Our damnation is double, being composed of our guilt and our punishment. More on original sin. Jesus was without guilt, because he did not sin. He undertook our punishment for our salvation. God arranged this before the creation of the world, and predicted this through his prophets (col. 163).

34. Jews did not show any respect for Christ and therefore do not receive the promised benediction. They contaminate and pollute the land which God gave them (col. 164).

35. Uses 2 Kings 21.6 and 21.14 to explain the nature of their polluting the land (col. 165).
36. Examples of prophetic scriptures which correctly understand the Passion and death of Christ (col. 165).

37. Jesus was not part of Adam's damnation and therefore suffered no damnation when he was crucified (see ch. 26). Augustine's Reply to Faustus the Manichaean (col. 166).

38. Examples of prophetic scriptures which correctly identify the Crucifixion (col. 167).

39. Jewish name of Jesus "Usum Hamizri" (Dissipator Egyptius) which Amulo believes is an attempt to link him with a false prophet from Egypt (col. 167).

40. Jews say that they took Jesus from his grave and dragged him through town thus explaining the empty tomb. Tree of Jesse. Even the Saracens recognize Christ. Jews say that Jesus is the son of Mary and Pandera (col. 168).

41. A list of arguments taken from Agobard against contemporary Jews (col. 170).

42. Example of Bodo's conversion to Judaism while a palace ecclesiastic under Louis the Pious (col. 170).

43. Desire for Christians to separate themselves from the contagion, as prescribed by canon law. A call to imitate Agobard (c. 171).

44. Desire to have the kings follow the old laws and canons. The Jews tend to their vineyards and make accursed wine instead of doing their civil duties (col. 172).

45. Augustine's Tracts on John the Evangile. Story of Sarah and
Hagar. Story of Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 3.96). Jewish slave owners punish the corpse and kill the soul (col. 172).

46. Augustine’s Epistle 204. Augustine says that the Jews are the worst heretics (col. 173).


48. Emperor Constantine. If a Jew circumcises a slave, he is to be freed. Julius Paulus, iurisconsultus of the Fifth (Roman) Senate (col. 175).


50. Gregory the Great’s letter to Theoderic and Theodebert, Frankish kings, stating Gregory’s amazement that Jews are allowed to own Christian slaves in their realms (col. 177).

51. Christians must not consort with Jews. All Jews are damned for killing Christ. Example of the Jews corrupting the text of Scriptures (col. 178).

52. Hilary of Poitiers did not even say hello to Jews (col. 180).

53. Life of St. Ambrose. A synagogue burnt down and St. Ambrose refused to rebuild it (col. 180).

54. The synagogue in ch. 53 was converted to Christian use (col. 181).

55. Council of Epaon (517), canon 15: Clerics not to consort
with Jews (col. 181).

56. Council of Agde (506), canon 40: Clerics and laity to avoid consorting with Jews (col. 182).

57. Council of Macon (581/3), canon 13: Jews not to be judges or tax collectors over Christians. Canon 14: Jews not to be in public during Easter. Canon 15: No Christians are to consort with Jews. Canon 16: Manumission price for slaves established at 12 sous (col. 182).


59. Conclusion (col. 183).

60. Conclusion (col. 184).
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