



Figure 1. Gospel book for Otto III, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4453, fol. 188v, (Lc 19, 41–44).

# Jesus wept! On the history of anthropophagy in Christianity

## *A new reading of a miniature from the Gospel book of Otto III as Kippfigur*

BEATE FRICKE

A miniature from the Munich gospel book of Otto III presents us with an idiosyncratic pictorial interpretation of a quotation from Luke. The manuscript with the four gospels was likely commissioned for Otto III early in the new millennium: It was written at Reichenau Abbey and decorated with twenty-nine page-size illuminations, representing forty-four individual scenes.<sup>1</sup> First, the composition links two temporalities (A.D. 70 and the “last days”) by their common setting, the city of Jerusalem. Second, it contains a unique subject in medieval manuscript illustration: the combination of Christ mourning the city’s future fall with the Maria Bethesuba anecdote from Flavius Josephus’ account, *The Jewish War*. Thirdly, the illumination challenges the reader/viewer with its tasks of interpellation, both textual and pictorial, by demanding a split perception as well as inducing a sort of double vision. This intertwining of textual and pictorial layers creates a spiraling, salient ambiguity—one that requires particular attention and asks for a beholder willing to attend to its multivalence.

In order to highlight the representational instability at play in the miniature I have chosen the term “ambiguous figure,” thereby translating the German *Kippfigur*. Ambiguous figures have played a major role in the psychology of perception since the dawn of the nineteenth century. One frequently reproduced *Kippfigur* is the duck-rabbit, first published in the *Fliegende Blätter* of October 23, 1892.<sup>2</sup> While the ambiguity of this particular figure relies heavily on its feathery appearance in the drawing, Wittgenstein, who took it from Joseph Jastrow’s chapter “The Mind’s Eye” in *Facts and Fables*

(1900), reduces its design to an ambiguous contour.<sup>3</sup> What is important for this study is that Wittgenstein differentiates between “continuous seeing” and the “dawning” of an aspect. While continuous seeing demands switching from one to the other aspect of the image (from duck to rabbit, the viewer cannot “see” both at the same time), the dawning aspects can merge and create a polyvalent meaning through various coexisting allusions. Medieval art often implies a multitude of dawning aspects. However, in this particular miniature, these aspects are too contradicting to merge completely, so that one can see only one or the other in a single instance: for example, Christ as a sovereign or a victim. Furthermore, Wittgenstein draws attention to the way the addressing of the picture (“Bildhasen,” “H-E-Kopf,” “Vexierbild”) changes one’s perception of it and describes how “the flashing of an aspect on us seems half visual experience, half thought.”<sup>4</sup>

While the interest of art historians in pictorial ambiguity has long been and still is a key to the artist’s play with polyvalence and multiple references,<sup>5</sup> I would like to take a different tack. A beholder of this particular miniature in the Munich gospel book does not see an expression of intentional ambivalence, but rather, is given the opportunity to switch from one aspect to the other. The viewer has to make a choice between two alternatives readings of the same image (duck or rabbit): she can *either* see continuously a representation of Christ having a vision of a future event (the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus’s soldiers) or can switch between dawning aspects—such as perceiving Christ as sacrifice or sovereign. If no one of these dawning aspects is

---

For their constructive criticism and stimulating suggestions, I thank Barbara von Flüe, Valentin Groebner, Eva Horn, Maja Naef, Stephen Stern, Ralph Ubl, and Gerhard Wolf.

1. The manuscript possesses twelve illuminated canon tables and four incipit pages. The illuminations are distributed evenly among the four gospels: Matthew (7), Mark (7), John (7), and Luke (8).

2. I. C. McManus, M. Freegard, J. Moore, and R. Rawles, “Science in the Making: Right Hand, Left Hand. II: The Duck-Rabbit Figure,” *Laterality: Asymmetries of Body, Brain and Cognition* 15, no. 1 (2010):166–185.

---

3. L. Wittgenstein, *Philosophische Untersuchungen*, ed. J. Schulte (Frankfurt a. M., 2001), pp. 1025–1029.

4. L. Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, trans. G. E. M. Anscombe (Oxford, 1958), p. 197.

5. U. Eco, *Opera aperta. Forma e indeterminazione nelle poetiche contemporanee* (Milano, 1962); D. Gamboni, *Potential Images. Ambiguity and Indeterminacy in Modern Art* (London, 2002); and V. Krieger and R. Mader, *Ambiguität in der Kunst. Typen und Funktionen eines ästhetischen Paradigmas* (Köln, 2010).

given a preference, the beholder has to decide which timeframe, narrative layer, or visual hint within the spiral of meanings to pursue. The Ottonian miniature's meaning resides in the oscillation of timeframes, narrative layers, and the ambiguity of Christ as a figure of the sovereign, standing within and yet outside the rule of law. As Wittgenstein has shown, the prior knowledge of the beholder contributes essentially to the reading of an ambiguous picture. To illuminate some of the visual, theological, and cultural discourses that would have informed the Ottonian miniature's beholder, this article addresses the historical polemics of anthropophagy between Jews and Christians as well as references to lesser known accounts including the topos of the destruction of Jerusalem.

So far, the miniature has been read by scholars as a polemical answer to Jewish allegations of Christian anthropophagy, the argument, which can only apply to later illustrations of Maria Bethzeuba eating her child—for example, in crusader manuscripts.<sup>6</sup> However, I situate the unique illustration in the historical context of the rising debates on the Eucharist, internal to Christianity at about the first millennium. Eating the host during the mass, which is miraculously transformed into the Body of Christ through transubstantiation, has an anthropophagic aspect. To justify this notion, theologians sought justification for Christian appropriation of sacrifice in a demarcation from Old Testament practices and understanding.

Christ mourns. His head is slightly bowed, his left cheek cradled by hands sheathed in sleeves (fig. 1). Four companions behind him look past him towards a fortification in the top half of the image, which symbolizes a city. Christ's attention, however, is focused on the city's extension below, connected by a strip of wall to the city above. What he perceives is not another city in another place, but rather in another, future time: He mourns Jerusalem's prospective fall. The Holy City is pictured twice in the miniature taken from the Munich Gospel Book of Otto III:<sup>7</sup> once "now"—that is, shortly

before Christ's arrest and thus in the temporality of St. Luke's gospel—and second, in the time of Titus's siege of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Though nowhere explicitly named, it is quite obviously the fall of Jerusalem described by Luke:

*Et, ut appropinquavit, videns civitatem flevit super illam dicens: Quia si cognovisses et tu, et quidem in hac die tua, quae ad pacem tibi! Nunc autem abscondita sunt ab oculis tuis. Quia venient dies in te, et circumdabunt te inimici tui vallo et circumdabunt te et coangustabunt te undique et ad terram prosternent te et filios tuos, qui in te sunt, et non reliquent in te lapidem super lapidem; eo quod non cognoveris tempus visitationis tuae.<sup>8</sup>*

The reader finds these lines from Christ's lamentation on the facing page; his ears ring with their accusatory tone; nonetheless the Christ upon whom he looks is silent. The insistent complaint is either yet unspoken or already pronounced, or perhaps it was only an internal monologue. Luke's gospel—not merely its illustration—situates Jerusalem's fall within the fate of humanity. Christ addresses principally the city of Jerusalem, and yet the often repeated "thou"—the possessive pronoun, which recurs no less than fourteen times in the course of its brief complaint—functions as a direct supplication and makes every reader a targeted listener: In Luke's inscription, Jerusalem becomes a personification; in the Ottonian illustration, it becomes a stage for a double vision. The ambivalence of Jerusalem (as city, as personification, and as future heaven) paves the way for reflection upon the hidden layers of meanings to be unfolded by the reading. The visual interpretation begins with Christ and follows the murals down to the represented city before turning back to Christ; this process engenders re-reading, encouraging the beholder to a second layer, that is, the reference to Jerusalem as heavenly city. The doubled abstraction of the city draws, via a "split" perception, the reader's attention to two "visions"—indeed two faculties of vision—implicit in the image. This "ambivalent stage" enables the beholder to perceive Christ as a *Kippfigur*, as I will demonstrate.

Christ's woeful words explicitly refer to the city's

6. K. A. Smith, "The Destruction of Jerusalem Miniatures in the Neville of Hornby Hours and Their Visual, Literary, and Devotional Contexts," in *Jewish Art 23: The Real and Ideal Jerusalem in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Art. Studies in Honor of Bezalel Narkiss on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. B. Kühnel (Jerusalem, 1998), pp. 179–202; and from the same author: "The Neville of Hornby Hours and the Design of Literate Devotion," *The Art Bulletin* 81 (1999):72–92.

7. Munich Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4453, fol. 188v. F. Mutherich, "Inhalt und Ikonographie der Bilder," in *Das Evangeliar Ottos III. Clm 4453 der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*, companion work to the facsimile edition with contributions from F. Dressler, F. Mutherich,

H. Beumann (Frankfurt a.M. 1978), pp. 69–134; and by the same author, "Zur Darstellung der Zerstörung Jerusalems im Evangeliar Ottos III," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 42 (1997):215–217; as a preliminary to this article see: B. Fricke, "Iss von meinem Leib! Zur Geschichte des Vorwurfes der Anthropophagie im Christentum," in *per imaginem. Bildlichkeit und Souveränität*, ed. Anne von der Heiden, Zürich/Berlin: Daphanes 2006:59–78.

8. Luke 19, 41–44, *Biblia Sancta iuxta vulgatam*, ed. R. Gryson et al. (Stuttgart, 1994). The author's emphasis.

yet unborn children, seen already hovering in mortal danger at the bottom of the picture. Evoking the coming fall, the reproach exploits a formula previously used to describe Sodom and Gomorrah and other cities, which succumbed to sin. No stone will remain standing in a Holy City like Sodom and Gomorrah, which by the Early Middle Ages had already become metaphors for faithlessness and the faithless, and thus also for every reader who doubts God's word. The blindness of his companions for that which Christ can (fore-)see [*nunc autem abscondita sunt ab oculis tuis*] takes on prime importance in St. Paul's treatment of sight and divine contemplation.<sup>9</sup> Whereas Paul prophesies a mirror, which exchanges its veil of tarnish for polish on the Day of Judgment (1 Cor. 13.12), here in Luke we see not a mirror, but a vision of the horrors accompanying the future destruction of Jerusalem. In the picture, the blindness of his company opens the eyes of the seer (the beholder of the miniature), playing upon the blindness of the Jews to the coming of the Son of God, the Messiah.

The amorphous substance, which lies below his and his fellow's feet, is ambiguous in its representational value. He either stands on a cloud as a visionary or on the bare earth (as indicated by the bottom part of the miniature as well as other representations of the bare ground in the same manuscript). The position of Christ's body is also ambiguous, which has interesting ramifications for the ontology of his bodily representation. The forthcoming bloodletting is not only implicit in the inner vision of Christ, but also explicit in the gesture of his humbly cloaked hands, which contrast with the bared hands of his disciples. The "good" sacrifice, brought by Abel with ritually covered hands, rather than with Cain's bared hands, is in this case Christ himself. Not only does he foresee the city's fall, his betrayal by his companion Judas, his denial by his disciples, and his crucifixion by his people, but he also envisions his own humanly body being sacrificed by his heavenly father.

The privileged subject of the miniature from the Munich book is this last prophecy, as shown by its lower half. To illustrate St. Luke's text, an unusual parallel was chosen, unique within Ottonian art. A second story was inserted into the picture, a story recounted by the Jewish historiographer Flavius Josephus in the sixth

9. 1 Cor. 13, 9–12: "*Videmus nunc per speculum in aenigmate, tunc autem faciem ad faciem*" (For now we see through a glass, darkly, but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known). See G. Wolf, *Schleier und Spiegel. Traditionen des Christusbildes und die Bildkonzepte der Renaissance* (München, 2002), p. 158.

chapter of his opus *The Jewish War*.<sup>10</sup> That story tells of Maria Bethzuba, who, crazed by famine during the Roman siege of Jerusalem, slaughters her own child. After having eaten of "her own flesh" herself, she offers the remains to soldiers attracted by the grill's aroma.<sup>11</sup> The story can alternatively be read as a polemical paraphrase of the Christian notion of the son sacrificed by his divine father, the son who "invents" the Eucharist to memorialize this sacrifice.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, the "desperate" Mary demonstrates *ex negativo* the positive example of the "sad, but hopeful" Mary, the mother of Christ. Due to the analogy of the names, his reference functions like a typological link between the

10. The Aramaic original was first set down after A.D. 77 by the Jewish historiographer Flavius Josephus and thereafter initially translated into Greek. The Latin paraphrase in the fourth century ascribed to a certain Hegesippus—presumably a (con-)fusion of the saint and the historiographer—presents a revision with markedly anti-Jewish tone entitled "*De Excidio Urbis Hierosolymitanae*." For greater detail, see M. E. Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source in Patristic Literature through Eusebius* (Atlanta, 1989), p. 46; for its medieval reception, see S. K. Wright, *The Vengeance of Our Lord. Medieval Dramatizations of the Destruction of Jerusalem* (Toronto, 1989). The author is certainly not Ambrosius, but rather, as Heinz Schreckenberg suggests, the converted Jew Isaac spoken of by Hieronymus (Comm. in Epist. ad Titum 3,9) whom Theodor Zahn ("*Der Ambrosiaster und der Proselyt Isaak*") *Theologisches Literaturblatt* (1899):313ff.) identifies as the same Isaac who brought accusation against Pope Damasus in A.D. 372. Hegesippus both dilutes and condenses Josephus throughout the text. The speeches are particularly liberally reworked and endowed with an unambiguously anti-Jewish character. The fall of Jerusalem and the Temple's destruction by Titus are thus cast as "just comeuppance" for Jewish perfidy and Christ's killing. See H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld* (1.–11. Jh.) (Bern et al. 1982), pp. 310f.

11. The treatment of this theme is unique in Ottonic art. Concerning Carolingian times, we are informed only thanks to a preserved titulus of a since lost mural representation in St. Gallen. See J. von Schlosser, *Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der karolingischen Kunst* (Wien, 1896), p. 329. As scholarly hors d'oeuvre to the topic of anthropophagy I recommend W. Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth. Anthropology & Anthropophagy* (Oxford et al., 1979); P. Bonnassie, "*Consummation d'aliments immondes et cannibalisme de survie dans l'occident du haut moyen age*," *Annales ESC* (1989):1035–1056; *Eating Their Words. Cannibalism and the Boundaries of Cultural Identity*, ed. K. Guest (New York, 2001), pp. 1–9; *Verschlungene Grenzen. Anthropophagie in Literatur- und Kulturwissenschaften*, ed. A. Keck, I. Kording, A. Prochaska, A. (Tübingen, 1999); H. Peter-Röcher, *Mythos Menschenfresser. Ein Blick in die Kochtöpfe der Kannibalen* (Munich, 1998); *Kannibalismus und europäische Kultur*, ed. H. Röckelein (Tübingen, 1996), and D. Fulda, "Einleitung. Unbehagen in der Kultur. Behagen an der Unkultur. Ästhetische und wissenschaftliche Faszination der Anthropophagie," in *Das andere Essen. Kannibalismus als Motiv und Metapher in der Literatur*, ed. W. Pape (Freiburg i.Br., 2001), pp. 7–50.

12. Matthew 26, 26–28, Mark 14, 22–24, and Luke 22, 19–20, and 1 Cor. 11, 23–30.

Old and the New Testament, only without the prophetic notion: Flavius Josephus and the evangelists had been writing more or less at the same time. Once again, the betrayal of those closest to the victim—mother, disciples, father—is emphasized. With the evocation of the self-sacrifice of flesh and blood in the ritual of the Lord's Supper [*hoc est corpus meum—hic est enim sanguis meus*],<sup>13</sup> we are reminded anew of the procured promise of the redemption from sin, particularly from Original Sin. That analogy is reinforced when one compares the justification of the Lord's Supper in John<sup>14</sup> with the story of the Garden of Eden in Genesis,<sup>15</sup> that is, when one compares dietetic imperative to dietetic injunction—while in Genesis God forbids eating (from the tree of wisdom), his son instructs his followers in the gospels to eat (his body). In both cases ingestion is a matter of eternal life, divine law, and true vision: In paradise, a divine injunction prohibits the pursuit of absolute knowledge, whereas in the New Testament it is Christ's commandment to consume his flesh—that is, to eat bread in order to commemorate the remission of Original Sin and in so doing to know and to realize the truth of the divine promise.

The Munich gospel book's miniature alludes, via iconographic tradition, to another child sacrifice, one arrested at the last moment. Three elements, known from other representations of the sacrifice of Isaac, dating from the period towards the end of the first millennium, informed this image: Maria Bethzeuba's one hand raised to deal a mortal blow, her child's head held firmly in the other, and the stump of wall, which can be read as an altar-block. The standard conventions for depicting divine agency, shown as either the hand of God or a salvific angel, are notably absent here. In contrast, in images of Abraham and Isaac, the divine agent intervenes in the action to interrupt the sacrifice and instruct the

obedient father, Abraham, to sacrifice a ram instead of his own son. One could say that Christ above—veiling his hands and (physically) motionless—assumes this position.<sup>16</sup> One observes soldiers fighting right and left and victims of the famine—but God is absent/not acting: He has forsaken the Holy City. This allusion can be read as a double barb: first against Judaism's sacrificial cult, and second against the blind obedience of the Jews, whereby they sacrifice rather than recognize the Messiah. Jerusalem, shown as the abbreviation of the city in the lower part of the miniature, is surrounded and invaded by soldiers. Attackers and defenders (Romans and Jews) are indistinguishable, both clad in the same, relatively modern armor: chain mail extending to the upper thighs, shining metal helmets, red and green shields. They deploy their lances with verve and carry crossbows, axes, and stone slings. The mass of Roman besiegers is parted in the middle to reveal three corpses on the ground. These are the victims of famine in the city beleaguered by Titus's mercenaries, as is revealed by a fourth body, which arrives pitched over the city walls.

As the earliest western depiction of the fall of Jerusalem, the miniature from the Munich gospel book of Otto III is exceptional in many other ways. Whereas manuscript illustrations from the time of the crusades tend towards an alliance of two events in different times, an overlaying and relaying of recent events with the "historical" event,<sup>17</sup> such as Jerusalem's reconquest and final loss and its conquest by Titus, the earliest extant Western illustration of that event was produced before the first crusade was proclaimed. The manuscript contains the four gospels, not a text of Flavius Josephus. Furthermore, it is the only reference in this manuscript to the writings of the Jewish author as well as its only miniature that uses for the illustration a story not taken from the gospels' accounts. The miniature's focal theme is thus Christ's mourning for Jerusalem, not the latter's "loss" or the hope of its reconquest. The subtle interplay and reciprocity of image and text, intertwining Luke's

13. The story of Jerusalem and Samaria in Ezekiel 23, 37, might have served as inspiration for Flavius Josephus. The sisters Oholah and Oholibah, who stand for Samaria and Jerusalem, respectively, practice adultery, fornicate, and kill their children: "[T]hat they have committed adultery, and blood is in their hands, and with their idols have they committed adultery, and have also caused their sons, whom they bare unto me, to pass for them through the fire, to devour them." Directly following this passage the siege of Jerusalem is announced.

14. John 6, 53–54: "Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Who so eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

15. Gen. 2, 16–17: "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

16. I would like to thank one of the anonymous readers for this observation.

17. See Smith (note 6); see also M. L. Price, *Consuming Passions. The Uses of Cannibalism in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (London, 2003), esp. the chapter "The Maternal Monstrous. Cannibalism at the Siege of Jerusalem," pp. 65–82, previously published separately as "Imperial Violence and the Maternal Monstrous. Cannibalism at the Siege of Jerusalem" in *Domestic Violence in Medieval Texts*, ed. E. Salisbury et al. (Florida, 2002), pp. 272–298. For the story's reception in Serbian and Russian versions of the Hamartolos Chronicles, see S. Worth, "Cannibalistic Infanticide in Jerusalem," *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 7 (1985):267–270.

account and a Jewish historian's account, are manifest in the artist's refined treatment of Jerusalem's fall.

Wittgenstein's thoughts on *Kippfiguren* help us understand the salience of this miniature's multivalency, that is, Christ's gesture, his physical position as well as his temporal situation outside the historical events represented, and anxieties about anthropophagy and its pictorial residues.<sup>18</sup> The openness of the pictorial layers, the playful disposition of personification and historical protagonists, the counter-play and mutual neutralization of eschatology and revisitation of Christ's prescience and past heathen crime all fuse harmoniously within this singular creation. The coherence of this Ottonian image is the result of a balance of several figurative ambiguities held in uncertain suspension: Christ especially, as a prototype of the sovereign simultaneously standing within and outside the rule of law.<sup>19</sup> As sovereign unconstrained by law, he simultaneously arranges that there will be no bounds to the law, no truth and knowledge beside or bypassing him (thus no Roman or Hebrew law). This engenders paradoxical boundaries, containing restrictions on the one hand, which are binding and constitutive for a universal scale of values borne by him ("Thou shalt not eat thy fellow man!"), but on the other hand imperatively commanding their symbolic transgression in the interests of the duties imposed by the faith ("Eat of my flesh!"). It is hardly possible to express more succinctly in pictorial form the allusions to inclusion and exclusion with their corresponding layering devices.

The Ottonian miniature thereby alludes to some fundamental motives of sovereignty implicated in a more profound conflict within Christianity: What is a just sacrifice and how do Christians differentiate themselves from Jews in this question? Christ is the "last" sacrifice, his death on the cross signals the obsolescence for Christians of the Jewish tradition of offering a living sacrifice (generally lambs and rams, less frequently firstborn humans).<sup>20</sup> In memory of this ultimate sacrifice, Christians celebrate the Lord's Supper. They recall,

18. L. Wittgenstein, *MS 144 (Philosophische Untersuchungen, Teil II)*, in *Philosophische Untersuchungen, Kritisch-genetische Edition*, ed. J. Schulte (Frankfurt a.M., 2001), § xi a7, p. 1025.

19. Giorgio Agamben further developed Carl Schmitt's idea of the sovereign being subject to law and standing outside of it at the same time: "This means that the paradox can be thus restated: 'Law is external to itself,' or, 'I, the sovereign, who stands outside law, declare that law is ubiquitous.'" G. Agamben, *Homo sacer. Die souveräne Macht und das nackte Leben* (Frankfurt a.M., 2002), p. 25.

20. L. Wilkens, "Opfer und Opferbeschaffung im christlichen Kult," in *Kannibalismus und europäische Kultur* (see note 11), pp. 61–74.

via a mimetic act, the Passion's point of departure, reenacting the memorial rite introduced by Christ himself ("This do in remembrance of me!" Luke 22, 19). This mimesis initiates and steers—via its "abduction" of the participants in another, symbolic reality—the perception of the ritual as a symbolic act: The bread is the sacrificial body by means of the liturgy, that is, the acts of the priest. But only the faithful are able to perceive and to benefit from it. Christ's role is enacted by the priest who repeats his words, instructing us, his disciples, to eat and drink of his body and blood so as to partake of everlasting life (John 6, 53–55).

This leads us to the decisive question: Is the miniature from the Munich gospel book to be read as an "answer," a reaction to Jewish allegations of Christian anthropophagy as it has been done so far,<sup>21</sup> or is it a pictorial relict of a controversy within Christianity concerning the cannibalistic impulse contained in the Eucharist? To answer this question, it is necessary to distinguish between ritual cannibalism (cannibalism as declaration of faith)<sup>22</sup> and the frantic act of a starving individual (survival cannibalism).<sup>23</sup> Maria Bethzeuba has lost all hope for herself and her child and oversteps the boundaries of human conduct in absolute despair. Interestingly, "Rabbinic parallels to the tale of the woman under siege are far less gruesome than the Deuteronomic and the Josephan account."<sup>24</sup> For Maria in the latter account, law has lost its authority and she behaves inhumanly, almost like an animal—that is,

21. Smith (see note 6), and M. L. Meuwese, "Representations of Jerusalem on Medieval Maps and Miniatures," in *Studies on Byzantine and post-Byzantine art*, ed. W. Deluga and M. Janocha. Proceedings of the symposium "Proskyneteria: Pilgrim's Souvenirs from the Holy Land" (Leuven e.a.: Peeters, 2005), pp. 139–148. For a more differentiating perspective and the later period, see A. R. Meyer, *Medieval Allegory and the Building of the New Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 2003), and S. Schein, *Gateway to the Heavenly City. Crusader Jerusalem and the Catholic West (1099–1187)* (Aldershot e.a.: Ashgate, 2005).

22. P. R. Sanday, *Divine Hunger. Cannibalism as a Cultural System* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 3–6.

23. Concerning the significance of the distinction between human and animal sacrifice, see R. Girard, *Das Heilige und die Gewalt* (Frankfurt a.M., 1999), pp. 22–27; for mankind's ability to indeed distance itself from the animal kingdom and yet not from animals (as individual species), see J. Derrida, "L'animal que donc je suis (à suivre)," in M.-L. Mallet, *L'animal autobiographique: autour de Jacques Derrida* (Paris, 1999), pp. 251–301. On p. 300: "Deux singuliers généraux, d'abord: le 'je' et 'l'animal' désignent au singulier, précédé d'un article défini, une généralité indéterminée" and p. 253: "A passer les frontières seules fins de l'homme je me rends à l'animal."

24. B. L. Visotzky, "Most Tender and Fairest of Women. A Study in the Transmission of Aggada," *The Harvard Theological Review* 76 (1983):403–418, here p. 408.

she no longer respects the rules of civilization. She exercises a violence prohibited by human society. What distinguishes her then from the soldiers around her? Both Maria and the soldiers are violent and kill. The decisive difference is that the soldiers kill in the service of their society: their violence is directed against “enemies,” not “friends,” to say nothing of their own children.<sup>25</sup> Walter Burkert has advanced the theory that all regulation and forms of authority in human society are based upon institutionalized violence.<sup>26</sup> The manner of Christ’s portrayal—standing above all displays of violence and obeying his own law alone—indicates that he effectively condemns both forms of violence visible in the picture’s lower half. The ritual of the Lord’s Supper, however, sublimates both. On the one hand, the slaughter of Christ is the result of the application of Roman and Jewish jurisdictions (Herod and Caiphas) and is analogized by the miniature’s vision in the combat of Romans and Jews for Jerusalem. On the other hand, Maria Bethzuba’s despairing infanticide must be read as God the Father’s sacrifice of his own son. The reference to the Lord’s Supper presents her as a counter-image of Christian emulation of Christ’s example in the picture’s upper half, as his inverted or negated alter ego.

Let us return to our miniature and the equivocal question: Does the Ottonic representation imply an anti-Jewish stance? Is it to be seen as a pictorial attempt to legitimize “holy violence,”<sup>27</sup> as one assumes for later representations of the same theme? Solely the reworking of the Jewish Wars by the so-called Hegesippus in the fourth century strikes unambiguously anti-Jewish undertones.<sup>28</sup> Illustrations of Maria Bethzuba killing/

eating her child appear in chronicles as well as in Hegesippus manuscripts dating from the time of the crusades.<sup>29</sup> These younger miniatures use the reference to Maria Bethzuba to enhance the cruelty of a war scene. Beginning in the fourteenth century, the illustrations focus exclusively on the transgression of Maria and show only her sitting at a grill, flames licking the limbs of her child. The question is, however, whether the Ottonian illustration was inspired by Flavius Josephus’s text or by that of the clearly anti-Jewish version of the so-called Hegesippus? Can one regard it as a parting shot in the revival of the *Adversos-Judaeos* debates, which arose anew in the eleventh century to persist for the next two centuries?<sup>30</sup> In order to settle these questions, we shall consider written sources and their “literary” imagery, which accompany the debate

---

mind of any whatsoever barbarous and impious person? [. . .] Fierce hunger poured itself into her innermost being, irritated her humors, stirred up her mind. The woman had a small infant, which she had given birth to. Aroused by its crying which she saw to weaken herself and the child terribly, over come by such great barbarity unequal to such a cruel misfortune she lost her mind and the practice of motherly tenderness forgotten she submerged her grief, took up madness. [. . .] Saying which she at the same time uncovered the scorched limbs and presented them for eating with an exhortation of this type of speech: ‘This is my lunch, this is your portion, look carefully that I have not cheated you. Behold one hand of my boy, behold his foot, behold half of the rest of his body, and lest you think otherwise, he is my son, you should not think it the work of another, I did it, I carefully divided it, I ate what was mine, I saved what was yours. You have never been sweeter to me, my son. I owe you that I am still alive. Your sweetness has held my mind. It has put off for your pitiable mother the day of death. You came to the rescue in a time of starvation, you are the gift of the greatest old age, you are the restrainer of the killers. They came about to kill, they became table companions. And they themselves will hold what they owe to you, since they have consumed my banquet. But why do you give back a step, why are you horrified in mind?’” English translation by Wade Blocker taken from [http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/hegesippus\\_05\\_book5.htm](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/hegesippus_05_book5.htm). For the Latin original, see *Hegesippi qui dicitur historiae libri V*, ed. V. Ussani (Wien/Leipzig, 1932) (= *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 66), pp. 381–384.

29. See Smith (note 6), H. Schreckenberg, *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter* (Leiden, 1972) (= *Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums* 5) and “Josephus und die christliche Wirkungsgeschichte seines ‘Bella Judaicum,’” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, II 21.2, ed. H. Temporini, W. Haase (Berlin et al. 1984), vol. 2, pp. 1106–1217.

30. See Schreckenberg (note 10) and his *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos Texte (11.–13. Jh.)*. *Mit einer Ikonografie des Judenthemas bis zum 4. Laterankonzil* (Bern et al., 1988) and *Christliche Adversus-Judaeos-Bilder. Das Alte und Neue Testament im Spiegel der christlichen Kunst* (Frankfurt a.M., 1999); A. Trepper, “The Fate of Jewish Historiography after the Bible. A New Interpretation,” in *History and Theory* 43 (2004):179–197.

---

25. Concerning the meaning of friend and foe and the resulting societal imperatives, see C. Schmitt, *Der Begriff des Politischen. Mit einer Rede über das Zeitalter der Neutralisierungen und Entpolitischen* (München, 1932), p. 1f.

26. The relationship between civil and religious law is constituted in “bloody” violence: “Within the group peace must reign, that which is commanded elsewhere is crime here. Order prevails inside, the extraordinary being unleashed outside; [. . .] sacralization and desacralization around a center where human community is founded upon combat, blood, and death.” W. Burkert, *Homo necans. Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen* (Berlin/New York, 1972), p. 30; also: “Order is founded, validated precisely by the contrast to that which preceded it. The experience of killing reveals the sanctity of life, a life which finds in death its nourishment and thus its survival. In ritual this paradox is fixed, played out, and generalized [. . .].” *Ibid.*, p. 490.

27. “It is violence which informs the saint’s heart and soul.” See Girard (note 23), p. 51.

28. Hegesippus, *De Excidio Urbis Hierosolymitana*, 5, 40, 1–41, 2: “What shall I say against the deed of Maria, which will horrify the

since Tertullian.<sup>31</sup> It will be of particular interest to determine whether these involve historically authentic disputes between Jews and Christians.

In his defense of Christianity in his *Apologeticum*, Tertullian recounts the accusation made against Christians by heathens: accounts of Christians slaughtering children, dipping bread in their freshly spilled blood, and the consumption of these blood-drenched morsels. And in this context, he recalls the much-related scene from a consecration ceremony in which the child is brought to whimper before it is sacrificed (“*infans tibi, qui adhuc vagit, necessaries*”).<sup>32</sup> Tertullian describes this proceeding in the form of a citation whose author he does not name. He lets the *fama* speak, after denouncing its effect and dissemination. He doesn’t specify the pagan accusers, but previously and subsequently mentions accusations by Romans. Certain accusations against Jews, such as their alleged cynocephaly, are no doubt later, anti-Jewish interpolations. He thus paraphrases the defamatory rumors about Christians:

Come hither, friend, and plunge your dagger into the heart of this innocent, who can deserve no punishment, who can be no man’s foe, and who may be every man’s son, considering our indiscriminate embraces. Or if another is to officiate in this bloody service, suppose yourself applied to after this sort: Come hither, and standby only while I make the sacrifice; behold me dispatching an infant off the stage in the very first act of life; see me sending the new soul flying out of the body before it was well in; do you gather up the rude indigent blood, and sop your bread liberally

31. For more recent medieval accounts, in which anthropophagy or its accusation figure, see H. Blurton, *Cannibalism in High Medieval English Literature* (New York, 2007), J. Marvin, “Cannibalism as an Aspect of Famine in Two English Chronicles,” in M. Carlin and J. T. Rosenthal, *Food and Eating in Medieval Europe* (London/Rio Grande, 1998), pp. 73–86; J. Tattersall, “Anthropophagi and Eaters of Raw Flesh in French Literature of the Crusade Period: Myth, Tradition, and Reality,” *Medium Ævum* 57 (1988):240–253; L. Rossi, “Suggestion métaphorique et réalité historique dans la légende du coeur mangé. Comprend une nouvelle édition du ‘Long temps ai estat cubertz’ de Raimbaut d’Aurenga,” in *Micrologus: Natura, scienze e società medievali*. *Nature* 11 (2003):469–500; L. F. Cordery, “Cannibal Diplomacy: Otherness in the Middle-English Text ‘Richard coerdelion,’” in A. Classen, *Meeting the Foreign in the Middle Ages* (New York/London, 2002), pp. 153–171.

32. In analogy to Christ: the plaintive while comprehending sacrificial victim. See Tertullian: *Apologeticum*, chaps. 7, 8. This and following citations from the ed. of Heinrich Hoppe (Wien/Leipzig 1889), p. 22. See also Tertullian: *Ad nationes*, I, 7, 31–33; and *ibid.*, I, 15, 2, ed. J. W. P. Borleffs (Turnhout, 1954) (= *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* 1).

in that wine, and indulge freely upon the flesh; [ . . . ] if you are thus initiated, and continue firm in the practice of these rules, you shall live for ever.<sup>33</sup>

Tertullian’s reply to this accusation is initially to doubt its sincerity: Whoever might believe such an exhortation could nonetheless never intend its execution and would in any case remain incapable of its consummation. He argues thereby in the belief of universally binding boundaries for human conduct:

Answer me now to the question proposed, Can you purchase heaven upon these terms? If not, if you feel nature recoil, and your soul shrinks at the proposal of such things, you can never think them credible in us. Did you but believe them, I am confident you would not do them; but did you believe them, and had an inclination to do them, I am of opinion that your very humanity would not suffer you to perpetrate such facts; and if you find too many misgivings in yourselves for the performance of such commands, why do you not conclude the same reluctance in others? Or if you can not be unnatural enough for these things, why should you judge others can?<sup>34</sup>

Humanity results precisely from this bounded nature of human conduct; a transgression would only be possible for Christians were they non-human, for example, composite beings. He asks himself whether they—Christians—are something else, whether they be “like the Cynopse or Sciapodes, with different rows of teeth for devouring, and different instruments for incest, from all other men?” In a final rhetorical escalation, he turns the accusation against its authors: Only someone who could conceive such an abomination could be capable of it:

Certainly, if you believe such actions possible for others, you may believe them possible for yourselves, you being men, as we Christians are; but if you feel this impossible in nature, you ought to give no credit to the report, because Christians and heathens have the same humanity.<sup>35</sup>

Franz Dölger places Tertullian’s advocacy in the context of other authors who sought to counter the accusation of anthropophagy, which had often been brought against Christians since the mid-second century.<sup>36</sup> One can read

33. Tertullian *Apologeticum* chaps. 2, 8. English translation taken from Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, trans. W. M. Reeve (London, 1889), p. 28.

34. *Ibid.*, chaps. 7, 8.

35. *Ibid.*, chaps. 8, 9.

36. Franz-Josef Dölger hypothesizes that Christians were suspected of being magicians and thus exposed to the accusation of ritual infanticide. In the magic papyrus he produces as evidence, however, the consecrational sacrifice is not that of a child but of a rooster. See F.-J. Dölger, “Tertullian über die Bluttauf,” *Antike und Christentum* 2 (1930):117–141.

similar apologies from Justinus, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus of Antioch.<sup>37</sup> The Letter of the Churches of Lyon and Vienne also recounts the leveling of accusations of anthropophagy by heathen slaves against their Christian masters. Writing at the same time, Minucius Felix embroiders the rumor that circulated about the Christians' Lord's Supper ritual. A child is bestrewn with flour, an initiate is assigned the butcher's task, the blood is then drunk greedily, and the flesh is distributed.<sup>38</sup> This story is then recycled by Augustine in his description of heretics from Asia Minor:

Of the Cataphrygians dreadful sacraments are reported. It is said that they mix with flour the blood of a one year old child, blood taken from tiny cuts made upon his entire body, thus fashioning the bread thereof for their Eucharist. Should the child die of this treatment, he is considered a great martyr, should he survive it, a great priest.<sup>39</sup>

Here Augustine directs the tendentiously damning story of children bled for hosts at the Cataphrygians, a sect founded by Basilides, and by no means at Jews or heathens. In his version, the accusation brought by other communities becomes a distanciation from deviant notions and practices of the Eucharist within Christianity and its derivative sects.

Neither Tertullian's apology nor Minucius's Octavius display clearly anti-Jewish tendencies; equally unbiased are the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, which relate the martyrdom of the apostle Matthew in the "anthropophagic" city of Myrna. They tell of a king who ordered soldiers, whose custom it was to consume human flesh, to dismember and devour alive the apostle and his companions, a plan thwarted by the touch of a child (Jesus) who intervenes from the heavens.<sup>40</sup>

37. Justinus, *Apologia*, I, 26, 7, also in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* IV, 8, 5; Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, 25, 3; Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis*, 3, 34, 35; Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolyicum*, 3, 4; also the Lugdunum martyrs account, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* V, 1, 52. See Dölger (ibid.), pp. 117–141.

38. Felix Minucius, *Octavius* 9, 5. The conspicuous parallels between *Octavius* and the *Apologeticum* have led to embroiled debate about the dependencies between the two texts.

39. Aurelius Augustinus, *De haeribus ad quod vult deum*, ed. R. van der Plaetse and C. Beukers (Turnhout, 1969) (= Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 46), pp. 263–345, here: 26, p. 302.

40. R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden. Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Literaturgeschichte* (Braunschweig, 1883), pp. 550–553; *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung. Apostolisches. Apokryphen und Verwandtes*, ed. W. Schneemelcher (Tübingen, 1989), vol. 2, p. 401, for further references. Gregory of Tours is probably the last recipient; see ibid., *Liber de miraculis beati Andreae apostoli*, in *Opera*

Interestingly, the cannibals in question are not the inhabitants of far-away Myrna, but their mercenaries. Although distant Myrna's sovereign is capable of imposing the gruesome sentence of being eaten alive, the subjects in his jurisdiction are incapable of executing the outrage. His sentence, combining the death penalty with what is most inhumane—cannibalism—must be executed by foreign mercenaries, absolved from his law.

Nevertheless, neither the accusation of anthropophagy nor its defamatory instrumentalization are Christian inventions. Numerous examples of both can be found in Greek mythology and Roman sources,<sup>41</sup> and I remind here briefly of two. In Dion Cassius's description of the Catalina conspiracy, the consul Antonius is summarily characterized by his weakness for boys' flesh. He is represented as having oaths pronounced over the entrails of boys he has slaughtered before consuming their flesh. To illustrate the cruelty of the tyrant Apollodorus of Alexandria, Diodorus recounts in 279 B.C. how the former calls a befriended boy as if to sacrificial duty, only to slaughter him—his own friend—as a sacrifice to the gods, and to share the entrails with his co-conspirators. They drink the blood mixed with wine.<sup>42</sup> Thus until the eleventh century—excepting the fourth-century Hegesippus—no evidence can be found for decidedly anti-Jewish reactions to possible Jewish accusations of

*Gregorii Turonensis*, 2 vols. (Hannover 1885) (= *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* 1), p. 824.

41. See M. Halm-Tisserant, *Cannibalisme et immoralité. L'enfant dans la chaudière en Grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1993).

42. Diodorus: *Fragmenta*, lib. 22, VI, 60f. About the bloodied chalice and antique prefigurations of blood and wine in the cup (Sallust), the conspiracy as consecration scene (Livius), see F. Dölger, *Die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit und der Schwarze. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Taufgelöbnis* (Münster, 1918). Christian Kornholt at the end of the seventeenth century posed the question of the origin of the accusations of child cannibalism; see C. Kornholt, *De vita et moribus Christianis primaevae per gentium malitiam affectis, liber* (Kiloni, 1683), pp. 94–151. Wormius, on the other hand, presumes that the accusation of anthropophagy arose from the early Christian tradition of visiting cemeteries and the graves of martyrs—see Wormius, *De veris causis cur delectatos humanis carnibus et promiscuo concubiti christianos calumniata sint ethnici, Hafniae* 1695, published by J. C. Martini, *Thesaurus dissertationum* II, 2 (Nürnberg, 1766), pp. 18–67. He concludes that Pliny alludes to the heathen "Thyestean Feast" accusation. The often-repeated opinion of Eusebius, that the origin of the defamation derives from the misdoings of Carpocratians and Basilideans, is confounded by the fact that the accusation was known in the first century and thus previous to Pliny's letter. Concerning the modern-day history of discoursing upon "internal" Eucharist controversies in the face of external anthropophagy accusations, see J. P. Waltzing, "Le crime rituel reproché aux chrétiens du II<sup>e</sup> siècle," in *Bulletins de la classe des lettres et sciences morales et politiques*, 5e ser., 11 (1925):205–239.

Christian cannibalism arising from late antique or early medieval writings addressing the Lord's Supper ritual.<sup>43</sup> And no writings against Jews since late antiquity from the pens of John Chrysostomos (fourth century), Isidore of Seville and Julian of Toledo (both seventh century), or the Lyon bishops Agobard and Amulus (ninth century) treat the accusation of anthropophagy made by Jews against Christians. Written sources rather make reference to smoldering conflicts within Christianity, which ignite around the eucharistic problem. The Munich illustration is not an expression of contention between Jews and Christians, the perspective in which it has hitherto been interpreted. It is therefore unnecessary to further investigate here the *Adversos-Judaeos* writings, which arise in the time of the crusades and against which Jewish voices then react.<sup>44</sup> The illustration is thus by no means the pictorial first rumblings of an anti-Jewish propaganda campaign; rather it presents the allegation of anthropophagy made against Christians—presumably by Jews—in connection with the Eucharist. It concerns a controversy within Christianity itself, one present from the very beginning, in which one distances oneself from the strange and from the “others,” a tracing of boundaries, which serves principally as a reflection upon one's own customs.

Most literature on the Eucharist to date has focused on the later Middle Ages or has considered only the crest of the wave, that is, the controversy caused by Berengar's letter to Lanfranc, written in the beginning of 1050, which criticized him for following Paschasius's

argumentation and rejecting Ratramnus's position as heretical (Berengar believed Ratramnus's text was written by John Scot Eriugena).<sup>45</sup> However, the debate on the Eucharist that ended with the excommunication of Berengar of Tours, in 1050, did not happen suddenly. Since the Carolingian tractates of Paschasius Ratpertus and Ratramnus, both entitled *De corpore et sanguine Domini* but expressing opposite opinions, the subject was discussed repeatedly. Both expressed belief in the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but Ratramnus emphasized the requirement of faith and considered it a symbolic action, while Radbertus Paschasius insisted on the miraculous aspect of the real presence of Christ in the host.<sup>46</sup> Michal Kobialka has shed light on the flare of the debate: “Herriger of Lobbes (ca. 940–1007) attempted to reconcile them using patristic texts. Ratherius, bishop of Verone (932–968), and Remigius, master at the cathedral school at Auxerre, seemed to subscribe to the position described by Paschasius.”<sup>47</sup> Gezo of St. Pierre follows the structure of Paschasius's tractate and sums up the arguments of Cyprian, Hilarius, Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory, John, Isidor, Isitius, Jerome, and Bede. He includes miracles related to the Eucharist (chapters 42–45). His argumentation refers to differences towards Jews, but not from a particular anti-Jewish point of view.<sup>48</sup> Favoring the position of Ratramnus were Atto II, bishop of Vercelli (924–961), and Aelfric, teaching at Cerne Abbas (987–1005).<sup>49</sup> Fulbert of Chartres, the teacher of Berengar of Tours,

43. Only in the context of crusades and heretical movements since the end of the first millennium does anti-Jewish sentiment mount in how Flavius Josephus's account is received. To name only a few contemporary interpretations of the Maria Bethzuba story in texts and images: John of Salisbury, *Polycratius* II, 6 and VIII; Vincent of Beauvais *Speculum historiale* X, 5; *Regensburger Kaiserchronik*, V 839–110; *Fränkische Reimbibel*, verses 470–528, in *Mittelhochdeutsches Übungsbuch*, ed. C. von Kraus (Heidelberg, 1926), pp. 273–274; Dante, *Divina Commedia*, Purgatorium 30, 23; see R. B. Herzman, “Cannibalism and Communion in ‘Inferno’ XXXIII,” in *Dante Studies* XCVIII (1980):53–78; for further examples see Price (note 17), p. 70ff.

44. For Jewish reactions, see I. J. Yuval, “‘They Tell Lies: You Ate the Man.’ Jewish Reactions to Ritual Murder Accusations,” in *Religious Violence between Christians and Jews. Medieval Roots, Modern Perspectives*, ed. A. Sapir Abulafia (New York, 2002), pp. 86–106, and R. C. Stacey, “From Ritual Crucifixion to Host Desecration. Jews and the Body of Christ,” *Jewish History* 12 (1998):11–28. Concerning the silence of Jewish historians since late Antiquity, see A. Tropper, “The Fate of Jewish Historiography after the Bible. A New Interpretation,” *History and Theory* 43 (2004):179–197. For the Christian tracts, see J. Cohen, “Christian Theology and Anti-Jewish Violence in the Middle Ages. Connections and Disjunctions,” *Religious Violence between Christians and Jews* (ibid.), pp. 44–60.

45. See M. Kobialka, *This Is My Body: Representational Practices in the Early Middle Ages* (Ann Arbor, 1999). The source at the center of his study, the *regularis concordia*, dates to the time period in question. However, the debates on the Eucharist mentioned by Kobialka are those around Berengar and later. See *Pratiques de l'eucharistie dans les Églises d'Orient et d'Occident (Antiquité et Moyen Âge)*, ed. N. Bériou, B. Caseau, and D. Rigaux (Paris, 2009). For an English edition of Lanfranc, see *On the Body and Blood of the Lord, Lanfranc of Canterbury. On the Truth of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, Guitmund of Aversa*, trans. M. G. Vaillancourt (Washington, 2009).

46. See J. P. Bouhot, *Ratramne de Corbie. Histoire littéraire et controverses doctrinales* (Paris, 1976), and J. Ernst, *Die Lehre des heiligen Paschasius Radbertus von der Eucharistie. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Stellung des hl. Rhabanus Maurus und des Ratramnus zu derselben* (Freiburg, 1896).

47. Kobialka (ibid.), p. 72; and Herriger of Lobbes, *Libellus de corpore et sanguine Domini*, PL 139, cols. 179–188. Herriger explains in col. 188B how the whiteness of the host gains color inside of the body.

48. I am grateful to Aden Kumler for sharing her knowledge about the debates on the Eucharist. I owe her the reference to Gezo Dertonensis, *De corpore et sanguine Christi*, PL 137, cols. 371–406.

49. Kobialka (see note 45), p. 72.

explicitly advises how to react to doubting voices that question the presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist. In a letter to Einhard, written in 1006, he describes how to confront doubts about the body of Christ. According to Fulbert, the suspicions were rising as a result of the reference to the host as the true body of Christ, despite the fact that his flesh was fully assumed by the fatherly glory ("*cum carnem assumpti hominis in paterna gloria sedentem, et hic sanctificatum panem verum Christi corpus audit nominari*"). Central to his argument is a comparison between the manna and the host. He aligns the forty-year flight from Egypt with the forty-day period when Christ's resurrected body appeared to his doubting followers—that is, the period between his earthly death and his heavenly ascension.<sup>50</sup> Fulbert is especially interested in the aspect of substantial change, which he explains as the Holy Spirit transforming matter by means of an invisible operation: The bread is substantially transformed into the true flesh ("*unus idemque artifex Spiritus invisibili operatione in substantiam verae carnis transfundit*"). Fulbert concludes with the crucial sentence, which includes a quotation from John: "[A]llowed to see the flesh is not just anybody, but the true Christ said: 'If you will not eat my flesh, there will be no life in you'"<sup>51</sup> It was the substantial change of the bread into Christ's flesh that Berengar will impeach a couple of decades later, although the issue was not taken up in the acts of the synod of 1024.

However, doubts about the presence of Christ in the host as well as the host's relationship to the Trinity seem to have persisted, especially if one considers the passage in the acts of the Synod of Arras that comments explicitly on these problems. After baptism, the Eucharist is the first major topic in the acts. However, the acts lay emphasis on explaining the invisibility of Christ's body after its resurrection. The wording follows Augustine's tract on John's gospel:

Then what if you shall see the Son of man ascending where He was before;" certainly then, at least, you will see that not in the manner you suppose does He dispense his body; certainly then, at least, you will understand that his grace is not consumed by tooth-biting.<sup>52</sup>

50. Fulbertus Carnotensis, *Epistula* 3, PL 141, cols. 195 C–D.

51. *Ibid.*, col. 192D.

52. Augustinus, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 27, § 3, CC 36, 12–15, p. 271: "Unde et Dominus: *Si inquit, videritis filium hominis ascendentem, ubi erat prius? Subaudiendum: Tunc videbitis, quia non eo modo quo putatis meam carnem credentibus distribuo, sed spirituali gratia me illis dando ipsos in meum corpus transfundo; et hec gratia non consumitur morsibus nec dentibus teritur, sed interioris hominis palato, hoc est ratione et intellectu mentis, percipitur.*"

In 1007 Fulbert of Chartres further elaborates his thoughts on the real presence of Christ in the host. He recalls the old debate between the Nestorians and the Arians about the nature of the Trinity and deals extensively with how one may imagine the unity of God the father with his son after his conception in the virginal uterus of Mary.<sup>53</sup>

While this issue is addressed in the acts of the Synod of Arras from 1025, too, the author Gerard—as opposed to Fulbert—follows the broader path and evokes arguments made by Bede, but particularly by the Carolingian authors Heiric of Auxerre, Haymo of Halberstadt, and Ratramnus.<sup>54</sup> The common point of their argument is that you can see the holy bread but not the power of God's word, the divinity that sanctifies the soul of the percipients.<sup>55</sup> Furthermore, they include two host miracles taken from an interpolated version of Paul Vinfidus's (Paul the Diacon's) *Life of Gregory the Great* from the ninth or tenth centuries.<sup>56</sup> Most important for my argument, however, is the explicit comment the acts make on consumption. The recipient of the host

53. Fulbertus Carnotensis, *Epistula* V: "*dum et illud de Virgine assumptum, et istud de materiali et virginali creatura consecratum, unus idemque artifex Spiritus invisibili operatione in substantiam verae carnis transfundit*" and acts of the Synod of Arras: "*Quomodo totum cum Patre fuit semper, et totum se clausit in utero virginis? Si totus in virgine, quomodo totus cum Patre?*"

54. I would like to thank Alexander Patchovsky for providing me with a draft of an unpublished edition: *Arrasi Sinodi (1024), Actae*, ed. A. Patchovsky, MGH, not yet published. I owe him the following references: Heiric of Auxerre, *Homiliae per circulum anni, hom. 1, pars hiemalis* 62, CCM 116A, p. 586. Further quotations of these verses from Augustine: *Beda Venerabilis, Expositio in Evangelium sancti Joannis*, c. 6, MPL 92, 720C; Alkuin, *Commentaria in sancti Iohannis evangelium*, lib. III, c. 15, MPL 100, 837C; Haymo of Halberstadt, *Homiliae de tempore*, hom. 62, MPL 118, 350D; Ratramnus of Corbie, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, § 80, MPL 121, 161f.

55. *Actae* (ibid.): "*Videtur enim sanctus ille panis, quo corpus Domini consecratur et visibiliter ore percipitur; sed virtus Dei verbi, id est divinitas qua anima percipientis sanctificatur, videri non potest. Ascendit ergo Christus perfecto corpore suo et reliquit nobis sacramentum corporis sui.*" Fol. 15.

56. Relevant for the dating is a manuscript at St. Gall (Hs. 567) from the eighth or ninth centuries. This manuscript is a copy of the oldest vita of Gregory I, written ca. 713 in the monastery of Streancheshalch (Whitby) in Northumbria. See F. A. Gasquet, *A Life of Pope St. Gregory the Great* (London, 1904), cc. 20f., pp. 24–28. The first host miracle is also found in a collection of Irish legends about Gregory I, see J. Vendryes, "Betha Grighora," *Revue Celtique* 42 (1925):119–153. For the origin of the host miracle, see *Miracula Nynie episcopi*, ed. Karl Strecker, MGH, PLMA, IV, 3 [Supplement], pp. 943–962, esp. pp. 957–959; *De vitis patrum, lib. V*, libellus 18, c. 3, MPL 73, 978D–980A; Paschasius Radbertus, *Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini*, c. 14, § 4, MPL 120, 1318f.

consumes the body of Christ not with teeth, but with the inner tongue: By means of the ratio and the intellect, according to Gerard of Arras-Cambrai, we perceive with the Eucharist the *bona gratia*, the Latin translation of the Greek word (*et hec gratia non consumitur morsibus nec dentibus teritur, sed interioris hominis palato, hoc est ratione et intellectu mentis, percipitur*).<sup>57</sup> This controversy within Christianity itself was present from the very beginning and was debated again periodically—like a wound that never fully heals. It was not only flaring up during the Carolingian era and during the mid-eleventh century, but was also a burning question for scholars at the time of the creation of the Munich manuscript.

Jerusalem as the most “unsightly” of all wounds for Christian rulers, according to Francesco Petrarca,<sup>58</sup> is used in this miniature as a *Kippfigur*. At the beginning of his chef-d’œuvre *Mimesis*, Erich Auerbach explains how the wound of Homer’s Ulysses functions as the revivification of the bygone: The glance’s touch upon it overlaying present reality with the mimesis of recounted myth.<sup>59</sup> The consequence of looking upon wounds corresponds to the shuttle devices described earlier, which arise as the result of the double legibility of figures and events in pictures as well as texts. Maintained in an uncertain equilibrium, they endow the picture with an exceptional presence; the dual readings’ incessant interchangeability procures a pictorial reality for the recounted myth.

In order to better understand how the past is revived by looking upon a wound, it is worthwhile to examine yet another writing hitherto unread in this context. I refer here to the apocryphal Fourth Book of Ezra (dating from the end of the first century and thus roughly contemporary with Flavius Josephus’s writings). It presents particularly fecund parallels with the story of Maria Bethzuba and its split visibilities in the miniature (those of earthly and heavenly Jerusalem, of the sacrifice of one’s own flesh, of Christ as a sacrifice as well as a sovereign, of past, present, and future).<sup>60</sup> Not to be

neglected is the theological importance of Ezra’s writings when considering the representability of the divine ruler and his intra-legal and extra-legal dominion. The textual background presents the problem of contested faith in God’s governance: paradoxically invisible, though of universal scope. The prophet complains about God’s unfathomable ways. The answer, at which he arrives in the course of the book, is that divine order can only be recognized in a larger context, namely that of the teaching of the two worlds.<sup>61</sup> Divine law prevails in both; God stands both within and outside the present world. We must accept that perceiving this world and gaining knowledge of the other, coming world is possible only analogically, through divine revelation. Ezra presents history as installed within a temporality fixed by God, admitting neither acceleration nor attenuation, whose end of time, however, is near. The individual’s access to the coming world, while enabled by divine grace, is nevertheless bound to his comportment in the present. Here it is imperative to choose either life or perdition. Respecting the law thus plays a central role—according to Ezra—allowing firm grounding in this world while prefiguring life in the coming.

The Fourth Book of Ezra contains many passages, which were understood to allude to the siege and destruction of Jerusalem and the iniquities committed.

And those who are in the mountains and highlands shall perish of hunger, and they shall eat their own flesh in hunger for bread and drink their own blood in thirst for water. [ . . . ] And as they pass they shall wreck the hateful city, and shall destroy apart of your land and abolish a portion of your glory, as they return from devastated Babylon. And you shall be broken down by them like stubble, and they shall be like fire to you.<sup>62</sup>

Particularly relevant to our investigation is a story taken from the ninth and tenth chapters of the Fourth Book of Ezra. The tenth chapter is the lamentation of a mother mourning her only son, to whom she gave birth at the age of thirty and who has died in his nuptial chamber the night of his wedding. She has taken her place outside the city (Jerusalem) to mourn her child, wishing neither to live any more, nor “[to] eat nor drink, but without ceasing [to] mourn and fast” until she perished.<sup>63</sup> Ezra, who hears her complaint in the field outside the Holy City, attempts to comfort her and urges her to return

57. See *Actae* (note 54).

58. F. Petrarca, *Itinerarium ad sepulchrum Domini nostri Iesu Christi*, see *Petrarch’s Guide to the Holy Land*, Biblioteca Statale, BB.1.2.5, ed. T. J. Cachey (Notre Dame, 2002), fol. 14v.

59. E. Auerbach, *Mimesis. Dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der Abendländischen Literatur* (Berne, 1959).

60. For a commentary, see *Die Ezra Apokalypse (IV. Ezra): nach dem lateinischen Text unter Benutzung der anderen Versionen*, ed. A. Klijn and J. Frederik (Berlin, 1992). Seven orders of law are described in the seventh chapter of the Fourth Book of Ezra (verses 92–98). For an English translation, see *The Apocrypha. Translated out of the Greek and Latin Tongues. Being the Version set forth 1611, revised 1894* (Oxford, 1898), pp. 24–25.

61. *Ibid.*, chap. 7, 55–57.

62. *Ibid.*, chaps. 15, 58 and 60–62.

63. *Ibid.*, chaps. 4, 10.

to the city. Then Jerusalem, the destroyed city, must be mourned:

Do not say that, but let yourself be persuaded because of the troubles of Zion, and be consoled because of the sorrow of Jerusalem. For you see that our sanctuary has been laid waste, our altar thrown down, our temple destroyed; [. . .] Therefore shake off your great sadness and lay aside your many sorrows, so that the Mighty One may be merciful to you again, and the Most High may give you rest, a relief from your troubles.

Suddenly, before Ezra's eyes, the mourner is transformed into a stroke of lightning, and an angel informs the bewildered Ezra that she was a vision, a personification of Jerusalem:

This therefore is the meaning of the vision. The woman who appeared to you a little while ago, whom you saw mourning and began to console—but you do not now see the form of a woman, but an established city has appeared to you—and as for her telling you about the misfortune of her son, this is the interpretation: This woman whom you saw, whom you now behold as an established city, is Zion. And as for her telling you that she was barren for thirty years, it is because there were three thousand years in the world before any offering was offered in it. And after three thousand years Solomon built the city, and offered offerings; then it was that the barren woman bore a son. And as for her telling you that she brought him up with much care, that was the period of residence in Jerusalem. And as for her saying to you, "When my son entered his wedding chamber he died," and that misfortune had overtaken her, that was the destruction which befell Jerusalem.<sup>64</sup>

This allusion to the crucifixion, a death in a nuptial chamber (in the Holy City), and the double appearance of Jerusalem in the literary "image," which the prophet Ezra evokes before our eyes, leads us back to our miniature and the outset of our investigations. The personification of Jerusalem mourning in reminiscence of her dead son is the alter ego of the Christ who mourns in anticipation of the destruction of Jerusalem. But whereas in the miniature a counter-figure is introduced—Maria devouring the fruit of her own womb—in the story the visionary is not Christ, but Ezra. His vision, as in the miniature, interweaves city, symbol, personification, and time. With an inner eye Ezra foresees the destruction of Jerusalem; he looks upon the city and its personification as *mater dolorosa*. The intertwining of Christ and Mary's bodily substances and personhoods anticipate later artistic developments in many ways. In the Munich gospel miniature just as in the Fourth Book

of Ezra, woman, mourner, and city alternately fuse and crystallize, their interchangeability regulated by layers, which imply stratified realities and thus different worlds: the present and the coming.<sup>65</sup> Divine law thus repeatedly reveals itself as paradoxical, as doubly legible. The ambivalent figure's double vision places the reader (observer) in a sovereign's perspective. The reader is seen as if in distorting mirrors, ambivalently constrained and unconstrained by law.

Ezra's liminal position brings us back to Christ in the Munich gospel book. Christ stands there—placed clearly outside the central axis—at the threshold of the spiral taken by our reading and corresponding to the picture's formal construction. Layers of meaning constitute its polyvalence. First, it represents three temporalities linked by their common setting, the city of Jerusalem. Second, it illustrates a unique subject, which combines Christ mourning the city's future fall with the Maria Bethzuba story. Third, it induces a sort of double vision through the textual *and* pictorial interpellation of the reader/viewer in a split perception. Let us follow the spiral's curve for the last time and conclude: If we exit the spiral of earthly violence, in which combat and siege unravel all order, and follow the picture's inner movement, we notice that Christ and his disciples are spared its centrifuge. They stand outside and yet directly on the threshold. The observer thus realizes that the intact Jerusalem in the picture's upper right hand corner encodes the heavenly Jerusalem. In this last ambiguous figure, the apostles and Christ are revealed as standing outside all earthly law, headed towards the hereafter in which myth, history, and reality condense and eternity begins with the Day of Judgment. Ezekiel is the Old Testament typological "prefiguration" to Christ in the New Testament, whose epoch is that of the new covenant, the new law—or, in an Ottonian beholder's mind—of the Holy Roman emperor. The prophet's eyes are opened for Jerusalem's perdition in a vision where he first glimpses the city's atrocities, then the paradisiacal city in the kingdom to come. Apart from the Apocalypse, for Christians he is the foremost Old Testament source for descriptions of the afterlife. From him we learn, to begin with, how the earthly Jerusalem, forsaken by God, succumbed to every kind of debauchery.<sup>66</sup> He further describes the

65. This visibility versus seclusion dichotomy is not only significant for our pictorial example, but also for the theological interpretation of the Apocrypha; see E. Brandenburger, *Die Verborgenheit Gottes im Weltgeschehen. Das literarische und theologische Problem des 4. Esrabuches* (Zürich, 1981). (= Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 68).

66. Ezekiel 8, 6–17.

64. Ibid., chaps. 40–48.

appearance of the future heavenly Jerusalem, knowledge acquired in the course of a celestial flight during a siege of the Holy City; an experience typologically associated with the ascension of Christ.<sup>67</sup> Against this backdrop, even the formal composition of our miniature is endowed with a double legibility. Then there is a layer in its very spiral: the fatal circle of violence seemingly culminating in Maria. However, Christ—standing at its threshold, its commutary movement's beginning and end—is (re-)presenting its (re-)solution: the heavenly Jerusalem. He stands, like a priest celebrating mass, on the threshold between consecrated and unconsecrated ground, a boundary overstepped by those who partake of the host.<sup>68</sup> The picture's split between cannibalism below and Eucharist above is overcome by its transmission of the two Jerusalems, superseded by its pictorial inclusion/exclusion technique. Christianity has long had to swallow a mass of its own strangeness, a strangeness perhaps inherent in its creation myth, one whose "digestion"—textual or pictorial—still awaits.<sup>69</sup> In this way, the dietetic injunction concerning the paradisiacal apple can become a dietetic imperative, a feeding upon one's "own" body, permitting, in Christ's footsteps, a return to the threshold of the paradise, an entry into eternal life.

67. *Ibid.*, 40, 1–48.

68. In numerous medieval writings, the church building was compared to the heavenly Jerusalem as earthly reference to the heavenly city. See B. Kühnel, *From the Earthly to the Heavenly Jerusalem. Representations of the Holy City in Christian Art of the First Millennium* (Rome, 1987) (= *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 42); P. Kurmann, "Zur Vorstellung des Himmlischen Jerusalem und zu den eschatologischen Perspektiven in der Kunst des Mittelalters," in *Ende und Vollendung. Eschatologische Perspektiven im Mittelalter*, ed. J. A. Aertsen and M. Pickacé (Berlin/New York, 2002) (= *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 29), pp. 292–300.

69. Reinhard Koselleck once described the discovery of the New World as a challenge for Christianity, one that consisted of incorporating within its conceptual scope masses of strange peoples not accounted for in its creation myth. See R. Koselleck, *Vergangene Zukunft. Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* (Frankfurt a.M., 1979), p. 246.