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My dissertation examines manuscripts and early printed books of the “Fortress of Faith” (Fortalitium fidei) as influential works in late medieval constructions of Jewish and Christian identity. I argue that the “Fortress of Faith” moves beyond traditional polemics in its comprehensive use of popular argumentative approaches, particularly in its use of images, which appealed to a variety of late medieval audiences. I suggest a revised stemma, giving preference to the influence of woodcuts over miniatures. Through both types of images, Christians were armed with mental pictures of themselves as knights guarding a Christian fortress.

The first two chapters study surviving manuscripts and incunabula of the text with regard to their material execution, visual imagery, verbal content, and regional production and dissemination. The presentation of the text evolved with its shifting audience from the time it was composed around 1460 by a Castilian Franciscan friar to the time it was translated into French and illuminated around 1480 and also while it was printed numerous times between 1471 and 1525. A third chapter addresses the “Fortress of Faith’s” role in shaping communal memory. It verbally and visually underscored the perceived dangers non-Christians posed to Christianity and suggested the unique danger
that the faith’s own delinquents posed toward it. The final chapter focuses on the hermeneutical Jew represented in the “Fortress of Faith” and beyond. In this text the “bad Jew,” so familiar in the medieval world, became the template for the much more broadly defined monstrous “other.”

My analyses show how the images of the preaching manual within the Latin manuscript and incunabula and French manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith” contributed to the text’s slandering of its enemies: heretics, Jews, Muslims, and demons. The body of images appropriated the visual symbols of courtly romance for new use in molding religious identity. For readers of the Fortalitium fidei, the fortress became the central feature in a universal program of animosity toward Jews and other non-Christians. This message was significant in its historical moment, affecting the understanding of medieval Jews, but also modeling their treatment throughout the early modern period in Europe.
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INTRODUCTION: TURRIS FORTITUDINIS A FACIE INIMICI

Introduction

“Turris fortitudinis a facie inimici” was a commonly invoked phrase during the late Middle Ages. Drawn from Psalm 61: 4 (NRSV), the characterization of God as a “strong tower against the face of the enemy” reassured Christians of the security their faith allowed them. As the opening passage of the Fortalitium fidei, or “Fortress of Faith,”

---

1 In finem, In hymnis David.  
Exaudi Deus deprecationem meam: intende oratione meae.  
A finibus terrae ad te clamavi: dum anxíaretur cor meum, in petra exalsti me.  Deduxisti me, Quia factus es spes mea: turris fortitudinis a facie inimici.  
Inhabitabo in tabernaculo tuo in saecula: protegar in velamento alarum tuarum.  
Quoniam tu Des meus exaudisti orationem meam: dedisti hereditatem timentibus nomen tuum.  
Dies super dies regis adiicies: annos eius usque in diem generationis et generationis.  
Permanet in aeternum in conspectus Dei: misericordiam et veritatem eius quis requiret?  
Sic psalmum dicam nomini tuo in saeculum: ut reddam vota mea de die in diem.  
Ps. 60:1-9 (Vulgate)  
Unto the end, in hymns, for David.  
Hear, O God, my supplication: be attentive to my prayer,  
To thee have I cried from the ends of the earth: when my heart was in anguish, thou hast exalted me on a rock. Thou hast conducted me;  
For thou hast been my hope; a tower of strength against the enemy.  
In thy tabernacle I shall dwell forever: I shall be protected under the covert of thy wings.  
For thou, my God hast heard my prayer: thou hast given an inheritance to them that fear thy name.  
Thou wilt add days to the days of the king: his years even to generation and generation.  
He abideth forever in the sight of God: his mercy and truth who shall search?  
So will I sing a psalm to thy name forever and ever: that I may pay my vows from day to day.  
Ps. 60:1-9 (Douay Version)  
To the leader: with stringed instruments. Of David.  
Hear my cry, O God;  
listen to my prayer.  
From the end of the earth I call to you, when my heart is faint.  
Lead me to the rock  
that is higher than I;  
for you are my refuge,  
a strong tower against the enemy.  
Let me abide in your tent for ever,  
find refuge under the shelter of your wings.  
Selah  
For you have given me the heritage of those who fear your name.  
Prolong the life of the king;  
may his years endure to all generations!  
May he be enthroned for ever before God;  
appoint steadfast love and faithfulness to watch over him!  
So I will always sing praises to your name, as I pay my vows day after day.
these words draw upon a popular medieval trope to proclaim a message of religious
identity, which extends from God to man through the institution of Christianity. The
same relationship is reflected in fortified architecture of the period. With violence
punctuating much of the Middle Ages, castles and towers connoted protection for
Christians. In fact, throughout the period, both residential and religious buildings under
minimal threat were cloaked with the features of fortification. Churches and castles
shared patrons and technological innovations and eventually developed a joint visual
vocabulary emphasizing stability, fortitude, and faith over more than half a millennium.

Ps. 61:1-9 (NRSV)
The verse examined above was frequently used in medieval liturgy, such as the prayers
used in receiving the bishop or laymen into fraternity with the brethren, as in the use of
Sarum. See Christopher Wordsworth, Ceremonies and Processions of the Cathedral
Church of Salisbury: edited from the fifteenth-century Ms. no. 148 with additions from
Cathedral Records, and Woodcuts from the Sarum Processionale of 1502 (London:
Cambridge University Press, 1901), 106 and 145-150.

2 See Sheila Bonde, Fortress-Churches of Languedoc: Architecture, Religion, and
and Janice Mann, Romanesque Architecture and Its Sculptural Decoration in Christian
Spain: Exploring Frontiers and Defining Identities (Toronto, Canada: Toronto University
Press, 2009).

3 Bonde, Fortress-Churches, 1-10 and 46. While the preoccupation with this type of
architectural structure seems to indicate widespread engagement in local warfare,
historical records negate this assumption. By the late fourteenth century, increased
stability and advances in warfare rendered fortified architecture relatively obsolete as a
means of defense. Charles Coulson seeks to free the study of fortified architecture from
the militaristic “straight-jacket” and align it with the larger values of both men and
women in the chivalric world. See Charles L. H. Coulson, Castles in Medieval Society:
Fortresses in England, France, and Ireland in the Central Middle Ages (Oxford, U.K.:
Oxford University Press, 2003). Pounds argues that the role of the castle in the later
Middle Ages shifted from one of protective design to a means for the display of rank and
wealth. See N.J.G. Pounds, The Medieval Castle in England and Wales: A Social and

Finally in an effort to reconcile popular and scholarly views on castles, Goodall defines
the castle as “the residence of a lord made imposing through the architectural trappings of
fortification.” See John Goodall, The English Castle: 1066-1650 (New Haven, CT: Yale
University Press, 2011), 6. Either directly or not, all of this scholarship indicates that
although fortified architecture was obsolete by the end of the fourteenth century, the
fortress retained its symbolic value for people of all classes.
The early and high medieval legacy of the lone citadel at the edge of the sea was irreversibly intertwined with Christian identity. Fortresses had once ensured the triumph of Christianity in the West, and they, therefore, reminded their residents of the long trajectory of Christian (re)conquest. Signifying both the battles already won and the mission of the Crusades, fortresses became the primary symbol in a literary and visual metaphor that cast Christians as defenders of their very own “fortress of faith.”

Alonso de Espina’s *Fortalitium fidei*, a late fifteenth-century text of international fame, molded this metaphor into an undeniable call for action from all classes of Christians. The “Fortress of Faith,” was a Franciscan text of five volumes, which appeared to judiciously record four non-Christian groups’ offenses against the Church. The presentation of the allegorical Christian fortress standing strong in the breach reminded its readers that despite the geographic breadth and relative dominion of Christianity, the foundation of the faith was under constant siege, whether apparent or not. In the first volume, he glorified Christianity, while he used the remaining volumes to slander his faith’s most prominent enemies: heretics, Jews, Muslims, and demons. The methods with which Espina sought to characterize groups of people perpetuated old traditions of distinguishing Christians from non-Christians through legend and iconography. As a work that evolved alongside public opinion, the text also invented new methods for categorization using the work’s literary organization and suggestive illustrations. Ultimately the “Fortress of Faith” beseeched its readers to defend Christianity from any perceived threat.

---

4 For biblical usages of the fortress metaphor, see, among others, Pss. 18: 1-6, 28: 7-9, 31:1-3, and 91: 1-3; Pr. 18:10; Isa. 25:12; and Jer. 16:19 and 6:27.
In this dissertation, I will explore the extensive influence of the “Fortress of Faith’s” words and images in shaping contemporary and anachronistic constructions of religious identity in late medieval Western Europe. An in-depth examination of surviving fifteenth-century manuscripts and a sample survey of fifteenth and sixteenth-century incunabula will demonstrate the range of the text’s geographic and sociological impact. I will discuss their richly illuminated paintings, pen and ink drawings, and colored woodcuts, along with their variety of printing formats and binding choices, to prove the text’s reception as a nostalgic allegorical call to crusade in aristocratic settings and as a pressing social directive in clerical circles across late fifteenth-century Europe. Furthermore, my consideration of the sustained popularity of these varying interpretations will claim the “Fortress of Faith’s” undeniably influential position within a body of rhetoric launched against Jews and other non-Christians during the early modern period.

Descending from the school of thought behind the anti-Semitic writings of Petrus Alfonsi (twelfth century), Ramón Martí (thirteenth century), and Alfonso de Valladolid (fourteenth century), the “Fortress of Faith” is often considered the height of anti-Semitic literature up to its own time. While the text makes no explicit connections to previous writers, it fits squarely within the adversus judaeos tradition familiar to all readers of the

---

Middle Ages. Most of the large illuminated versions of the “Fortress of Faith” hail from the libraries of wealthy book collectors. Each of these manuscripts reveals important details about its owner and can be measured against its relatives in terms of the quality of its materials and miniatures. However, the pristine condition of these manuscripts indicates little about the intellectual use of the text, and their large format denies the potentiality of frequent use. Conversely, both reader notations and the increasing portability of the printed editions over time demonstrate clerical readers’ sustained engagement with the “Fortress of Faith.”

I. Background

While provenance ties the most decorated editions of the “Fortress of Faith” to their original owners, little is known about the author of the original work. Alonso de Espina’s name was not connected to the text until 1571, and his identity remains shrouded in mystery. What is clear is that conversion in late medieval Spain was one of the most prominent issues on Espina’s agenda. Although the organization of the “Fortress of Faith” outlines a separate treatment of heretics and Jews, the historical context of the converso situation in late medieval Spain suggests that such a separation was ideologically impossible. Even Espina’s personal biography has been the subject of considerable speculation, with early scholars asserting his converso status and associated


preoccupation with issues of conversion and heresy for almost half of the “Fortress of Faith.”

Espina’s original manuscript, from around 1460, is believed lost. The earliest extant copy of the “Fortress of Faith” is the _Fortalitium fidei_ manuscript held in the chapter house of the cathedral in El Burgo de Osma. This copy belonged to a Spanish bishop active shortly after the original text was written and includes several drawings, including a full frontispiece clearly related to the images in later copies of the text, as well as other narrative images explicitly tied to the stories and accounts within the work. The frontispiece visually outlines the “Fortress of Faith,” adhering to traditional examples of fortified architecture in Spain. It includes a fortress, rendered schematically, with five towers referring to the five volumes of the text. (Figure 1)

---

8 In earlier years, most historians identified Espina as a zealous convert from Judaism. Among these scholars were M. de la Pinta Llorente, N. López Martínez, Amador de los Rios, Menéndez Pelayo, Modesto Lefuente, Américo Castro, Sánchez Albornoz, and Cecil Roth. Two notable exceptions are the arguments of Henry Charles Lea and A. Lukyn Williams. Benzion Netanyahu argued convincingly that Espina was not and could not have been a convert, and his theory has found favor with contemporary scholars of the “Fortress of Faith.” See Benzion Netanyahu, “Alonso de Espina: Was He a New Christian?,” in _Toward the Inquisition: Essays on Jewish and Converso History in Late Medieval Spain_, ed. Benzion Netanyahu (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997). Such speculation about Espina’s religious background is not unwarranted and not without precedent in historical religious figures from the Middle Ages. For example, the scathing anti-Jewish remarks of Pedro de la Cavallería and Juan de Torquemada (1388-1468) are attributed to their desire to blot out their own Jewish ancestry.


10 El Burgo de Osma, Archivo Capitular, Ms. 154.

11 _The Fortress of Faith_, Soria, ca. 1460. El Burgo de Osma, Archivo capitular, Ms. 154, fol. 1 r.
with Christian soldiers and the heavenly court, while the enemies encroach around the base of the fortress.

Later copies of the “Fortress of Faith” diverge in two directions: the incunabula of clerical readers and the manuscripts of courtly collectors. The Latin text of the *Fortalitium fidei* was printed in six editions before 1550. Some of these were outfitted with standardized woodcuts to accompany the text. In the small woodcuts from 1475 and 1487, a few Jews, Muslims, and demons observe heretics attempting to uproot a single tower. (Figure 2) Synchronously, the “Fortress of Faith” was translated into French and executed in a suite of lavish vernacular manuscripts. One manuscript, originally a possession of Louis de Gruthuyse, Seigneur de Bruges, is the only copy that can be unquestionably linked to its owner. Closely related to this manuscript is another, which likely belonged to Edward IV of England. These manuscripts include five full-page frontispieces of the attacking enemies, incensing readers’ chivalric sensibilities in defense

---

12 The text was printed in Strasbourg in 1471 (Johann Mentelin), Basel in 1475 (Bernhard Richel), Lyon in 1487 (Guillaume Balsarin), Nuremberg in 1485 and 1494 (Anton Koberger), and Lyon in 1511 and 1525 (Étienne Gueynard). Please see Appendix II for a complete listing of known editions. *Fortalitium fidei*, Basel, 1475.

13 Eight full and partial French manuscripts survive. The “Fortress of Faith” was also translated into German and Italian. However, what remains from these editions is extremely fragmentary. One German fragment of the text survives in Stuttgart (LB, HB I 26 (XVI)). Folio 247 presents a German translation of “Consideratio IX: tertia expulsion iudaorum,” which records the third expulsion of the Jews. Please see Appendix I for a complete listing of known manuscripts.

14 Louis de Gruthuyse’s arms and motto appear in the illuminations of this manuscript (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale Ms. fr. 20067-20069), and its entire provenance is well documented.

15 While Edward IV’s manuscript (London, British Library Ms. Royal Ms. 17 F, VI and VII) is less well documented than that of Louis de Gruthuyse, their appearances are strikingly similar in terms of format and style. It is presumed that Edward IV’s manuscript was intended as a reproduction of his long-standing friend, Louis’. While there is no documentation of the manuscript’s commission, it does appear in a catalogue of a library, to which Edward IV’s collection was bequeathed.
of the Church. The miniatures of the *Forteresse de la foy* reflect the aristocratic status of their patrons in their rich illuminations by the court artist, Loyset Liédet. The adequate, though not superior, quality of transcription juxtaposed with the luxurious materials and courtly iconography of these manuscripts suggests their bibliophile owners valued them more as visual showpieces than as polemical resources.

Dissimilarly, more strictly religious audiences all over Western Europe adopted a more utilitarian approach to the “Fortress of Faith.” After acknowledging the existing scholarship on the text’s use by Spanish mendicants and heads of state, I will examine other types of readers who have been ignored thus far. I will use ecclesiastical library records to demonstrate the “Fortress of Faith’s” distribution to all levels of the clergy and important members of Christian communities who could afford to purchase copies. My analysis of inscriptions and inserted images from a sample of the incunabula will foster an understanding of the extent to which the books were used as preaching and inquisitorial manuals.

In this study, I will focus on clerical and noble readers, only discussing the larger lay population in terms of how the underlying themes of the “Fortress of Faith” were transmitted into the European Christian consciousness via diverse media like sermons and chivalric values. Although I surmise a certain amount of clerical dissemination of the “Fortress of Faith’s” message to Christian communities, the physical evidence does not allow a meaningful exploration the topic.

II. Literature

---

16 See Appendix III.
Focused scholarship on the “Fortress of Faith” is startlingly narrow in approach. Historians link the text to the author’s biography, crusader studies, biblical commentary, medieval polemic, and socio-religious history in Spain. In the few monographic, historical studies devoted to the text, it is lauded as a key work in understanding late medieval Spanish approaches to non-Christians. Alisa Meyuhas-Ginio and Steven McMichael believe that the work reveals the religious counsel given to Ferdinand II and Isabella I in the Apocalypse-obsessed years preceding the Spanish Inquisition and focus specifically on Espina’s treatment of the Jews.¹⁷ Ana Echevarria and Rosa Vidal Doval read the “Fortress of Faith” as an indicator of the real, but oft ignored, tensions among religious groups during the so-called Spanish *convivencia*. Echevarria places the “Fortress of Faith” within an environment of medieval polemic against Islam, effectively calling into question the reality of the peace that existed among Christians, Jews, and Muslims throughout the high and late Middle Ages.¹⁸ Vidal Doval’s scholarship considers the “Fortress of Faith’s” religious and social implications concerning heretics and *conversos* in late medieval Spain.¹⁹ Such an approach is long overdue since the *converso* issue is completely integral to the *convivencia* and its demise in late medieval Spain and is vividly reflected in multiple volumes of the *Fortalitium fidei*.

¹⁷ The most important of these works are: Alisa Meyuhas-Ginio, *De bello Iudaeorum* and *La forteresse* and Steven J. McMichael, *Was Jesus.*


Art historical discussions of images from the “Fortress of Faith” briefly discuss one or two illuminations from the French manuscripts now in London, Paris, and Brussels. These passing remarks remove the miniatures from their larger context and are predominantly concerned with using the “Fortress of Faith” to demonstrate the talents of late fifteenth-century illuminators in Bruges, particularly those of Loyset Liédet and his atelier. Such approaches are useful for reconstructing relationships between the French manuscripts but often ignore content in favor of attribution. In a separate vein, iconographers cull the imagery of the late Middle Ages in search of representations of Jews that parallel the images of the “Fortress of Faith.” Their arguments rely heavily on the physiognomic and symbolic attributes of the people depicted but neglect markers and allegories that reveal the broader implications of the text.

Loyset Liédet was one of the most prolific miniaturists working in Bruges in the 1470s. As a court painter for the Dukes of Burgundy, particularly Charles the Bold, he was regularly employed to illustrate manuscripts of favorite texts. His paintings and those of his workshop are generally deemed satisfactory, though without any real genius in their execution. For general information on Liédet’s work, see John W. Bradley, A Dictionary of Miniaturists: Illuminators, Calligraphers and Copyists with References to Their Works, and Notices of Their Patrons from the Establishment of Christianity to the Eighteenth Century Compiled from Various Sources Many Hitherto Inedited (New York, NY: Lenox Hill, 1887-1889), 2:203-205; Jane Turner, ed., The Dictionary of Art (London, UK: Macmillan Publishers Limited, 1996), 19:340-341; and Benezit, ed., Dictionary of Artists (Paris, France: Éditions Grund, 2006), 8:1027. The most recent general discussion of Loyset Liédet’s workshop can be found in Thomas Kren and Scot McKendrick, Illuminating the Renaissance: the Triumph of Flemish Manuscript Painting in Europe (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2003). Liédet’s biography is discussed on pp. 230-233, and his work is addressed throughout the catalogue, which attempts to reconstruct the artistic milieu of Flemish manuscript painting in the late medieval and early modern periods.

Anti-Jewish iconography has received a great deal of attention since the beginning of the twentieth century. For an introduction to basic anti-Jewish iconography, consult Bernhard Blumenkranz, Le Juif médiéval au miroir de l’art chrétien (Paris, France: Études augustiniennes, 1966) and Ruth Mellinkoff, Outcasts: Signs of Otherness in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993). While art historians are predominantly interested in the “Fortress of
Only two art historians have seriously considered the images of the “Fortress of Faith,” and both have focused solely on the manuscript illuminations. Merle Fifield’s excellent survey of the extant French manuscripts describes their illuminations and attempts to identify some stylistic similarities among the paintings, but he is predominantly concerned with reconstructing their provenance and their relationship to fifteenth-century theatrical productions.22 Paulino Rodríguez Barral’s work delves into subject matter contextualizing several illuminations within the widespread anti-Jewish iconography of medieval Spain.23 However, he spends little time addressing the issue that only one of the illuminations was produced in Spain or for a Spanish audience, and he does not consider the larger implications of the similarities between images of Jews and images of other non-Christians within the “Fortress of Faith.”

The scholarship of Rosa Vidal Doval strives to understand the overarching message of the “Fortress of Faith,” and she provides a notable exception to the dearth of literature on the titular image. Although her greatest focus is the position of the *converso* as it relates to the text, she does not focus exclusively on the implications of Espina’s works for that singular enemy. In a separate, briefer study, Vidal Doval discusses the

---


fortress as an “architectural allegory.” 24 To start, she connects the image of the fortress in the Burgo manuscript to the literary structure of the text, noting the five towers in the image and the five volumes in the treatise. 25 Then she addresses the fortress’ potential as a mnemonic device for preachers. 26 Finally, she characterizes the fortress as a multivalent symbol and, therefore, one completely appropriate in medieval culture. 27

Vidal Doval’s argument explains the appeal of the “Fortress of Faith” both in the specific locale of Castile and among the general reading public beyond. It is the only meaningful attempt to link text and image in an exploration of the tower images, and her analysis provides an invaluable background for studying individual images of the “Fortress of Faith” and their ability to convey meaning among disparate audiences during the fifteenth century.

My art historical investigation into the “Fortress of Faith” follows two paths. First, I evaluate the fortress, or tower, as a symbol for late fifteenth-century Christians. Further consideration of the fortress image links it to the arts and influences of the courts, the clergy, and the common alike. Second, I consider how established anti-Jewish iconography was used to perpetuate anti-Jewish sentiment and also invigorate negative interpretations of heretics and Muslims. The long tradition of anti-Jewish imagery, which invaded the contemporary visual culture of the late Middle Ages, is omnipresent in the “Fortress of Faith.” It defines not just Jews, but all non-Christians, as enemies of the

26 Ibid., 150-151.
27 Ibid., 151-153.
Church and its faithful, and my investigation of the representation of the Vices will
demonstrate them as complementary to the new use of anti-Jewish iconography.

The present study is unique in its methodological combination of manuscript and
print history, memory theory, and consideration of medieval othering to explore the
verbal and visual implications of this remarkable text. Drawing upon the scholarship of
both historians and art historians, I will show that the “Fortress of Faith” participated in a
broad phenomenon in which images constituted and inspired ideas equally as
successfully as words.

III. Fundamental Questions

This dissertation seeks to broaden the traditional scope of the “Fortress of Faith’s”
interpretation by addressing the work’s visual and material reception by a vast range of
audiences across a wide geographic space. The dissemination of the “Fortress of Faith’s”
message through its adaptation from manuscript to printed book and its reception in
aristocratic and clerical circles is investigated through an examination of the
illuminations from the Burgo, Paris, London, and Valenciennes manuscripts and the
woodcuts of the incunabula.

Representations of attackers in the “Fortress of Faith” raise some interesting
questions. In the body of images from outside of Spain, the perpetrators are not
apprehended or punished. They also do not appear to be advancing with any success.
Rather, the figures surrounding the tower appear to be frozen in time. Despite their
animated gestures, the images have a static quality, as if the battle has come to a
momentary halt. Given the imagery’s unique appropriation of polemic and aristocratic
culture, it seems that the reader was invited to muse on the threatening and deviant
identity of the non-Christian only to prepare himself for potential attacks. Without actually engaging in a physical battle, the Christian is depicted as the glorious victor.

Images of the “Fortress of Faith” adopted many existing iconographic conventions for categorizing non-Christians, but ultimately the image makers appropriated both the conventions of contemporary religious printed books and the iconography of courtly romance and morality in order to reconstruct Christian and non-Christian identity for late medieval readers. In so doing, the text created communal memories of events in which purported enemies attacked Christianity. The diversity of the “Fortress of Faith’s” versions attests to the ways in which these new memories and identities were crafted and embedded in the Christian mind.

The production of the “Fortress of Faith” at the pivotal moment in the transition from manuscript to print culture identifies the two fundamental comparisons at the heart of this study. One is the comparison of manuscripts and incunabula of the text; two is the comparison of their respective regions, audiences, and images. Examining the evidence for the “Fortress of Faith’s” extensive network of secular and religious audiences is key to interpreting the evolution of the text’s received message and the role of its images in late medieval memory formation and Jewish-Christian relations. Chapters Two and Three are, therefore, exclusively concerned with the examination of surviving manuscripts and incunabula of the text.

Chapter Four addresses the “Fortress of Faith’s” power to shape the historical memory of its readers through its repetitive records of accusations and punitive measures enacted upon Christian enemies. The text engages with the phenomenon of medieval communal memory in multiple ways. At the most basic level, the text provides a list of
anti-Christian crimes that recall well-known accusations of non-Christians. However, it also potentially adapted old stories and images to new locations. The sheer volume of the list ensures that anyone who looked to it for a reference was presented with numerous other crimes of which he was previously unaware. These new crimes reinforced the authority of already familiar ones and contributed to the general malaise surrounding non-Christians in Europe. Images of the “Fortress of Faith” further established non-Christians as a spiritual adversary. Figures wear and hold symbolic markers that reference specific crimes, while the tower under siege allegorically explores the idea that all non-Christians seek to destroy the institution of Christianity. Perhaps most interesting is the suggestion of Christians as enemies. The “Fortress of Faith’s” representation of the Vices forced Christians to recognize the danger within themselves.

Chapter Five considers the “Fortress of Faith’s” use of Jewish identity to define the characters of non-Christians and Christians alike. The text is contextualized within the phenomenon of Christian self-perception and the Jewish-Christian polemic of the late Middle Ages, but it uniquely appropriated the approach toward the Jews to redefine and denigrate all outsiders. Espina’s selection of heretics, Jews, Muslims, and demons reflects his social and religious circumstances in late medieval Castile, but the evolving images of the fortress transmitted a broader message about non-Christian and Christian behavior as readers began to associate both with dangerous denials of the Church’s authority. In its treatment of non-Christians, the “Fortress of Faith” departs from both traditional iconographic and narrative practice. Its illustration of the “other” provides a new approach for understanding the development of the monstrous. In so doing, it
becomes a primary text for analyzing late medieval and early modern contributions to race theory.

Undeniably an outgrowth of medieval polemic, the “Fortress of Faith” moves beyond traditional works in its comprehensive use of popular argumentative approaches. Furthermore, the collection of images associated with the text suggests a new way of communicating polemic to its rapidly expanding audience. As companion pieces to dense volumes of inflammatory writing, illuminations and woodcuts of a fortress under siege provided a meditative image upon which any Christian reader could reflect. Together, the words and images of the “Fortress of Faith” elucidated a Christian survival mission in a world of increasing religious, social, and intellectual diversity. Unlike earlier polemic works, which appealed to singular audiences, Espina’s fifteenth-century text almost immediately crossed geographic boundaries. The early modern development of the printing process allowed the dissemination of the “Fortress of Faith” to royals, nobles, clerics, and commoners throughout Western Europe. Finally, a single text and its images spoke to all Christians concerning the accepted history of anti-Christian behavior, the perceived threat of the enemy, and the legitimacy of historical, present, and future responses of Christians in the West.

1) Introduction

Via analysis of word and image relationships in “Fortress of Faith” manuscripts, this chapter addresses the transformation of Alonso de Espina’s original work in later French translations. I will consider the significance of the architectural edifice of the fortress in these images and the relationship between the fortress and the text’s privileged readers. It inserted a socio-religious and economic message about the spiritual security of the Church into popular secular images of impregnable towers and “castles of love.” The familiar image of the castle, now assaulted and divorced from a specific locale, allowed wealthy Christians to imagine themselves as soldiers engaged in a daily struggle against the collective enemy presented in the “Fortress of Faith.” Examination of illuminated manuscripts of the text initiates a study of the work’s visual themes and the trajectory of their interpretation for different audiences through the end of the fifteenth century. It will be shown in this and the remaining chapters that new understanding of fortress imagery was relevant to a much wider population.

A codicological review of surviving manuscripts and visual analysis of five sets of miniatures of the “Fortress of Faith” demonstrate the diversity among the one Latin manuscript and nine French copies currently known. El Burgo de Osma, Archivo Capitular Ms. 154 (El Burgo de Osma, A.C. Ms. 154), Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale Ms. fr. 20067-20069 (BnF Ms. fr. 20067-20069), London, British Library Ms. Royal 17 F, VI and VII (BL MS Roy 17 F, VI and VII), Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipale Ms. fr. 0244 (Valenciennes, BM Ms. Fr. 0244), and two miniatures from an unidentified
manuscript at the Brooklyn Museum of Art (BMA, Accession 11.506 and Accession 11.507) are the primary documents for examination.\(^{28}\)

These manuscripts form a coherent group with a clear visual timeline in which there is a distinct shift in style and content between the extant Latin manuscript and the French translations.\(^{29}\) While a number of copies of the “Fortress of Faith” survive, great uncertainty surrounds the circumstances of the original manuscript’s production. Little is certain about the author, and nothing is known of the physical text that he wrote.\(^{30}\) Some scholars have speculated that the images from the Burgo manuscript were possibly derived from the original, but the full-page illumination at the beginning of Ms. 154 suggests much greater connection to its owner, Bishop Pedro de Montoya, than to its mendicant author. The minutely detailed pen-and-ink drawing of the besieged fortress is

---

\(^{28}\) Such an approach will not preclude consultation of other editions and is only meant to provide a framework for exploration.

\(^{29}\) Despite the obvious differences in style, it is notable that Montoya came into contact with the style of France and Flanders through his patronage of Spanish artists under the influence of the northern style, as pointed out by Mildred Davison in her discussion of the Chicago Art Institute’s altarpiece from El Burgo de Osma. See Mildred Davison, “An Altarpiece from Burgo de Osma,” \textit{Art Institute of Chicago Museum Studies} 3 (1968): 111.

\(^{30}\) Espina is known to have published at least three other works, and a few of his sermons also survive in the collection at El Burgo de Osma. Alonso de Espina, \textit{Sermones de nomine jesu vigintiduos}, 1454; ibid., \textit{Sermones plures de excellentia nostrae fidei}, 1459; and a treatise on fortune, dedicated to Juan II of Castile (1404-54). Rojo Orcajo’s catalog description “Codice Num. 26” is listed as “Master Espina. Sermones morales et de tempore.” Because Espina’s name is not mentioned until folio 100 of 128 in this manuscript, it is unclear whether he is responsible for the entire text or simply the section that begins, “\textit{Incipiunt sermones Reverendi magistri de spina de penis inferni. Adversarius vester diabolus...}” after five blank pages. It is also notable that the style of the sermons shifts at this point as well. These observations are important for two reasons: 1) They suggest Espina is the second author in this text. 2) Only twenty-eight pages of this sermon manual can be confidently attributed to Espina or used to draw conclusions about him. See Timoteo Rojo Orcajo, “Catálogo descriptivo de los códices que se conservan en la Santa Iglesia Catedral de Burgo de Osma,” \textit{Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia} 95, no. 1 (1929): 739-40.
an image for extended contemplation. Its distinct sections, along with inscriptions and strategic touches of color, constantly redirect the viewer to new content so that the more text he reads, the deeper his understanding of the listed crimes’ consequences becomes. The miniatures of the French manuscripts foster a similar accumulation of meaning, but they do so via consecutive miniatures with discrete foci. The range in the quality of materials, the general milieu of the text’s readers, and the individual provenances of the manuscripts, suggests a new iconographic formula, perhaps with a pivotal miniature, in the development of “Fortress of Faith” imagery. Departure from earlier partial analyses furthers our understanding of the “Fortress of Faith” as a text of utmost relevance to medieval belief. The rich imagery of the full-page illuminations provides the opportunity to review established and new relationships between Christian and non-Christian groups and to think about what these alleged relationships reveal.

2) The Latin Manuscript of the “Fortress of Faith” – El Burgo de Osma, A.C. Ms. 154

Despite Alonso de Espina’s reputation as a learned and holy doctor and Franciscan preacher, neither the site of his birth nor his death is known. Recent scholarship suggests that he was confessed in the convent of Saint Francis in Valladolid. The probable product of a convent education, Espina embraced the *devotio moderna* and traveled around Castile preaching and perpetuating the traditions of late twelfth-century chroniclers who considered the Visigothic period a golden age worthy of late medieval

31 Alisa Meyuhas Ginio, *La forteresse*, 9-10. It should be noted that Ana Echevarria believes that Espina was born around 1412 in Palencia. Echevarria, *The Fortress of Faith*, 47.
emulation. While the *Fortalitium fidei* is considered his most influential work and the most anti-Jewish work written up to its creation, Espina’s sermons that survive in Codex 26 of the library at El Burgo de Osma are more indicative of his daily activities as an itinerant preacher.

Although it has been argued that Espina was the rector of the University of Salamanca, a confessor to the king of Spain, and a *judeoconverso*, little evidence confirms such claims. He was likely a regent of studies at the *Studium Generale* at the University of Salamanca. It is more difficult to ascertain whether or not Espina was a confessor to Enrique IV of Castile (1454-1474). He must have confessed Alvaro de Luna, as the chronicles of Juan II, Alvaro de Luna, and Juan de Palencia all record that Espina met de Luna as he approached the gallows on June 2, 1453. However, as Echevarria has argued, historical records show that Lope de Barrientos, Bishop of Cuenca from 1434 to at least 1455 was royal confessor, succeeded by Pedro de Villacastín. Ultimately, Espina’s historical circumstances are best attested in his authorial choices for the “Fortress of Faith.”

Espina relied heavily on anti-Jewish polemic as a model for structuring each of his volumes about non-Christians. Early anti-Jewish polemics drew inspiration from patristic writers such as Tertullian, Augustine, and Cyprianus. However, the new

---

34 Monsalvo goes so far as to identify Espina as potentially the most important anti-Jewish writer of 15th-century Iberia. See Antón Monsalvo, “Algunas consideraciones,” 1061.
35 Meyuhas-Ginio, *La forteresse*, 10. She questions all of these assumptions and asserts that the answers are best found within the *Fortalitium fidei*.
36 Echevarria, *Fortress of Faith*, 48. McMichael also makes this assertion.
37 Ibid., 49. McMichael, *Was Jesus*, 1-2. McMichael remains convinced of Espina’s post as confessor to Enrique IV.
polemical approaches, which remained popular from the twelfth century through the Enlightenment, also included the use of scriptural proofs for Christian doctrines, rationalistic proofs, accusations against Talmud and other post-biblical literature, and Jewish texts to prove Christian doctrine and messianic arrival. These tactics sought to reassure Christians of the value of the Old Testament and Jewish presence when appropriate. However, staged and written polemical works instigated the progressive isolation of Judaism, which paralleled the geographic, social, and economic marginalization of resident Jews.

For Christian audiences the most relatable form of Jewish-Christian polemic was the rationalistic proof. A proof was demonstrated via a dialogue in which a Christian cornered his Jewish opponent, seemingly proving the errors of Judaism from the inside.

---


The “Fortress of Faith” adopted a hybrid approach, deriving from this and other styles of polemic. The text is particularly demonstrative of the widespread influence of Peter the Venerable from the twelfth century forward. Peter’s declaration of the inhumanity of Jews was a source of inspiration for Espina and is an idea that is central to the effectiveness of the “Fortress of Faith” for a widely varied audience. The first half of the volume adheres to polemic tradition in its discussion of Jewish blindness, disunity, misunderstanding of Mosaic Law, and denial of both the Gospels and natural science. However, what follows is a seemingly exhaustive list of Jewish crimes, self-conceits, and obstinate acts against and in the face of Christianity.

El Burgo de Osma A.C. Ms. 154 is a manuscript of ink on parchment with one hundred sixty folia. It measures 365 x 276 mm and is ruled with sixty-nine lines in two columns. The table consists of eight leaves, and the text begins on folio 9 recto with the words, “Turris fortitudinis a facie inimic tu es…” or “You are a tower of strength in the face of the enemy…” The entire text is in Latin and is accompanied by several miniatures executed in pen and ink with minimal additions of color. Of greatest interest to this study is the opening miniature. (Figures 1 and 2) The manuscript is believed a copy made in 1464 for Bishop Pedro de Montoya (active 1454-1475) whose crest appears

---

41 Foremost among such polemicists was the twelfth-century Petrus Alfonsi, who used his personal background as a convert from Judaism to Christianity to write a treatise in favor of his new faith. See Petrus Alfonsi, *Dialogue Against the Jews*, Fathers of the Church 8, trans. Irven Resnick, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2006).
42 The “Fortress of Faith” was not the first text to blend polemical approaches. One of the fourteenth-century’s most popular polemic works to do this was Samuel of Morocco’s eleventh-century text mentioned above in n. 15.
43 Peter the Venerable was very outspoken about the alleged Jewish replacement of Scripture with the Talmud. His arguments were part of a larger movement that removed contemporary Jews from the protection of their conditional tolerance as fully established by Augustine. See Funkenstein, *Perceptions*, 189-196.
at the bottom of folio 1 recto.\textsuperscript{45} Nothing is known of its predecessor. The 1464 inscription rules out the possibility that this is the original manuscript of the text as scholars date the original to between 1458 and 1460, and there is no known connection between Montoya and Alonso de Espina.\textsuperscript{46}

Pedro de Montoya was one of the foremost patrons of art and architecture for the cathedral of El Burgo de Osma and its surrounding community. Installed as bishop following his service in the Castilian armies of Juan II and Enrique IV, he led the diocese and served as civil overlord from 1454 to 1475.\textsuperscript{47} His greatest contributions were the wall he erected around the city in 1456 and the extensive library he donated to the cathedral in 1474. The marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella in 1469 gave way to a much more peaceful period, which allowed Montoya to focus his efforts on expanding the cathedral, which in addition to the library, included the creation of some small chapels and a large altarpiece with retable and altar frontal.\textsuperscript{48}

It is unclear how Montoya acquired El Burgo de Osma, A.C. Ms. 154. His coat of arms, ten silver leaves on a blue ground below a green bishop’s hat, appears without

\textsuperscript{45} The final words of the manuscript date its production to 1464. Rojo Orcajo, “Catálogo,” 253. Folio 188 verso: “...benediction et gracierum action sine fine amen-Explicit fortalitium fidei Scriptor ipsius fuit garsias de Sto. Stephano de gormacio. Deo gracias-de mandato Domini mei petri episcopi oxomensis anno 1464.” The crest is also identified on p. 253. Presumably, this manuscript was part of the library, which Bishop Pedro de Montoya gave to his cathedral. Interestingly, Montoya’s other major contribution to El Burgo de Osma was his rebuilding of the town walls, an act allegorically echoed in the Fortalitium fidei’s focus on fortifying the Christian faith.

\textsuperscript{46} The text itself gives a date of 1458, but scholars agree that the text was expanded for several years afterward.

\textsuperscript{47} Mildred Davison, “An Altarpiece,” 108.

\textsuperscript{48} Davison, “An Altarpiece,” 109. The altarpiece is now housed at the Art Institute of Chicago and serves as a testament to Spanish engagement with the northern gothic style of France and Flanders. It demonstrates a degree of naturalism and an interest in the textile arts. See Davison, “An Altarpiece,” 108-124.
coloring below the full-page miniature that opens the text. (Figure 2). This is the case for many of the works he owned. Frequently, the placement of the arms indicates Montoya as a buyer of ready-made works into which his crest could easily be inserted.

The illuminator of the miniature is an unnamed artist. Some scholars have identified the scribe, Steven of Gormaz, as the miniaturist, but there is no evidence to support this assertion. Speculations that Montoya was intimately involved in planning the decoration of his manuscript nicely reflect his service in the king’s army and his work in erecting walls around the city of Burgo while serving as bishop. However, if, as suggested above, Montoya simply had his arms inserted into the miniature later, his agency in the manuscript’s decoration was more likely minimal.

Acting as frontispiece for the entire volume, folio 1 recto presents a large illumination of the Fortalitium fidei populated with its protectors and engulfed by its enemies. (Figure 1) This earliest surviving image of the “Fortress of Faith” reflects the text’s organization. The fortress consists of five towers, which correspond to the five volumes of the text. Angels fill the four outer towers and accompany an enthroned Christ with the Virgin at his side at the summit of the larger, central tower. Heretics, Jews and Muslims occupy discrete regions near the base of the tower. The heretics carve out their hole beneath the left side of the fortress, while the passive Jews are isolated in a cavern to the right. The Muslims are separated from these group and dominate the foreground, while angels and demons confront each other in the surrounding skies. Best read from

---

49 Steven of Gormaz is named on folio 188 verso: “...Scriptor ipsius fuit garsias de Sto. Stephano de gormacio...” See Rojo Orcajo, “Catálogo,” 253.
50 Davison makes this argument concerning the patronage of the Chicago altarpiece. Davison, “Altarpiece,” 120.
bottom to top, this image of the “Fortress of Faith” projects an image of confidence in the
case of adversity.

In the lower left region of the picture, heretics occupy a hole in the earth. (Figure
21) Willfully engaged in a destructive attack, the heretics use spades, axes, and other
tools to dig beneath the foundation of the fortress. Despite their vigorous efforts, the
fortress stands strong. Two men being burned at the stake below them underscore the
ineffectiveness of their attempt.

Below the right corner of the fortress, a walled area encompasses a group of Jews.
(Figure 22) Unlike the heretics, the Jews appear quite passive. Historical and symbolic
markers identify them as the outdated ancestors of the Christian church. In keeping with
the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council, they wear round red badges. Their
blindfolds are iconographically consistent with medieval Christian belief that Jews were
blind to the truth of Christianity. As in the miniature, Jews were deemed literally
shackled by their carnal understanding of the world. The key interpretive factor for the
Jews presented here is the central visual element. The static mass of Jews huddles around
a figure holding an open book. The book is opened outward for the other Jews to see, but
the futility of the action is immediately apparent; the blindfolds prevent them from seeing
the book, and none of them actually looks toward it. The inability to read the book is
highlighted in the lack of words inscribed on the open pages, and the central figure’s

51 As Rodriguez Barral notes, the red badges seen here correspond to those used during
the reign of Enrique II. Although the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 prescribed physical
markers of religious difference, manuscript miniatures indicate that they were not
enforced until the fifteenth century. For example, the badges are not depicted in the
Códice Rico of the Cantigas of Alfonso X. (e.g. Figure 23) See Rodriguez Barral, La
imagen del judío, 53.
presentation of a blank book, rather than a scroll, hearkens back to the idea that the Jews live and act in the religious past.

While topography and walls isolate the heretics and Jews, the Muslims in the lower central portion of the image are in immediate contact with Christian troops. (Figure 24) Just outside the castle entrance, the opposing forces line up with the Christians on the left and the Muslims on the right. Both parties fight with their kings and sound their trumpets as they charge into battle. The Christian front is armored, and their horses are draped in battle clothes, while the Muslims eschew body armor, carry oddly decorated shields, and ride unsaddled into battle. The Muslims fly a white flag with a white crescent inscribed in a red pentagon, while the Christian flag bears a red cross and the red words “fides vinc,” or “faith conquers.” The sentiment proves true in the depiction of the surrounding battle. Fallen Muslim warriors and their wounded horses topple into the immediate foreground, while an endless supply of Christian soldiers spills through the open doorway and protects the fortress from within its lower walls.

There are three other figures among the Muslims linking them to the final enemy of the “Fortress of Faith”: demons. At the bottom left of the Muslim section, a prominently horned figure appears behind two bleeding horses. (Figure 25) This figure reaches up to hold the hoof of another horse. Although its rider continues to fight, the upper horse is also wounded and presses its head into the hand of a very strange figure with six heads and hands for feet. The mouth of one of the heads carries an unrolled scroll with the words, “trij fut saraceni,” perhaps referring to the defeat of the three wounded Muslims on horses to the right. Another demon in the left margin identifies the figures with the same words, while his mirror image at the side of the Jews also has a
banner that reads, “trij fut Judei,” continually associating both non-Christian groups with the demons. (Figures 26 and 27) On the right side of the Muslims, a winged and two-armed pig urges unwounded Muslim horses into battle against the Christians. (Figure 28) The winged pig seen here references the demons flanking the castle above, but its figure type will be more relevant to multiple images of demons found in the French suite of “Fortress of Faith” manuscripts.52

In addition there are demons, which appear to promote the actions of the heretics, Jews, and Muslims. These demons appear at the flanks of the castle’s lower towers. (Figures 29 and 30) They are not winged and lack the sympathetic qualities often ascribed to heaven’s fallen angels. On the contrary, these demons adopt a distinctly animalistic character and are nothing short of grotesque with their leers, grimaces, and bleeding wounds. At the left corner of the fortress, one kneeling demon raises a rosary as if in supplication, but the crimson marks on many of their bodies that correspond with the blood on the swords of the angels above clearly define them as eternally dangerous enemies of the Church.

A series of protective groups occupies the fortress. (Figures 31 and 32) From its lower walls, hooded soldiers with spears peek through crenellations. Seven winged soldiers fight from above the doorway. Recalling the archangel Michael, with their armor, these figures brandish medieval weapons: spears, swords, shields, a cannon, and bows and arrows. Immediately above these fighters and in front of the central tower’s doorway, the earthly administrators of the Church are gathered. The central figure in this

---

52 Related winged beasts are also drawn in the margins of the folio. Like the polycephalous figure that accompanies the Muslims within the miniature, these figures make reference to other enemies.
group is the pope who raises his right hand in blessing. Surrounding him are nuns, bishops, and priests with their hands clasped in prayer. Only one figure, a Franciscan, stands out. While the other figures pray, this man stands just behind and right of the pope with arms outstretched.\(^{53}\) Winged soldiers guard the backside of the fortress, and the heavenly army with swords and instruments hovers in the surrounding skies. The four turrets are also filled with angels.

At the summit of the fortress, Christ is seated on an ornately carved Gothic throne. (Figure 33) Larger than the surrounding figures, the savior wears a golden crown with red and blue jewels. He holds his golden cross staff in his left hand and raises his right hand with beam and scepter toward the sky. As the partially robed “Man of Sorrows,” blood drips from the wounds in his hand and his side. The blue-cloaked Virgin Mary sits at Christ’s feet as two angels appear to deliver the crown for her coronation as the Queen of Heaven. The disciples behind Mary observe the occasion along with the angels to Christ’s other side. Just below this group, the fortress is labeled in gold writing: “\textit{turris fortitudinis a facie inimici}.”\(^{54}\)

Ultimately, this illumination indirectly asks the reader to discern his or her own place in the fight depicted. The image is formally and metaphorically divided into two planes. The lower, terrestrial plane is filled with Christian soldiers and their human

\(^{53}\) It is tempting to classify this Franciscan figure as a portrait of Alonso de Espina. However, given the lack of information concerning the production of this miniature or what models may have existed for it, such a statement would be nothing more than speculation.

\(^{54}\) Several other miniatures are found in Ms. 154 but none as influential as the frontispiece discussed above. These other images serve as more literal illustrations of the allegations recorded in the text and are, therefore, only briefly addressed in Chapters Four and Five. A miniature on folio 108 recto depicts the 1410 Host Desecration of Segovia as an example of the obstinate malice of the Jews, which is addressed in the tenth consideration of the third book, and multiple miniatures illustrate the attacks of Muslims.
enemies. The upper, heavenly plane includes both militant and peaceful angels, the Virgin Mary, Christ, and his disciples. The demons, archangel figures, and clergy act as the liminal bodies that delineate the boundary between the heavens and the earth. In reading this image the viewer can both recognize himself and emulate others embroiled in a metaphorical war between ultimate good and evil.

3) French Manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith”

The *Forteresse de la foy* manuscripts were translated directly from the Latin, but they stand apart from El Burgo de Osma, A.C. Ms. 154 in their execution of a new visual formula for the “Fortress of Faith” specific to the work’s changing audience across Europe. Scholars are quick to assert Louis of Bruges as the leading patron of the suite of French manuscripts given that the opening miniature in his own copy includes his arms below the collar of the Golden Fleece and his device, the cannon, in the right lateral border.\(^{55}\) Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS 9007 (BR MS 9007) is the only other manuscript to include the arms of an owner, Charles de Croy, but given that these are painted over an earlier set of arms and that the crossed batons of Burgundy appear in multiple margins, its patronage is still debated. It is likely that Louis of Bruges’s manuscript was the model for a suite of manuscripts produced for his associates, Edward IV of England, Charles de Croy, and Maximilian I, Holy Roman Emperor. However, it is problematic to ascribe the same influence over copies that are different in format. Clearly there is a relationship between the miniatures opening each volume of the above bibliophiles’ books and the single miniature in the Valenciennes manuscript, but there is little historical evidence to suggest the true nature of that relationship. In fact, the

\(^{55}\) For the most thorough attempt at reconstructing the history of patronage for *Forteresse de la foy* manuscripts, refer to Fifield, “The French Manuscripts.”
miniature in Valenciennes, BM Ms. 0244 appears at least equally connected to the opening illumination of El Burgo de Osma, A.C. Ms. 154. The assertions made concerning BL Ms. Roy 19 E IV, Douai, BM MS 515, and Berne, SB Ms. 84 are based upon their inferior execution and lower-cost materials. This study proposes a new timeline for the production of French manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith” based on visual and verbal content, materials, and style.  

First, the identification of the translator, Pierre Richart, in only the partial Berne, SB Ms. 84 suggests its placement as the chronologically earliest French manuscript of the text. Second are the works on paper, Valenciennes, BM Ms. 0244 and Douai, BM MS 515. Valenciennes, BM Ms. 0244 shares the most visual content with the opening miniature in the Latin manuscript. However, the miniature from Valenciennes conveys a similar message in a more explicitly instructive way. Complete with straightforward labels for figures and objects, the inserted miniature on vellum provides a code for creating images of the “Fortress of Faith.” Although Douai, BM MS 515 has only the spaces for five opening miniatures, it is included here as a possible model for other manuscripts employing the same arrangement of a separate miniature to open each volume. Perhaps the execution of these manuscripts on paper does not diminish their position in “Fortress of Faith” production; instead both works can be understood as guidebooks for scribes and miniaturists.

As noted above, the idea of Louis of Bruges as the patron of several of the French manuscripts remains attractive given their ownership. Additionally, the arrangement of the miniatures and their stylistic similarities suggest a single artist. BL MS Royal 17 F,

---

56 Figure 20 provides a chart for visualizing this study’s reconstruction of the “Fortress of Faith’s” production timeline.
VI and VII and BR MS 9007 likely follow BnF Ms. fr. 20067-20069. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Mss. 2535 and 2536 (ÖNB MS 2535 and ÖNB MS 2536) must follow these as they each include the complete set of five miniatures, though with some liberties in content and the hand of a different scribe. When miniatures of the “Fortress of Faith” appear in art historical scholarship, they are almost always removed from the context of the manuscript in which they appear. *Forteresse de la foy* illuminations are mentioned as examples of the work of Loyset Liédet and his atelier. However, they are not among his well-documented work and, therefore, receive only enough attention for attempts to fit them into Liédet’s body of work based on his residential and patronage history and his dates of membership in the Bruges confraternity of illuminators.

The miniatures in ÖN Mss. 2535 and 2536 are assigned a later date and different artist than BnF Ms. fr. 20067-20069, BL MS Roy 17 F, IV and VII, and BR MS 9007, and their visual chronology is easily delineated. Dissimilarly, BL MS Roy 19 E, IV and BMA, Accessions 11.506 and 11.507 present several options for their placement in the “Fortress of Faith’s” production timeline. BL MS Roy 19 E IV is written on vellum in a different hand than BL MS Roy 17 F, VI and VII, and it has blank spaces for five opening miniatures. The Brooklyn Museum images could belong to the incomplete manuscript in London, to Douai, BM MS 515, or a thus far unknown copy of the “Fortress Faith.” However, if this timeline is to be followed, Douai, BM MS 515 should be eliminated as the content and composition of one of these images is more closely linked to the Vienna miniatures than to any other.

57 For example, see Kren and McKendrick, *Illuminating the Renaissance*, 230-233.
BnF Ms. fr. 20067-69 is the best documented of the manuscripts under examination. (Figures 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) The arms and device of Louis of Bruges, Seigneur de Gruthuyse, expressly identify him as the owner of the work.\textsuperscript{58} A work on parchment, the manuscript contains four hundred thirty-nine folia measuring 500 mm x 370 mm. The translator is not named in the manuscript but has been identified elsewhere as Pierre Richart, dit l’Oiselet.\textsuperscript{59} The unnamed scribe transposed the French translation of Espina’s text in two columns. The illuminator clearly departs from the style and execution of Bishop Montoya’s manuscript, eliminating the narrative miniatures and devoting a separate full-page illumination to each of the enemy groups discussed in the text. These formulaic miniatures serve as frontispieces to each book and are executed in the court style of the period.

BL Royal Ms. 17 F, VI and VII is a two-volume vellum manuscript of four hundred fifty-two folia, each measuring 506 x 356 mm. (Figures 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13) The scribe, Jehan du Quesne, adhered to the tradition of a double-columned composition in his transcription of the French translation. Due to its shared text-image structure and stylistic similarities with BnF Ms. fr. 20067-69, this manuscript is presumed a copy of Louis of Bruges, Seigneur de Gruthuyse’s lavishly embellished codex. The spaces for the owner’s arms are left blank, but the manuscript probably belonged to Edward IV of England.\textsuperscript{60} The friendship of Louis of Bruges and Edward IV along with evidence from

\textsuperscript{58} Beyond the identification of these symbols, the provenance of this manuscript is very well-documented as will be shown below.

\textsuperscript{59} Hermann Hagen and Jacques Bongars, \textit{Catalogus Codicum Bernensium} (Bern: typis B.F. Haller, 1875), 103. The translator is named in the Berne copy of the manuscript.

\textsuperscript{60} The early provenance of this manuscript and Edward IV’s undecorated copy of the same text are relatively easily reconstructed. Warner and Gilson’s description identifies it as no. 22 in the Richmond Palace manuscript catalogue of 1535, and Cora Schofield
the colophon and the calligraphic style of the copyist date this manuscript to the mid-
1470s. On the whole, the illuminations in this manuscript bear a striking resemblance
to those of the Paris manuscript, but close examination reveals enough divergent details
to examine them in addition to those in Paris.

Valenciennes, BM Ms. 0244 differs from the French manuscripts described above
in its quality of materials and number of illuminations. (Figure 14) Comprised of five
hundred twenty paper folia measuring 385 mm x 278 mm, the text is a mixed Gothic
script arranged in two columns of forty-one lines each. Its only miniature appears on a
vellum leaf preceding the text of Book I (folio 27 recto). Given what is known about the
provenance of this manuscript, it was likely the possession of Baudouin II de Lannoy of
Lille, but its exact dating remains unclear. While the composition of the single
illumination matches the format of the manuscripts belonging to Louis of Bruges and
Edward IV, all of the enemies are displayed in a single image, and the execution of the
scene suggests a lesser workshop.

Although BMA Accessions 11.506 and 11.507 are single illuminations on
parchment, there is reasonable evidence to conclude that they were once intended for and
possibly even incorporated into a larger illuminated manuscript, such as those with empty
miniature spaces now in London and Douai. (Figures 15 and 16) The measurements for

names a *La Forteresse de la Foy* in the *Wardrobe Accounts for 1480*. See Cora M.
Schofield, *The Life and Reign of Edward the Fourth, King of England and France and

62 Ibid., 103-104. The manuscript’s ownership by Baudouin de Lannoy also comes from
one of the more tenuous reconstructions of provenance concerning the suite of French
copies. The earliest definite owner was Françoise de Barbenchon, widow of Philippe de
Lannoy and daughter-in-law to Baudouin II de Lannoy.
63 *Forteresse de la foy* (c. 1460-80), London, British Library, MS Royal 19 E IV.
these images are consistent with the miniatures in the Paris copy as well as the empty spaces in the second London manuscript. Anomalies in the subject matter suggest thematic experimentation like that seen in the first miniature of BR MS 9007, which is sometimes described as the “Construction of the ‘Fortress of Faith’.” (Figure 17) This description is particularly puzzling given the shovel bearers and Vices at left and the male figures at right in the miniature. Their shift in style has prompted scholars working at the Brooklyn Museum to suggest a dating later than that of the Paris, London, and Brussels manuscripts, but insufficient provenance records inhibit a scholarly consensus.

The five manuscripts described above provide the core group of illuminations for this study, but it would be imprudent to completely ignore the other six manuscripts as they each reveal important details in their images, materials, patronage, and provenance. Berne, SB MS 84 is not illuminated but significant because it is the only French manuscript to name a translator. BR MS 9007 contains illuminations consistent in style

---

*Forteresse de la foy* (c. 1460-80), Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 515.

64 The images from the Brooklyn Museum measure 23 x 21 cm and 22.1 x 21.3 cm. The images in the Paris manuscript measure 24.5 x 22.5 cm, and the spaces in the second London manuscript measure 25 x 22.5 cm.

65 *Forteresse de la foy* (c. 1460-80), Brussels, Bibliothèque royale, MS 9007, folio 14 r.

66 The conservation notes for the miniatures go as far as to ask, “Could these be nineteenth century copies?” The museum files for these images only state Robert Hoe purchased the miniatures as lot 65 of an A. Firmin Didot sale in Paris, 1884. Hoe owned the miniatures until the director of the Brooklyn Museum, A. Augustus Healy, purchased them for about $2200.00 at a New York sale of said owner’s collection on February 27, 1911. Healy gave the miniatures to the museum on April 19th of the same year.

67 “*Le present Volume a esté translaté de latin en français par Pierre Richart, dit l’oiselet, Prestre et Cure de Marques.*” It seems significant that Marques is only a few miles from Lille, Douai, and Valenciennes, all cities with French manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith” connected to them. This is a manuscript of 335 paper folia, containing only volumes four and five of the text and lacking illustrations or space for them. See Fifield, “The French Manuscripts,” 99; Johann Rudolf Skinner, *Catalogus Codicum MSS Bibliothecae Bernensis* (Bern: Ex. officina typographica illustr. Reipublicae, 1760), 68; and Hagen and Bongars, *Catalogus Codicum Bernensium*, no. 84.
with those included in Louis of Bruges’s and Edward IV’s manuscripts (BL MS Roy 17 F, VI and VII and BnF Ms. fr. 20067-69), but the circumstances concerning its production and early ownership are elusive.  

(Figure 17) ÖNB MSS 2535 and 2536 are ornate manuscripts from the collection of Maximilian I Holy Roman Emperor. (Figures 18 and 19) Both of these format text and image in the same manner as the manuscripts of Louis of Bruges and Edward IV, but the illuminator is not Loyset Liédet. Little is

The naming of the translator and material properties of the Berne manuscript suggest an execution date near that of the Valenciennes manuscript in the production timeline proposed in the following pages.

This manuscript is also executed on vellum, but the fourth volume is incomplete. It is clear that the manuscript once belonged to Charles de Croy, prince de Chimay as an inscription on the second guard leaf reads, “Ce livre appartient a Monseigneur Charles de Croy prince de Chimay histoire in quatre histoires (1) et sappelle Le livre de la forteresse de la joy. Signe par mon dit seigneur. Charles. Videt serenissimus Pr Card Ferdinandus 12 dec. 1639. Quod attestor. A. Miraeus Bibliothec. Regius.” His arms appear twice, but in one of these instances, his arms are evidently painted over another crest, presumably belonging to an earlier owner. In addition, the crossed arms of Burgundy appear in two borders, but it is unknown whether this symbol indicates original ownership or should be dated to the manuscript’s later entry into the library of the Duke of Burgundy, which may have occurred at any time over a number of years. For a full description of the manuscript, see J. Van Den Gheyn, Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, III (Bruxelles: H. Lamertin, 1903), 104. For further speculation on the earliest provenance of the manuscript, refer to Fifield, “The French Manuscripts,” 101-103.

See Franz Unterkircher, Manuscrits et livres imprimés concernant l’histoire des Pays-Bas 1475-1600 (Bruxelles: Bibliothèque Albert Ier, 1962), 51-54. Although Unterkircher once dated both manuscripts to after 1508 due to a presumed portrait of Maximilian I in one of the illuminations, Fifield believes that the manuscripts were produced between 1470 and 1480 along with the other French translations and that the portrait is more likely a symbolic Holy Roman Emperor. The so-called portrait appears on folio 258 of MS 2535 near a banner of the Holy Roman Emperor and a horse draped in cloth decorated with the Austrian eagle. See Fifield, “The French Manuscripts,” 55.

The style of these miniatures is similar enough to suggest that the master worked under Liédet, a workshop practice that may be attested to in several unfinished portions of miniatures in Charles de Croy’s copy (MS 9007, Bibliothèque Royale, Brussels). The scribe for these manuscripts is Jehan du Quesne, who is also responsible for copying the translations belonging to Edward IV and Charles de Croy (Ms. Royal 17 F VI and VII, British Library, London and MS 9007, Bibliothèque royale, Brussels). See Fifield, “The French Manuscripts,” 104-105.
known concerning Douai, BM MS 515. It is a paper copy with large spaces left for miniatures at the beginning of each volume. Given this manuscript’s paper support and the relationship it constructs between word and image, it could be read as a transitional work between Valenciennes, BM Ms. 0244 and the more lavish codices of Louis of Bruges, Edward IV, Charles de Croy, and Maximilian I. While scholarship on French manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith” generally begins with Louis of Bruges’s manuscript, this study reconstructs the timeline of the text’s visual evolution and proceeds from the Burgo manuscript to its relative in Valenciennes. The latter’s singular miniature can be treated as a transitional image linking the Latin illuminated manuscript to the French illuminated translations of northern European book collectors.

Valenciennes, BM Ms. 0244 (Figure 14)

Despite its apparent simplification, the opening miniature of Valenciennes, BM Ms. 0244 maintains the basic composition and subject matter seen in the Burgo frontispiece. The manuscript, itself, is a bit of an enigma among most of the French

---


72 Fifield alternatively reconstructs the evolution of the “Fortress of Faith” and its manuscript images with the Burgo copy as the direct ancestor of the Paris manuscript, which served as the model for those in London, Brussels, and Vienna. He places the manuscripts in Valenciennes and Douai latest due to their lesser material and artistic quality. However, the reasoning for the order of the manuscripts presented here is equally credible as it considers manuscript materials and measurements and the formal qualities of the miniatures. If Fifield’s assertion that the finished manuscripts were ruled and transcribed in Lille before being sent to Bruges for illumination, then there is a possible explanation of how Valenciennes Ms. 0244 came to reside in the library of Baudouin II de Lannoy, then governor of Lille.
manuscripts because it was likely produced for a patron of more moderate wealth. Its provenance suggests a noble patron of the Burgundian court, and its material qualities rank it below several other manuscript copies of the text. Espina’s *Fortalitium fidei* is translated into French and transcribed onto 520 paper folia measuring 385 mm x 278 mm. A single full-page illumination on parchment appears on folio 27 recto. While the pages are roughly the same size as those of the Burgo manuscript and of a smaller scale than other French copies, the miniature is comparable to the later images in size. The completed faces, inscriptions, and golden accents negate the illumination’s characterization as a study despite its under-developed painting and garish coloring noted by connoisseurs of miniature painting. In particular, the inscriptions go to far too much effort in decoding the imagery for its audience.

Because Valenciennes, BM Ms. 0244 is deemed inferior to the clearly related copies of Paris, London, Brussels, and Vienna, it is generally discussed as a mediocre copy of the lavish manuscripts descended from the model codex of Louis of Bruges, Seigneur de Gruthuyse. However, if, as Fifield suggests, it is possible that a cheap and fragmentary paper copy of the text now in Berne was once a travel possession of Charles the Bold, a formidable book collector in his own right, it must also be possible that the Valenciennes manuscript was purposely executed with lesser materials and technical detail. The formatting reflects the other manuscripts’ organization, as does the spatial

---


74 Fifield, “The French Manuscripts,” 99. Fifield suggests the manuscript may have arrived in the city after the death of Charles the Bold at the Battle of Nancy in January
Perhaps this manuscript and its miniature were the model for the more refined manuscripts of Louis of Bruges, Edward IV, the House of Croy, and Maximilian I. In this light, the golden inscriptions within the illumination become particularly important. Not only do they decode the imagery of the miniature, they are more specifically adapted in the manuscript of Louis of Bruges. In discussing Valenciennes, BM Ms. 0244 between the Latin manuscript in Burgo de Osma and the French manuscript in Paris, this study considers the material and visual aspects of the manuscripts, which are key to reconstructing the history of production for the *Forteresse de la foy*. As such, it seems appropriate to proceed from the El Burgo de Osma, A.C. Ms. 154 to the French, paper copies of Berne, Valenciennes, and Douai, to the lavish manuscripts of Louis of Bruges, Edward IV, Charles de Croy, and Maximilian I.

Although the space for a coat of arms beneath the opening miniature of Valenciennes, BM Ms. 0244 is left blank, an inscription on the guard leaf reads, “*Ce livre est a Françoise de Barbenchon, dame douagière de Molembeuse.*” Françoise was the wife of Philippe de Lannoy, Seigneur de Molembais, and the second heir to her father-in-law’s famous library. Born around 1440 and inducted into the Order of the Golden Fleece in 1481, Baudouin II de Lannoy was a contemporary of all of the other book owners discussed here. Fifield asserts that Baudouin must have ordered the book while 1477. After the duke fell, the Swiss took possession of his baggage, reportedly delivering his copy of the *Cyropédie* and, presumably, other objects to their home city of Berne.

---

75 The miniature measures 200 mm x 180 mm.
76 Certainly, the relationship of the assumed original owner, Baudouin II de Lannoy, to these houses supports such a suggestion. All of these figures belonged to the same social circle and were members of the Order of the Golden Fleece, Baudouin having been inducted in 1481 at Bois-le-Duc.
77 “This book belongs to Françoise de Barbenchon dame douagière de Molembeuse.”
serving as governor of Lille and suggests that this is especially likely since all of the French manuscripts are tied to Lille’s du Quesne officine.  

In the large miniature, the fortress is situated on a circular island in the middle of a flowing river, a trope familiarized by images of Mont Saint Michel outside of Paris. (Figures 34 and 35) None of the enemies have traversed the moat, though their arrows have. Three archers in the lower right corner of the picture take aim at the fortress. (Figure 36) The artist seems to have intentionally positioned the figures in profile to emphasize their facial features. Otherwise, there are no visual cues for distinguishing them from the other enemies except the three appearances of the label “Juifs” or “Juyfs.” A similar cluster appears in the lower left corner, but these figures are, as labeled, “Sarasins,” or Muslims. (Figure 37) It is possible that the artist made an effort to depict these men with flatter noses, as was customary in contemporary images of Muslims, but two of the three faces are damaged. Just behind a hill in the immediate foreground, the busts of seven bearded men in hoods, head coverings, and a hat are visible. (Figure 38) Three of the men face the fortress, while the other four are viewed in profile. None of the figures appear to aggress against the tower or its protectors. In fact, two of the men in profile seem engaged in conversation. Three of these figures bear the inscription “ypocrites,” linking them to the heretics discussed in the second volume of the text.

Seven men of the Church surround the base of the tower. (Figure 39) From the center, the pope gazes directly out at the viewer. Two bishops, a cardinal, and three Dominican friars direct their attention to the fortress as enemy arrows assail it. The
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78 Fifield, “The French Manuscripts,” 103-104. The manuscript’s entire provenance from Françoise de Barbencon forward is accessible and recounted by Fifield on page 104.
arrows are mostly directed at the crowned and sword-bearing figures in the central windows. A Dominican friar with arms extended occupies each of the two side windows.

Looming from across the river on either side of the tower, two polymorphic demons bear arms against the fortress. (Figure 40) They bear many features of the monstrous including wings, fangs, strangely enlarged ears, and bird talons in place of hands and feet. The static quality of their stances allows the viewer to note these features in conjunction with the curious bands of color that cover the demons' bodies. Most striking are the additional, grotesque faces on their abdomens, from which coarse beards billow to hide the genitals of their otherwise nude bodies. The demons carry crowbars and firearms and are labeled “pedriez mortels,” or “lost souls.”

Three women occupy the upper story of the tower. On either side, a nun in a white wimple extends a hand out over the demons and is labeled “virtus,” while an arrow sails toward her. The word “vice” appears alongside the arrow.

Despite the many differences between the frontispiece of the Burgo manuscript and the illumination in the Valenciennes copy, it is impossible to deny their relationship. Both use a tower or fortress as a centralizing element in the composition, and both include representations of both attackers and protectors of the “Fortress of Faith.” These shared basic features of composition and content strongly suggest the Latin manuscript enjoyed an audience in Flanders or Northern France at some point during the late fifteenth century. In comparing the miniatures, it is tempting to interpret the Valenciennes image as a lazy imitation of the Burgo image. In the latter, countless details repetitively explain the nature of the fortress and those who assault it. However,

79 The exact type of firearm is unclear from the illuminations, but they closely resemble “hand cannons” or tiller guns from the fifteenth century.
the unrefined version of the image found in Valenciennes might simply suggest a viewer
differently primed for the message presented in the “Fortress of Faith.” With fewer
figures to examine and simple inscriptions serving as cues for the reader, the
Valenciennes image encouraged an audience with a sophisticated visual literacy to
interpret the miniature metaphorically and allegorically. 80

**BnF Ms. fr. 20067-20069** (Figures 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8)

The prevailing theory about the production of the *Forteresse de la foy*
manuscripts attributes their existence to the patronage of Louis of Bruges, Seigneur de
Gruthuyse. 81 The material evidence for this assertion includes both the complete
provenance of his manuscript of the text and the border imagery of its illuminations.
Although a new sequence of manuscript production is proposed above, the provenance of
the Gruthuyse manuscript remains important. Most of the illuminations in the
manuscripts include playful and delicately executed borders, but only BnF Ms. fr. 20067-
20069 includes the identifiers of its original owner. 82 Not only does the copy once
owned by Louis of Bruges bear his arms and the collar of the *Toison d’or* beneath the
opening miniature, but Louis of Bruges’s device, the cannon, and motto, “Plus est en
vous,” also appear within the right border. (Figure 41) The appearance of the Gruthuyse
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80 The audience mentioned here is meant to include illuminators of later manuscripts
alongside general readers. Later in this chapter and again in Chapters Four and Five, I
will return to some of the metaphorical and allegorical interpretations of the “Fortress of
Faith” for more in-depth exploration.
82 This manuscript is described in Charles de la Roncière, *Catalogue général des
arms and device suggest the direct transmission of the manuscript from the atelier to the Gruthuyse library, and its provenance from that point forward is complete.  

Louis of Bruges, Seigneur de Gruthuyse, was a well-known, loyal servant of the House of Burgundy.  (Figure 42) At times, this relationship also brought him into considerable favor with the Houses of York and Hapsburg, making him a very popular member of court for most of his life.  Born to Jean of Bruges and Marguerite de Steenhuyse around 1426, his favor with the House of Burgundy dates to the 1440s.  Having already competed at the tournament of l’Ours in 1443, he represented Philip the Good’s wife, Isabelle of Portugal, at the Easter tournament of 1447.  In his twenties, Louis of Bruges served Philip the Good as a cupbearer, as diplomat to the treaty conferences at Cambrai, as governor of Flanders, and as peacekeeper between the duke and the people of Ghent.  He married Marguerite de Borssele of Zeeland in 1455, and in 1461 he joined Marguerite’s father, Henri, as a knight of the Golden Fleece.  (Figure 43)

Gruthuyse was a pillar of Burgundian diplomacy under both Philip the Good and his son, Charles the Bold.  In 1463, he was made lieutenant general of Holland, Zeelande, and Frisia, and in 1466, he was present for the treaty signing of Charles the Bold and
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83 Fifield, “The French Manuscripts,” 106-107.  Fifield goes on to outline the complete provenance of the manuscript.  Either before or upon the death of Louis of Bruges, this manuscript entered the library of Claude d’Urfé at Chateau de l’Abbatie en Forez, where it remained until 1777.  In that year, the duc de la Vallière purchased the manuscript and kept it until his death in 1783, at which time the manuscript entered the Bibliothèque royale, now the Bibliothèque Nationale de France.

84 Joseph van Praet, *Recherches sur Louis de Bruges, seigneur de la Gruthuyse*: suivies de la notice des manuscrits qui lui ont appartenu, et dont la plus grande partie se conserve à la Bibliothèque du roi (Paris: De Bure frères, 1831), 1-6.  At the tenth chapter Gruthuyse was elected as the sixty-first chevalier de la Toison d’Or in replacement of the recently deceased Jean de Verny, seigneur de Fourvens (d. 1460).  He was inducted along with Juan II of Aragon and Navarre; Adolph the Young, Duke of Gueldre and Count of Zutphen; Thiebault of Neufchatel, Maréchal of Burgundy; Phillippe Pot, Seigneur de la Roche de Nolay; and Guy, Seigneur de Roye.
Edward of York and helped to arrange the marriage of Charles the Bold to Edward’s sister, Margaret of York.\(^8\) Upon Philip the Good’s death in 1467, Gruthuyse immediately entered into the direct service of Charles the Bold, ensuring the new duke’s triumphal entry into Ghent and attending his wedding to Margaret of York in 1468.\(^9\)

Gruthuyse’s favorable relationship with Charles the Bold and his bride also facilitated a mutually beneficial relationship with the House of York. In 1470, he provided Edward IV with refuge after plucking him from the hands of Warwick pirates. Edward IV intermittently visited with his sister at Artois and enjoyed the hospitality of the Hotel de Gruthuyse from 9 October 1470 until 19 February 1471, when he returned to England.\(^10\) Louis of Bruges and Edward IV remained intimate friends as witnessed in Gruthuyse’s continued support for cooperation between the Houses of Burgundy and York. Gruthuyse’s kindnesses and efforts did not go unnoticed, as Edward IV appointed him Count of Winchester by the end of 1471.\(^11\)

Charles the Bold died in 1477, but Gruthuyse’s ten years of service to the Houses of Burgundy and York had rendered him indispensable to both parties. As Mary of Burgundy, daughter of Charles and Margaret and niece of Edward, entered the spotlight, Gruthuyse became a trusted advisor in both public and private matters. They shared political triumphs and losses, and after arranging Mary’s marriage to Maximilian of

---

\(^8\) Van Praet, *Louis de Bruges*, 7-9.
\(^9\) Ibid., 7-8.
\(^10\) Ibid., 9-10.
\(^11\) Ibid., 11. Gruthuyse did not formally receive his title as Count of Winchester until the 13th of October, 1472, when he traveled to England. He received permission to use the arms of the old counts of Winchester later that year, but such permissions and the title were posthumously stripped from him in 1500. See Van Praet, *Louis de Bruges*, 14.
Austria, Gruthuyse and Charles de Croy gave her hand to the future emperor.\textsuperscript{89} He remained close to the couple until Mary’s death in 1483.\textsuperscript{90}

At this time Gruthuyse and Maximilian found themselves at odds with each other concerning the future of the Lowlands as part of Maximilian’s realm. Despite having been chamberlain to their son, Philip the Fair, and one of the executor’s of Mary’s will, Gruthuyse quickly fell out of favor with the Hapsburg. After demanding that Philip’s guardianship be transferred from Maximilian to a resident of the Lowlands, Gruthuyse spent over three years in prison. Upon his release in February of 1488, he found his beloved homeland on the verge of revolt and spent the rest of his life working to reduce Maximilian’s power in the Lowlands. By the time of his death in 1492, his position as a knight of the \textit{Toison d’Or} had been revoked, and his splendid reputation among the ruling powers had all but disappeared with the death of Mary, the last heir of Burgundy.\textsuperscript{91}

The grand scale of Gruthuyse’s library is a testament to his high standing with the Burgundian dukes. In fact, the collections of Philip the Good and Charles the Bold were probably the lone rivals to it.\textsuperscript{92} Beyond the sheer number of manuscripts he owned, the insertion of portraits of him, particularly those in which he presents a manuscript to another lord, underscores his role as a patron of manuscript arts.\textsuperscript{93} (Figure 44) He is often credited with inspiring a love of manuscripts in Edward IV, King of England, whose own manuscript collection reflected Gruthuyse’s in both content and aesthetic tastes.\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{89} Van Praet, \textit{Louis de Bruges}, 17-19.
\textsuperscript{90} Fifield, “The French Manuscripts,” 108.
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., 108-109.
\textsuperscript{92} Van Praet, \textit{Louis de Bruges}, 34.
\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., 35.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., 11.
The illuminations in the Gruthuyse, London, and Brussels manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith” are attributed to Loyset Liédet (1420-1479). Born in Hesdin and possibly the son of Flemish School painter Willaume Liédet of Lille (active 1407-1414), he was active as a miniaturist in Bruges between 1445 and 1479. He worked for the Dukes of Burgundy as early as 1460, joining the ranks of Jean Le Tavernier, Jean Hennecart, and Simon Marmion. Touted for several important commissions, such as his work on Philip the Good’s *Histoire de Charles Martel et de ses successeurs* and *Histoire Générale de Haynaut*, Liédet and his workshop were well sought-after miniaturists based in Bruges. (Figures 45 and 46) While not the most regaled artist of

---

95 Their singular attribution and repeated use of the polygonal tower strongly advocate for their creation by Liédet in Bruges, a city, which boasts a similar octagonal tower constructed in the 1480s. Alternate spellings for Loyset Liédet include Loiset, Lowiis, Louis, Lieder, and Lyédet. As with many miniaturists from this period, there is great debate concerning the details of his life and career. Virtually every biographical source for Liédet lists different dates for his birth, death, employment, commissions, and guild membership. For the purposes of consistency in this study, I have chosen to defer to the timeline that emerges from the works of Bodo Brinkmann and Paul Durrieu. 


98 For information on the *Histoire de Charles Martel et de ses successeurs*, see J. Van den Gheyn, *Histoire de Charles Martel: Reproduction des 102 Miniatures de Loyset Liédet (1470)* (Brussels: Vromant and Company, 1910). Legaré and McKendrick argue that although the historical documents do not record all of his payments or commissions, his atelier was extremely prolific as indicated by modern scholars’ numerous attributions to them. See Anne-Marie Legaré, “Loyset Liédet: un nouveau manuscrit enluminé,” *Revue
his time, he was the most active illuminator at Charles the Bold’s court around 1470, and he is notable as one of the last artists to work for commission rather than joining the rapidly expanding open market.\textsuperscript{99}

Recorded as both “enlumineur et historieur,” he was frequently commissioned in 1468, and his name is first listed in the records of the Bruges Confraternity of Illuminators in 1469.\textsuperscript{100} McKendrick speculates that Liédet joined the guild to extend his atelier’s commercial reach, a feat achieved in his commissions for Louis of Bruges and Ferry de Clugny, Bishop of Tournai, for whom he worked while maintaining the favor of Charles the Bold between 1470 and 1480.\textsuperscript{101} Whether serving the Burgundian Dukes or patrons from their network of acquaintances, Liédet illuminated predominantly lay, vernacular manuscripts.\textsuperscript{102} Much of his work is regarded as adequate, but not exceptional.\textsuperscript{103} However, some of his surviving miniatures demonstrate a high level of achievement, as well as the influence of greater masters, such as Simon Marmion.\textsuperscript{104} Historians interpret the disappearance of his name from guild records after 1478 as evidence of his death the following year.\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{100} The Dictionary of Art, Vol. 19, s.v. “Loyset Liédet.” Durrieu, La miniature flamande, 21.
\textsuperscript{101} Kren and McKendrick, Illuminating the Renaissance, 230-233.
\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{103} Durrieu, La miniature flamande, 21.
\textsuperscript{105} Durrieu, La miniature flamande, 22. For the last appearance of Liédet’s name in the Bruges guild records, see Weale, “Documents inédits sur les enlumineurs de Bruges,” Le Beffroi, 4 (1873): 301. His death was first proposed in Pinchart’s scholarship of 1865. Working from a document in the city accounts of Valenciennes, Vanwijnsberghge argues
Connoisseurs note his use of “gaudy, artificial coloring, dominated on the one hand by contrasting tones of russet, orange and pink, and on the other by a rich, bright blue.” (Figure 47) Durrieu suggests that in order to maintain a high level of productivity, he worked with collaborators, at least two of which were more talented than he. Many of the decorative borders surrounding his miniatures are distinctive in their use of foliage, fantastical beings, and coloring. It is probable that Liédet employed a singular artist or workshop under the influence of Lieven van Lathem to produce the borders seen in manuscripts like La Forteresse de la foy and the Chroniques. Van Lathem’s employment for the production of Gruthuyse manuscripts becomes evident once the recognition of repeated symbols, such as the cannon in the border, is established. (Figures 41 and 48)

In examining multiple series of “Fortress of Faith” illuminations, it becomes clear that each group promotes a particular message and is intended for a sophisticated, visually literate audience. Perhaps the most provocative message appears in BnF Ms. fr. 20067-20069. It continues to depict heretics, Jews, Muslims and demons as threats to Christianity but goes further in its implication of Christian sin. The illuminator’s usage of the popular fifteenth-century Vices, inscriptions and contemporary costume force the
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107 Durrieu, La miniature flamande, 22.
108 Kren and McKendrick, Illuminating the Renaissance, 268. A specific example of this is seen in the firing cannon in the lower border of the miniature, “The Author Hears the Story of Gillion de Trazegnies” in J. Paul Getty Museum Ms. 111 (folio 9v). It is clearly visually tied to the cannon of Louis of Bruges’s emblem in the opening miniature of the Paris Forteresse de la foy.
reader to consider Christian guilt alongside the alleged crimes of the non-Christian enemies. The combination of these contemporary concerns and the familiar chivalric elements of castle and knight result in a hybridized set of miniatures capable of presenting uncomfortable issues to the elite via a soothing medium.

Each of the five full-page illuminations conforms to the standardized formula in which a singular tower is set in an isolated landscape. Clergyman, monks, kings, knights, and nuns occupy the towers’ interiors and turrets. A solid wooden door blocks the only entrance to the fortress, and additional friars, popes, bishops, and cardinals embrace the tower and stand guard against its encroaching enemies. An outer band of figures represents the Vices and the various enemies of the Church. Like the figures inside the fortress, many of those on the exterior bear arms. One male and six females carry attributes and are labeled as the Vices, while the remaining figures in the foreground represent the enemies expounded upon in each volume of the text.

In the image, which opens the third volume of the Gruthuyse manuscript, Jews are the featured enemy. (Figure 6) As in the Burgo manuscript, the blindfolds and cloth badges mark the Jews. The figures wear long garments over fitted long-sleeved shirts and hats. The Jews wield spears but lack the aggressive qualities of their allegorical companions, the Vices. Consummate figures of contradiction, the Jews are attackers who do not attack. Chains are visible at their waists but hardly seem cumbersome. Their spears are aimed at the fortress, but their stances remain static. The Jews pose a minimal threat compared to the labeled Vices, who seem to launch their weapons and taunt the fortress and its inhabitants. (Figure 49)
The opening illumination for the fourth book presents the Muslims in a manner similar to the Jews. (Figure 7) With Islam being such an alleged integral element in the constant call to Crusade, it seems that the extent of the Muslim threat to Christianity is significantly devalued. Only four Muslims are depicted in this image, and although they are armed with a spear, a sword, and stones, the figures appear to contemplate their assault more than to enact it. Billowing sleeves, exotic and expensive elements of clothing, and turbans serve to label these figures as Muslims, but their behavior does not reflect the nature of the Muslims described in the pages that follow.

The traditional enemies’ placement in the foreground of each miniature supports the assertion that the manuscript makers and owners remained steadfastly focused on the threats of heretics, Jews, Muslims and demons. However, the new insertion of the carefully inscribed Vices indicates a shift in the conception of what constitutes a danger to Christianity. (Figure 50) While the Vices were a familiar trope of manuscript and other arts during the fifteenth century, their unprecedented inclusion in texts of the “Fortress of Faith” reveals specific meaning not present in earlier manuscripts. Louis of Bruges and his close associates were charged with answering a new question presented solely in the images of the text: who are the real enemies of Christianity? Confronted with the choice between the traditional enemies discussed in the text and weak Christians they lived among, royal and noble readers assuredly found themselves in unfamiliar territory. Events of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries demonstrate a continued public concern over the behaviors of non-Christians, and it is reasonable to assume that the private
thoughts of some individuals were equally, if not more, consumed with the dangers of Christian misconduct and doubt.¹⁰⁹

The popularity of the cardinal Virtues and Vices during the period are evidence for, at the very least, the self-recognition of the capacity for Christian sin. Such concern is evident in popular contemporary texts like the *Roman de la Rose*, as well as Dante Alighieri’s *Divine Comedy* and the Irish monk, Marcus’s *Visions of Tondal*, which explored the concepts of sin, death, and the Christian afterlife. Liédet’s sustained use of figural allegories of the Vices in the “Fortress of Faith” is decoded through the examination of the frontispieces for Books Two and Three of Louis de Gruthuyse’s illuminated manuscript. (Figures 49 and 51) In both of these miniatures, the Vices are identified in golden script, and key physical features are retained throughout all of the illuminations. Most obvious is the identification of the male spear-bearing figure as Pride (*Orgueil*), but meaningful symbols accompany three of the other Vices as well. Avarice (*Avarice*) carries a moneybag, a chest, and/or loose coins and wears a white veil. White-veiled Gluttony (*Gloton*) is observed as she eats or drinks, and simply dressed Wrath (*Ire*) leans defiantly forward with her hands on her hips. These markers are visible in all five of the illuminations of the text. Lust (*Luxure*), Envy (*Envie*) and Sloth (*Presse/Paresse*) receive less attention but are routinely made apparent through gestures, clothing, and attributes.

In the final image of the Gruthuyse “Fortress of Faith,” the Vices are visually separated from the enemies discussed in the text. (Figure 52) Here the vices adopt the

stiff poses previously taken by the Jews and Muslims. The demons, which hover above, are more actively engaged in battle than any of the other enemies. Their placement and actions within the composition imply that the attack on the physical “Fortress of Faith” is relocated from the terrestrial realm to that of the heavenly. Assuredly the demons still attack the tower with spears and knives, but the bulk of their fight is with the angels occupying the upper regions of the fortress and skies. Although some of the other figures in the castle have weapons, the angels make direct contact with the demons. This turn of events in the great war on Christianity again forces the Christian reader to reconsider the true nature of the struggle at hand. If the fundamental battle is between the heavenly angels and the beastly demons, or more simply between good and evil, then every Christian, whether clergy, royal, or common, must accept his own responsibility as a man of faith in a world plagued by the influence of evil and sin.

It is difficult to determine what features indicate a heretic in the miniature dedicated to this group. (Figures 5 and 51) As in the other images, the Vices accompany the heretics in their attack on the “Fortress of Faith.” The illuminator is careful to provide variety in costuming the group of heretics, dressing some in short tunics and tights and others in long robes and arming them with various implements including a bow and arrow, swords, and a large basket of stones. However, it is the Vices who receive the readers’ attention. They fill the central band of the picture and carry inscriptions and attributes that reveal their identity. The unexpected focus on the Vices creates an intellectual obstacle for the reader who expects the frontispiece to match the content of the volume it precedes. Instead of allowing the reader to move comfortably from the miniature to the text, the illuminator beckons the viewer to consider the relationship
between vice and heresy. The nuanced arrangement of the composition provides further urgency for such a challenge. Much more than in the miniatures dedicated to Jews, Muslims, and demons, the heretical enemy shares the pictorial space. Their bodies overlap with those of the vices, and they invade the space elsewhere reserved for the familiar allegories.

Perhaps the most alluring image in the Paris manuscript is the one that precedes the entire text. (Figure 53) In it, unlabeled men and women and religious and secular figures are juxtaposed with each other as they circle the tower. Although the Vices become a familiar motif throughout the manuscript illuminations, their meaning is initially less obvious, and the rest of the figures present an interesting problem for interpretation. In the left-center area of the picture, three men dig away at the foundation of the fortress. The figure brandishing the pick-axe might be identified as a Muslim because of his baggy clothing and turban, but the other two men wear brown and black robes. Another figure in brown robes is seated in the foreground. He places his rosary beads on the open book in his lap but holds a shovel in his left hand. Similarly, the figure raising an axe at the right wears a cross on his belt and appears to have just abandoned a book whose pages still flap in the breeze. To his left, a courtier prepares a cannon to fire toward the door. Finally, the knight in the right background almost perfectly mimics the gesture of the Vice just in front of him as he aims his spear at the tower. Lacking any instructive inscription, the viewer is left to contemplate the identifications and natures of the characters presented. Positive and negative attributes are seemingly interchangeable, and no consistent patterning of costume emerges to distinguish the good defenders from the bad attackers. Instead, the viewer must anticipate the actions of the figures. Will the
monks focus on prayer or engage in destruction? Will the knight charge the fortress or protect it? Will the victors be Virtues or Vices?

Even more intriguing is the message conveyed through the bodies of the two mendicants standing before the castle door. While the other men of the Church place their hands against the walls as if to brace them, a Franciscan and a Carmelite monk face away from the structure, and appear to sit against it as if their physical exertion is the only thing preventing the fortress from toppling into the viewer’s space. The Franciscan clearly references the “Fortress of Faith’s” author, but the Carmelite indicates new readership for the text. The miniatures not only expand the definition of the enemy, as discussed above; they extend the mission of the fortress’ protectors to the larger Christian community, in this case eliminating any perceived barriers between mendicant orders in favor of a unified defense against evil. In the same way, the intermingling of traditional non-Christians with the Vices encourages the reader to interpret the two figure types as inherently related.

**BL MS Roy 17 F, VI and VII (Figures 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13)**

Although two manuscript copies of the “Fortress of Faith” are traceable to the collection of Edward IV, the king was likely relatively uninvolved in the production and visual messaging of the text. A close associate of Louis of Bruges, Edward’s interest in the manuscript arts mimics the lavish tastes of his friend’s collection. While his relationship with Louis of Bruges can be characterized as the friendliest and most

---

110 The popularity of Franciscans and Carmelites, along with Augustinians, in Bruges during this period could explain this new visual coupling. James M. Murray discusses Bruges’s mercantile interests in the religious orders during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. See James M. Murray, *Bruges, Cradle of Capitalism, 1280-1390* (Cambridge, England: University Press, 2005), 225.
intimate of sorts, Edward IV’s (1442-1483) biography suggests constant tension with nearly all of his relatives. Historians describe his marriage to Elizabeth Woodville (1437-1492) and his concern with French conflict as suffocating factors in his interactions with his uncle, Lord Warwick; his brother, the Duke of Clarence; his brother-in-law, Charles the Bold; and his nephew by marriage, Maximilian I, Holy Roman Emperor.111 These assessments are useful for reconstructing Edward’s political and familial history, but they neglect to consider Edward’s immense efforts to promote his court as one of enviable opulence.

Not even the impoverished state of his early reign discouraged him from spending to impress his lords and his foreign peers. He constantly invested in jewel-encrusted objects and precious metals and allotted a considerable budget for fine clothes and linens.112 In addition, he spared no expense in providing the celebratory spectacles to which the European courts were then accustomed. When his sister, Margaret of York, married Duke Charles the Bold of Burgundy, the celebration was largely his financial responsibility and met all expectations according to the memoirs of the ducal master of ceremonies, Olivier de la Marche.113 His acquisition of countless jewels and metals proved very useful in providing fluid capital for various military endeavors and expensive predicaments, while his commitment to the public display of English royal wealth demonstrates his desire to save face among his contemporaries.

111 For basic biography, see Scofield, Edward the Fourth; Charles Ross, Edward IV (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974); and David Santiuste, Edward IV and the Wars of the Roses (Barnsley, GBR: Pen and Sword, 2010).
112 Ross, Edward IV, 257-259 and 261-264.
Edward IV’s investment in court culture and his cultivation as a man of letters resulted largely from his interactions with Louis of Bruges, Seigneur de Gruthuyse. As noted above, contact between Edward and Louis initiated in the Bruges lord’s service to Charles the Bold. He served as an intermediary figure between the two rulers, hosting Edward before and after visits with Charles and also acting as an ambassador of Burgundy on official business in England.114

The most significant event in their interaction occurred during the summer of 1470. It was then that Edward traveled to the northern part of his kingdom to quickly find himself outnumbered and without aide against the Lancastrians, Lord Warwick, and his brother, the Duke of Clarence. Without any hope for replenishing his troops, Edward and his companions fled to the Low Countries in early October. With his finances dwindling and ships of the Hanseatic League in hot pursuit, Edward landed in Alkmaar. There, he connected with his friend, Louis of Bruges, who clothed and fed him and then conveyed him to his own home in the Hague.115 Edward spent more than two months there awaiting an audience with his brother-in-law, Duke Charles the Bold.116 Not only was he extremely well attended to while residing in Bruges, the ship upon which Edward eventually led the charge back toward England belonged to his host’s father-in-law, the

---

114 Scofield, Edward the Fourth, 32-36.
115 Ross, Edward IV, 151-153.
116 Ibid., 160. On 26 December 1470, Charles the Bold finally called upon Edward IV. The reasons for his delayed welcome hinged upon Burgundy’s precarious position between England and France, as the House of Lancaster had declared itself an ally of Louis XI, and the French were already asserting their authority in parts of northern Burgundy. Even at the meetings that followed Charles’ summons, the Duke was careful not to publicly display any favoritism for the Yorkists. However, he did secretly provide him with twenty thousand pounds and several Dutch ships for his safe passage back to England.
admiral Henri de Borselle, lord of Veere. In return, on Gruthuyse’s 1472 diplomatic visit to England, Edward far exceeded the social expectation for receiving such an ambassador, providing his guest with a royal escort, lavish accommodations at Windsor Castle, priceless gifts, and the king’s undivided attention. In addition, under great pomp and circumstance, Edward created Gruthuyse as Earl of Winchester on October 13th at Westminster Abbey.

The king’s admiration for his friend following his stay in Bruges is materially palpable in his patronage of manuscript arts. The cultivation of this interest before Edward and Louis were acquainted is unlikely. It is known that as an adolescent, Edward owned a manuscript containing medical treatises, Aristotelian theory, and Roger Bacon’s commentary. However, historical documents provide little other indication for or against Edward’s pursuance of a manuscript collection in the early years of his reign. Historians consistently identify his exile in Bruges as the source of his literary predilection. The connection is likely given Edward’s certain exposure to Gruthuyse’s extensive library, then only second to that of Duke Charles the Bold. As a patron of letters, Edward IV frequented the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, and he was not

---

117 Ross, Edward IV, 160. Henri de Borselle’s ship was named the Antony.
118 Scofield, Edward the Fourth, 37-39 and Ross, Edward IV, 260-261. Bluemantle chronicled the ceremony of Gruthuyse’s creation. See “The Record of Bluemantle Pursuivant”, in Charles Lethbridge Kingsford, English Historical Literature (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 380-8. Henry VII revoked Gruthuyse’s earldom in 1500, eight years after the seigneur’s death. However, his arms are still preserved in locations such as the Great Hall of Winchester. See Figure 54.
119 London, British Library, MS Royal 12 E XV.
120 Scofield, Edward the Fourth, 452. Ross’ assessment of Edward IV’s patronage and interest in the arts seems to suggest that the sovereign did not see himself as a promoter of the arts to be remembered. Instead, his interest in manuscripts and printed books seems predicated on his enjoyment of luxury items and literary entertainment. See Ross, Edward IV, 267-70.
unaware of intellectual trends on the continent.\textsuperscript{121} He avidly procured Latin and French manuscripts produced in the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{122} Scofield speculates Edward may have acquired some examples of scribes’ and illuminators’ work before returning to England, and he certainly commissioned a number of manuscripts to be produced in Bruges and added to his personal library thereafter.\textsuperscript{123} The British Library’s Royal Collection is a testament to his personal development as a bibliophile.

Most of the king’s manuscripts were quite large, and the Wardrobe Accounts of 1480 show that he spared no expense in having them bound and transported for his viewing pleasure.\textsuperscript{124} Often more than three hundred parchment leaves, his manuscripts included beautifully executed miniatures bearing the symbols of the English monarchy.\textsuperscript{125} Stylistically, his collection reflected those of his Burgundian contemporaries both in appearance and substance. The preference for French histories, historical romances, and moral treatises paired with the limited attention given to Italian humanism distinguish Edward’s tastes as distinctly northern.\textsuperscript{126}

---

\textsuperscript{121} Scofield, \textit{Edward the Fourth}, 429-451.
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., 451.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., 452.
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid., 454.
\textsuperscript{125} Ross, \textit{Edward IV}, 264-5. Common measurements for these Flemish manuscripts were 485 x 305 mm, and their inclusion of symbols such as the royal arms, Garter insignia, and Yorkist badges explicitly connect them to Edward IV and the English monarchy. For a more in-depth examination of Edward IV’s role in the development of the English Royal Library, see Warner and Gilson, \textit{Catalogue of Western Manuscripts}, Vol. I, xi-xii and Vol. II, 54, 139-41, 170, 173-6, 258, 261-2, 313-16, and 347 and Margaret Kekewich, “Edward IV, William Caxton and Literary Patronage in Yorkist England,” \textit{Modern Language Review}, LXVI (1971): 481-7.
\textsuperscript{126} Among his histories and historical romances were Raoul Le Fevre’s \textit{Receuil des Histoires de Troyes}, the anonymous \textit{La grant hystoire Cesar}, Josephus, Livy, a French translation of Vincent de Beauvais’s \textit{Speculum Historiale}, Jean Mansel’s \textit{Fleur des Hystoires}, William of Tyre’s \textit{History of the Crusades}, and portions of Jean Froissart’s \textit{Chroniques} and Jean de Wavrin’s \textit{Anchiennes et nouvelles cronicques dangleterre}. 
There is no denying that BL MS Roy 17 F, VI and VII, like the majority of Edward IV’s manuscripts, emulate the Burgundian court style in terms of both subject matter and execution. Its relationship to Louis of Bruges’s *Forteresse de la foy* manuscript has already been established above. Most notable is the way that Edward’s manuscript adopts the chivalric references common to Flanders to serve the king’s more personal interests in the state of England. Edward’s use of chivalry to proclaim the sovereignty and superiority of his realm is apparent. Symbols of the House of York and the Order of the Garter abound on the objects he acquired and were featured prominently in public spectacle and pageantry. Undoubtedly, Edward’s exposure to the Burgundian court and his induction into the Order of the Golden Fleece further encouraged his chivalric tendencies.  

Membership in the Order was a significant and pervasive element of royal and noble identity, and Edward’s knighthood was no exception. A Latin poem in BnF Ms. fr. 17001 compares Edward’s 1470 reacquisition of England to the Argonaunts’ legendary search for the Golden Fleece, inserting Charles the Bold favorably into the role of Jason. Similar literary invention is seen in the prologues to William Caxton’s printed books.

Although BL MS Roy 17 F, VI and VII and BL MS Roy 19 E, IV do not bear the arms of Edward IV, the manuscript is described in the Wardrobe Accounts of 1480 along with the 1479 *Bibles historiales*, Froissart’s *Chroniques*, and copies of Josephus and

---


Titus Livius.\textsuperscript{129} Hardly likely to be confused with some other text, Edward’s two copies of \textit{La Forteresse de la foy} provide a reliable example of how the king, or some other patron, might have worked with Netherlandish workshops to produce one or more manuscripts of a text he found desirable.\textsuperscript{130} The full-page illuminations in BL MS Roy 17 F, VI and VII introduce the text’s five volumes and draw upon themes seen elsewhere in Edward’s library. The king’s interest in works such as Giovanni Boccaccio’s \textit{De Cas des Nobles hommes et femmes malheureux} and Alain Chartier’s \textit{Le Bréviaire des Nobles} is translated in these images calling into question the traditional characterization of the “Fortress of Faith” as solely a theological allegory.\textsuperscript{131} While it cannot be denied that the body of the text is concerned with allegedly historical religious events and related allegories, the painted figures of the Vices in the Paris and London manuscripts indicate a

\textsuperscript{129} Scofield, \textit{Edward the Fourth}, 454. MS Royal 17 F VI and VII is also thought to be entry no. 22 in the catalog of manuscripts of the Old Royal Library (Richmond Palace, 1535) and entry f. 13 in the catalog from 1666. The manuscript entered the British Museum collection in 1757 when George II donated the Old Royal Library to the institution.

\textsuperscript{130} It should be noted that MS Royal 19 E IV is missing several quires and individual leaves and is also executed in a different hand than 17 F VI and VII (see official entry from the British Library’s digital catalog of manuscripts), another reason to speculate on Edward’s role in the production of the text in multiple workshops. The reason for both manuscripts’ omission of the arms of the House of York remains unknown, though Fifield’s suggestion that a single patron like Louis de Gruthuyse commissioned a suite of the manuscripts to give to his associates is attractive. If this was the case, Louis would have expected each new owner to have his arms inserted, but this explanation ignores the fact that Edward IV owned two distinct copies of the text. Using this reasoning, it seems equally as likely that Edward IV commissioned multiple copies of the text. Ultimately the lack of arms seems destined to remain unexplained.

\textsuperscript{131} Ross, \textit{Edward IV}, 265-6. \textit{La Forteresse de la Foy} is one of the few “religious” works from Edward IV’s collection to have survived the destruction of the Reformation. Its survival seems more than a happy accident given that the 1510 and 1525 printings of the \textit{Fortalitium fidei}, with their Reformation-style woodcuts, were well-represented in English libraries and are often found with extensive marginal notes. For more on these and the other Latin printings of the \textit{Fortalitium fidei}, see Chapter 3.
fusion of the religious and moral interests of the libraries of Louis of Bruges and Edward IV.

General comparison of the frontispieces in the Paris and London manuscripts confirms that the two groups of images are closely related. Both present a central tower in the countryside. Occupying the interior and surrounding the base of the fortress are its defenders: monks, nuns, clergymen, and fathers of the Church. Beyond this inner circle of figures, male and female laypeople are positioned to express either physical or moral threats to the Church and its earthly foundations.

Despite the similarities noted above, there are enough departures from BnF Ms. fr. 20067-20069 to determine that the images from each manuscript were not executed side by side in an illuminator’s workshop. The London manuscript demonstrates an interest in Gothic architectural flourishes, both in the central fortress and in the cityscapes, which emerge from the hills in the background. The female personifications of the Vices are not labeled in this manuscript, but they are often depicted with representative symbols of their sins. The Vices and the physical attackers of the London “Fortress of Faith” are disconnected from each other, as the female figures stand to either side of the tower in the middle ground, while the men armed with shovels and axes occupy the immediate foreground. Also worthy of consideration is the stylistic shift from the border of the Paris manuscript to that of the one in London. Both the coloring and the vegetation suggest a later execution, at least of the border, for the London manuscript. (Figures 41 and 55)

Two adaptations serve to immediately differentiate the images of the Paris and London manuscripts. The more obvious difference is the embellishment of the
architectural structures. In some images the simple tower repeated throughout the Paris manuscript is updated to the Gothic style with two tiers of flying buttresses and pinnacles. There are also walled cities and Gothic structures nestled in the background. These departures from the architectural structures and landscapes of the Paris manuscript suggest more geographic specificity, a quality that may have connected well with Edward IV’s campaigns to reunite the English realm under his leadership.

The second adaptation of note is the new presentation of the female figures surrounding the tower. Their role must be further explored in the progression of miniatures throughout this manuscript. Despite their lack of labeling inscriptions, these women are still easily identified as personifications of the Vices. In the miniature opening the first volume there are seven women flanking the tower, three of which are easily identified as Avarice, Lust, and Gluttony. (Figure 9) One woman on the left displays gold coins in the folds of her dress. To the right of the tower, a second woman gazes at herself in a mirror, while a third carries a large silver vessel and raises a round silver bowl to her lips.

Avarice, Lust, and Gluttony are again present in the miniature for the heretics’ volume where all of the Vices are subject to a much more physical response from the castle’s defenders. (Figure 10) At right, only one woman wields a spear at the fortress, while three others appear to be collecting themselves near the margin of the illumination. Gluttony, carrying a golden vessel and bread, looks back at the tower, as does Greed, whose bag of gold has spilled onto the ground. On the left side of the image, two women are struck on the head with large stones. Despite the blood flowing from these wounds, Lust continues to gaze at her reflection in a looking glass.
The frontispieces to Books Three, Four, and Five all but relegate the Vices to the margins. In the image for Book Three, the Jews become the dangerous attackers of the fortress. (Figures 11, 12, and 13) The Vices in Book Four are content to quietly conspire with each other, while those in Book Five are crammed to one side and lack any identifying attributes. The lack of consistency in the display of the Vices supports Fifield’s idea that Edward IV’s illuminated manuscript was a copy of the Paris manuscript of Louis de Gruthuyse. However, the somewhat tamer representation of the Vices suggests new meaning and does not find its match in the representation of all of the enemies.\textsuperscript{132}

In the opening miniature of the volume concerning the Jews, the stones previously seen in the hands of the castle’s defenders move to the fists of its attackers. (Figure 56) Most striking is the image of one Jewish man preparing to hurl a stone at the tower. Though physically labeled with the symbolic blindfold, he does not conform to the traditional model of the subdued Jewish captive. Unlike the static and bound Jews in the manuscripts from Burgo de Osma and Paris, this man does not wear chains, and his eyes peek out from beneath his blindfold suggesting the falsity of his legendary visual impairment. Not only does he see, he demonstrates his own violent agency as he pushes back his sleeve and winds up to throw.

The men who stand behind the stone-thrower underscore his role in demarcating the shift from the passive Jews of established iconography to their identification as active threats to medieval Christianity. Another blindfolded figure thrusts his sword upward at a woman in a habit leaning out of a tower window. The other figures are less active but

\textsuperscript{132} Other miniatures from the larger suite of “Fortress of Faith” images indicate varied success in the use of the allegorical Vices.
clearly play the roles of supporting Jews. Some even wear the yellow badge. The lone
remnant of the idea of the blindly stumbling Jew is the man in the left foreground
wearing both a blindfold and a sword and gingerly wielding a spear at no particular
target.

Despite the specific attention given to the character of the Jews in this miniature,
the Vices are not rendered obsolete. (Figure 11) Instead of flanking the tower, six women
and one man appear on the right. The men and women protecting the tower seem less
concerned with any potential threat they may provide, but their presence still resonates
with the audience, which has especially come to expect the visible symbols of Lust,
Gluttony, and Greed.

In the miniature devoted to the Saracens, the Vices resume their posts across the
middle ground. (Figure 12) The moneybag and sacramental vessels both appear as
accouterments of costume, and the figures demonstrate a deeper sense of engagement
among each other than previously witnessed. On the left two different pairs make eye
contact. A woman gestures toward the fortress, while another engages a man with a light
touch on his shoulder. On the right, a threesome of women interacts with each other and
points at the tower. All three groups appear to conspire against the tower, while the four
men in the foreground are much less engaged with the edifice. Their displacement from
the tower’s immediate vicinity reduces their threat to one of only typological
significance. Flowing white turbans, unruly hair, curved swords, and bare legs all
suggest the established understanding of the aggressive and bestial orient, but the figures
merely observe from the periphery.
The varying degrees of interaction between the enemies and the Vices raise important questions about changed perceptions of these figures between the Paris and London manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith.” Unlike the Paris manuscript’s predominant usage of the Vices to voice concerns about sub par Christians, the London manuscript presents the threats of the Vices and the Church’s traditional, religious enemies as equally dangerous. This oscillation of focus between religious evil and social wickedness is specific to Edward IV and the English audience.

The religious enemies retain the Christian memory of their crimes to varying degrees. For example, the monstrosity of the demons is blatantly depicted, while the geographic isolation of the Muslims allows them a small reprieve. The heretics receive a beating worthy of a true adversary, but the cunningness of the Jews is more specifically emphasized. On the other hand, the repetitive insertion of the Vices into the miniatures suggests a more sustained message, and one that extends beyond the religious enemies into the realm of the Christian fold. As previously noted, the themes of Virtue and Vice were wildly popular means of promoting good, Christian behavior during the late Middle Ages. England was no exception to this phenomenon of allegorical rhetoric. The women used to illustrate the Vices in Louis de Gruthuyse’s and Edward IV’s manuscripts were palpable figures because they looked like Christian women excluding their symbolic markers. Through these women, the illuminators made the arguments that vice exists everywhere and that its existence and proximity can turn friends into enemies. One’s Christian neighbor might harbor Jewish or Muslim tendencies or even be a heretic or demon. Ultimately, Edward IV’s manuscript is a culminating demonstration of the fear
that Christians could be as dangerous as their so-called enemies simply because they might succumb to the most reviled sins of the early modern world.

In Edward IV’s manuscript, it is difficult to say with certainty that the demons depicted at the beginning of the fifth volume are easily conflated with the heretics, Jews, and Muslims presented before them. (Figure 13) The demons take center-stage as they attack the tower from both sides and are hurled into the picture’s foreground. Their presence has even caused a change in the meteorological atmosphere as dark clouds roll in at the back of the scene. Although the demons and Vices are not interspersed as in the previous illuminations, the sinful humans are still present, creeping into the scene from the left. Given the theoretical nature of the verbal argument presented against the demons in the text, it is reasonable to argue that the relationship between the demons and the Vices is still susceptible to debate. While it is clear that the Vices and human enemies comingle, the influence of the demons upon the Vices, and vice-versa, has yet to be navigated.

BMA, Accessions 11.506 and 11.507 (Figures 15 and 16)

As noted above, other illuminated manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith” existed across Europe. Under the prevailing theory that Louis of Bruges was the archetypal patron of these manuscripts, the subsequent owners’ membership in or proximity to the Order of the Golden Fleece, and therefore Gruthuyse, are deemed sufficient evidence to conclude that the seigneur commissioned the illuminated manuscripts now in London, Brussels, and Vienna for his close associates. This argument is rather convincing for the relationship between the Paris and London manuscripts. Despite some minor stylistic
differences and ideological developments, the style of the tower, the inclusion of the Vices, and the execution of the landscape all indicate a clear line of descent.

The connections between the Paris manuscript and those in Brussels and Vienna are more tenuous. A brief examination of ÖNB MS 2535, fol. 86r demonstrates some obvious departures, particularly in the presentation of the tower and its immediate surroundings. (Figure 57) In this and another miniature, the fortress occupies the left side of the picture space with the predominant action of the miniature occurring from the center to the right. Additionally, the tower is more simply articulated and a feeble wall sometimes surrounds it. The illuminator has seemingly confused the content of the miniatures opening the second and third volumes, as the heretics are here presented with their requisite shovels but also with the chains and blindfolds normally associated with the Jews.\(^{133}\) The absence of the Vices places the conflated enemy directly in the spotlight for the viewer. Apart from all this, the Vienna illuminations are stylistically later than those in the Paris and London manuscripts, which is particularly obvious in the border. (Figure 58) While this final observation does not preclude Louis of Bruges as a patron, it

\(^{133}\) The placement of heretics and Jews in the same miniature could also be purposeful. The *converso* issue, which often described these two groups interchangeably, was particularly pressing when the miniature was executed. The image could make overt reference to the *converso* situation. On the one hand, it is difficult to determine if Maximilian I or other viewers from the northern European courts were familiar enough with the *converso* situation to appreciate the nuance depicted. On the other a visual exploration of the perceived overlap between Jews and heretics might also suggest a more careful and sensitive reading of Espina’s arguments concerning the issue. Dealing with the two religious groups in Books Two and Three of the text, Espina clearly defines *Iudei occulti* as heretics and *Iudei publici* as stubborn and harsh. See Alisa Meyhuas Ginio, “The Fortress of Faith – At the End of the West: Alonso de Espina and his *Fortalitium fidei,*” in *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews,* eds. Ora Limor and Guy G. Stroumsa (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996), 221-222.
certainly works against a theory that he commissioned the entire suite of manuscripts at once for presentation at a single gathering of his social contemporaries.

Even BR MS 9007 departs from the Paris miniatures, as the first image is interpreted as the raising and embanking of the “Fortress of Faith.”¹³⁴ (Figure 17) Connoisseurship identifies BR MS 9007, BnF Ms. fr. 20067-20069, and BL MS Roy 17 F, VI and VII with the same master, Loyset Liédet. Similar analysis also links the BR MS 9007, BL MS Roy 17 F, VI and VII, and ÖNB MSS 2535 and 2536 via the scribal hand of Jehan du Quesne.¹³⁵ If the painter and scribal attributions are correct and Louis of Bruges is deemed the patron of these manuscripts, the Brussels copy demonstrates the possibility of artistic experimentation even within the confines of the closed group.

Although much remains to be explained about the patron(s) and owners of the fifteenth-century manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith,” two additional related miniatures in the Brooklyn Museum are an even greater mystery. (Figures 15 and 16) The images are roughly the same size as those already discussed and appear to have been torn from a larger work. BMA Accession 11.507 conforms to the traditional rudimentary layout of “Fortress of Faith” images, while BMA Accession 11.506 departs from the standard composition and, according to the museum archives, is entitled “Entrance into the Mystical Fortress.” The execution of the painting in both miniatures is unlike that of other “Fortress of Faith” illuminations, prompting at least one scholar to suggest a sixteenth-century dating and alternative usage for the images.

¹³⁴ Van den Gheyn, Catalogue... Belgique, 104.
Very little is known about the creation and provenance of these two miniatures beyond their acquisition for the Brooklyn Museum.\textsuperscript{136} As the images are inconsistent with most of the museum’s collection, the illuminations rarely leave storage. Currently, the miniatures on parchment are mounted on cardboard.

The museum identifies Accession 11.507 as “The Fortress Defended.” In the background, the sky and distant landscape features are executed in saturated blue tones, while the more immediate ground and rock formations possess a yellow-green quality. The foliage, especially the deciduous trees, is notable for its specific attention to individual leaves. In the foreground, the tower is depicted with sensitive attention to value gradation. The illuminator’s employment of cross-hatching creates highlights and shadows, as well as more minute detail in the execution of the tower. The flags that fly from the tower windows have golden crosses and borders on grounds that are graded from white to pink to red. There is also considerable use of gold in the details and highlights throughout the image.

The relationship between the types of figures in this miniature differs from that observed in the images from the London and Paris manuscripts. In the former, the figures inhabiting the tower were smaller in scale than the attackers and the Vices. Here, all of the figures are comparable in size, which results in a superimposed appearance of the fortress defenders. In fact, all of the figures in the miniature appear merely inserted into the pictorial space. The formulaic appearance of all of the men surrounding the

\textsuperscript{136} See note 68 above. The museum files specifically identify the miniatures as coming from a French manuscript of de “Spina’s ‘Les forteresses de la foi,’” and also identifies the more traditional image as a depiction of heretical attackers. It is unclear where these determinations originate but likely that the information is assumed from later research conducted on the “Fortress of Faith.” Although the figures do attempt to undermine the foundation of the tower, similar motifs can be found in depictions of the other enemies.
tower is unsuccessful in revealing anything specific about their identities as enemies of Christianity. They lack clothing markers or attributes that name them as either religious groups or allegories of more general sin.

Perhaps most interesting because of its anomaly status is Accession 11.506, the miniature dubbed “Entrance to the Mystical Fortress.” This illumination is comparable to Accession 11.507 in terms of quality and method of execution, although it is slightly darker in appearance. Given its different treatment of the landscape, new formation of the tower, and compositional departure from all other known images of the “Fortress of Faith,” it probably would not even be deemed an image of the said fortress had it not been acquired along with Accession 11.507. Instead, its departure from the composition of related images indicates a spirit of experimentation in workshop production of “Fortress of Faith” images.

The tower is shifted from the center to the left side of the composition. Three figures bearing shields stand guard in the wall surrounding the tower. Directly above these figures, three different flags billow in the breeze. The first is a white cross on a gold ground with a green border. The second is a white cross on a red ground with a green border, and the third is a gold cross on a green ground with a green border. Three clerical figures further guard the entrance to the fortress. A cardinal holding a book and a shield, as well as two bishops with books and staffs stand on a raised and fenced platform in front of the entryway. The identity of those denied entrance to the fortress is unclear, and there are not enough similarities to positively identify them as the attacking figures in 11.507.
Although it cannot be known for certain that these miniatures were meant for a French manuscript of the “Fortress of Faith” contemporary with the manuscripts of Louis of Bruges (245 x 225 mm miniatures) and Edward IV (240 x 225 mm miniatures), their measurements (230 x 210 mm and 221 x 213 mm) are strong evidence for that case. Clearly the painting of a different workshop, the images are another testament to the freedom among patrons and artists to adapt images of the “Fortress of Faith” for specific audiences and tastes.

4) Conclusions

Illuminated manuscripts of the *Forteresse de la foy* demonstrate a new agency in the images’ conveyance of meaning. Shifts in medium and style are the results of the new patronage and the geographic locale of production, but new visual content suggests an evolution of the “Fortress of Faith’s” message despite the fact that the text’s verbal translation remains consistent with the words of its author. Most striking is the relationship depicted between the castle and its protectors and enemies. The generic castle image presents the overarching theme of the work, while the individuals surrounding it respond to specific elements recorded in the individual volumes and *considerations*.

Though it might be argued that the manuscripts with individual miniatures devoted to each enemy are so divided simply for their readers’ visual delight, there are too many meaningful adaptations and departures for this to be the case. Not only does each enemy individually attack the fortress, they do so with increasing efficacy. The passive Jews in the Burgo and Paris manuscripts are transformed into real threats in the London manuscript and are even confused with the dangers of the heretics in ÖNB MS
While most of the defenders and attackers merely populate the fortress and its surroundings in the Burgo manuscript, they become more physically engaged in the struggle of the Church in the Flemish iterations. The attackers increasingly thrust spears, shoot arrows, throw stones, swing axes, and grind shovels in their attempts to destroy Christianity, while the defenders respond with equal violence, present the Gospel, and even physically brace the tower in the midst of the enemies’ repeated siege.

The “Fortress of Faith” provides few certainties about the exact nature of its historical dissemination. Attempts at reconstruction require consideration of the transmission of information alongside the interests of the text’s author, translators, copyists, patrons, and artists. Repeated attempts must be made to reconcile the comparative agency of each type of creator, as well as his mode of communication: words or images.

The undiscriminating reader might be impressed with Alonso de Espina’s arguments in the “Fortress of Faith.” However, those familiar with the polemical works of Petrus Alfonsi (12th century), Ramón Marti (13th century), and Alfonso de Valladolid (14th century) are instantly struck with the friar’s lack of originality and belabored attempts to ignite new fires with old facts. As Monsalvo notes, the trajectory of Espina’s own thoughts concerning the Jews is not visible in the text, and the work is, thus, better read as a compilation of varied and disparate anti-Jewish polemics, legal precedents, and

---

pedagogical methods.¹³⁸ A similar evaluation can be made concerning the other enemies discussed in the text, though the discussion of the Jews often appears to be better rooted in history.

The text supports the two most reliably known facts concerning Espina’s life. Its encyclopedic nature and organization reflect his academic background, while the inflammatory style of the writing reflects his mendicant activities. Drawing on polemical tradition, as well as popular myths and legends, though hardly exciting, was both strategic and successful; readers found themselves in familiar methodological territory but suddenly also possessed a wealth of information at their fingertips. The constant tension between the work’s encyclopedic presentation and its sensational arguments presented readers with images of multiple enemies pursuing the single objective of Christian destruction. Espina’s initial audience of itinerant preachers found an exhaustive list of crimes to address. The struggle at the heart of scholarship on the “Fortress of Faith” is that of perception versus reality. Readers must consider the nature of the author’s personal truth and his reasons for presenting it while also reexamining the personal truth of each reader and creator that would interact with the text over the following two hundred years.

The translators and copyists responsible for the French manuscripts do not appear to have departed from the original Latin text in any meaningful way. Apparent attempts to fit the body of the text into prescribed spaces demonstrate the level of collaboration between textual producers and visual designers. Abbreviations and minor inaccuracies in

the different manuscripts demonstrate a lack of scribal agency and suggest the subservience of the written word to the overall visual presentation of the work. However, saying that the miniatures were entirely responsible for the trajectory of “Fortress of Faith” manuscript production probably overstates the case.

The circumstances under which the “Fortress of Faith” reached Burgundian courts remain unknown, though the present and following chapters attempt some suggestions. The text was undeniably popular among some of the most elite nobility of the late fifteenth century. Presumably, these later owners could have commissioned the manuscripts to more faithfully reference the Latin manuscript(s) and their miniatures, but they refrained. Therefore, their French translation, expensive materials, and distinctly Flemish style must be explored as deliberate choices. Manuscript production of La forteresse de la foy was an act of appropriation, which expanded Espina’s text beyond its initial usage as a preaching index. Not only the attention given to size, medium, miniatures, and calligraphic style, but also the inscriptions of personal mottoes and insertions of arms, indicate the seriousness with which courtly owners adopted the text into their personal libraries.

Most integral to this study are the potential interests of the artists responsible for the large illuminations accompanying the Latin and French manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith.” Despite the shared content in all of the fortress images, their styles and iconographic usages reveal much about their fifteenth-century reading. It is impossible to discern the degree of shared agency between patrons and artists, but examination of the images with respect to how each text was used suggests effective collaboration between
the two parties. It is worth remembering that the final execution of the pictures was ultimately at the discretion of the miniaturists.

Since the Latin manuscript in El Burgo de Osma is not the original, but the oldest extant and only one of its kind, it is difficult to accept it as unerringly representative of the physical text composed by Espina. As a Franciscan, Montoya likely used the text in exactly the way that Espina intended, and perhaps as a collector, he simply added his crest to a prefabricated work. In either case, the frontispiece conforms to the text’s intended usage as a preaching manual and encyclopedia of five discrete volumes. The image is easily read from top to bottom, with the volume of figures steadily increasing as the eye approaches the bottom of the page. The battling Muslims and Christians burst forth from the fortress much like the way the text spews forth an infinite list of crimes. The energy of the images reflects the intellectual momentum and xenophobic fervor embedded in Espina’s project.

The insertion of repetitive images at the beginning of each volume, as seen in the majority of the French manuscripts, provides an entirely different cadence for reading the text. The frantic vigor of the Burgo illumination gives way to a series of carefully staged and repetitive scenes. Furthermore, the schematic rendering of the miniature opening the Valenciennes manuscript is evidence of calculated attempts to more directly convey the message of the “Fortress of Faith.”

Given the considerable adaptations in manuscript illuminations of the “Fortress of Faith,” both readers and artists must be considered members of the audience. The religious and pedagogical background of Friar Alonso de Espina along with the miniatures in the oldest extant Latin manuscript indicate his intention that the text be used
as a source book for fellow mendicants, and perhaps, even as a manifesto for the self-claimed holiest of sovereigns, the *Reyes Católicos*, Ferdinand II of Aragon and Isabella I of Castile. Without the original manuscript to consider, it is impossible to ascertain any visual development between it and the copy that exists in El Burgo de Osma. However, the style of the miniatures’ execution, as well as their content suggest Bishop Montoya’s oversight in the production of the manuscript and its imagery. The frontispiece to the manuscript is more literal and austere than its descendants, advocating for a clerical or monastic reading of the text as it denies the frivolities of court tastes.

The “Fortress of Faith’s” French translations and their Flemish miniatures engaged new readership within the courts. Their unique imagery is the direct result of the artistic vocabulary and metaphorical inclination of court patronage in the North. While it is unknown how the text reached the Burgundian Netherlands, its adaptation of the fortress into a *tableau vivant* of moral and religious fortitude clearly appealed to the nobility of the region prompting the text’s patronage in the lavish format and style of the area. The sheer size of the surviving manuscripts attests to the attention and value accorded them at their moment of creation, but their material quality, level of painterly execution, and intellectual engagement with contemporary imagery link them undeniably with the grand patrons and owners of the period, most notably members of the Order of the Golden Fleece.

Friar Espina’s apparent concentration on heretics and Jews, or the “*converso* situation,” reaches much further than his personal historical moment. It is indicative of
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139 Alisa Meyuhas-Ginio argues throughout her scholarship that the “Fortress of Faith” was one of the most important works in urging Ferdinand and Isabella to sanction the Inquisition.
mounting pan-European fears over how well one could know his neighbors during this period. As the concept of identity became more complicated, the certainty of virtue diminished. The prominent depictions of the Vices in the manuscripts in Paris and London highlight their patrons’ and illuminators’ tendencies to use allegory to deal with this crisis. These images put the “Fortress of Faith” in dialogue with contemporary illuminated manuscripts and paintings, but more importantly, demonstrate the depth of fifteenth-century readers’ contemplation of the human condition. Sustained interest in the Virtues and Vices during this period did more than simply illustrate good and evil; it confronted readers and viewers with the idea that both virtue and vice resided within themselves.¹⁴⁰

French manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith” were intended for a more limited audience quite different from readers of the Latin editions. Their pristine folia, elegant transcription, and lavish paintings align them with the elite consumption of the fifteenth century. These patrons adopted the traditional symbolism associated with non-Christians and the stylistic and allegorical trends then en vogue in Northern Europe to adapt polemical works to the manuscript style of histories and epic romances. The translation of the “Fortress of Faith” images to this distinctly northern style is indicative of the courtly lenses through which such patrons viewed the world. (Figures 59, 60, 61, and 62) The simultaneous vulnerability of Christianity and the individual Christian’s responsibility to protect it were universal themes embedded in the books, but like other large-scale manuscripts in the collections of bibliophiles like Louis of Bruges, Edward

¹⁴⁰ This representation of the confrontation between good and evil in the self will be a major focus of Chapter Four.
IV, Maximilian I, and Baudouin II de Lannoy, part of their allure lay in their inaccessibility to the masses.

All of the French manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith” except Berne, SB MS 84 and Douai, BM MS 515 can be definitively linked to knights of the Order of the Golden Fleece.\textsuperscript{141} Established in 1430 by Philip the Good and later administered by Charles the Bold and Maximilian I, the Order sought to create a network of *chevaliers* to uphold the standards of court life and protect the Church, the embodiment of Christianity. Hearkening back to the feudal roots of medieval Europe, the knights were expected to exhibit utmost courage in support of the sovereign who led the charge to defend the faith. In return, the sovereign was obligated to seek the advisement of the knights before entering such a battle. This relationship promoted a general feeling of nostalgia for an older societal order among the nobility and the common people. Because the arrangement also kept knights in elite positions, they were able to maintain their status as important patrons of the arts.\textsuperscript{142} It is both their advancement of artistic production and the elaborate culture of gift giving within the Order that encourages scholars to use *Forteresse de la foy* owners’ membership as the driving force for exploring the French

\textsuperscript{141} Louis of Bruges, Edward IV, Maximilian I, and Baudouin II de Lannoy were all knights of the Order. For the most thorough discussion of provenance, see Fifield “The French Manuscripts.”

manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith,” particularly the so-called “Louis of Bruges suite.”

Although significantly undervalued in previous analysis, the French manuscript of the “Fortress of Faith” in Valenciennes is pivotal in terms of visual influence. Transcribed on paper and bearing only one miniature, this manuscript is frequently discounted because of its lower quality materials and cruder painting. However, in examining the entire surviving suite of illuminated manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith,” the lack of expense and simplification deems the manuscript an excellent candidate for a circulating model. Although less detailed than the opening image of El Burgo de Osma, A.C. Ms. 154, the basic formula of the image remains the same. One might even imagine that a verbal description of the Burgo miniature was the basis for the one in Valenciennes. It relies on the implications of the allegory of the Church as a fortress, eliminating the heavenly figures but including the enemies with explicit inscriptions. The formulaic nature of the miniature allows the possibility of its use as a cartoon or model for later manuscripts. Additionally, a strong case is to be made for a direct connection between the Valenciennes illumination and the woodcuts accompanying the 1475 and 1487 Latin printed editions of the “Fortress of Faith,” which shall be addressed in depth in Chapter Three.

It appears that scribes and translators possessed limited agency and/or interest in adapting the text beyond the basic translation, but the surviving miniatures of the
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143 Although this study is only concerned with manuscripts of the French translation of the “Fortress of Faith,” there were other notable manuscripts and vernaculars of the text. Few of these works, and little of them, survive, but there is sufficient evidence that they did once exist. Appendices I and II list the manuscripts and printed editions of the “Fortress of Faith” relevant to this study.

144 I will return to this proposed connection in Chapter 3.
Forteresse de la foy prompt an entirely different understanding of the contribution of manuscript ateliers for this text and others of the period. The attribution of Louis of Bruges as a head patron and a rudimentary assessment of the images suggest simple, repetitive execution. However, the identification of different hands and the varied evolution of key visual elements is better read as workshop experimentation that seeks to address a complicated social issue.

The provenance of “Fortress of Faith” manuscripts reveals little more than is already known about the fifteenth-century patrons of the text. The lack of arms to identify specific owners in most cases does not impede the French manuscripts’ assignment to the noble houses most closely tied to Louis of Bruges, and by extension, Charles the Bold of Burgundy. Furthermore, the execution of the northern miniatures emphasizes a worldview particular to their audience just as the detailed drawing and modest coloring of the Latin manuscript’s images is reflective of the clerical mindset in late medieval Spain. The miniatures are much more successful in conveying a range of consumption of the “Fortress of Faith” than the woodcuts found in printed editions of the text. In the latter, the image is reduced in size, detail, and place of importance, which does not reduce its didactic function but does sometimes eliminate markers of patronage.145

The review of codicology and analysis of images explored above provides consideration of both aesthetics and content in the “Fortress of Faith.” It is important to consider the dynamic character of the figures encircling the fortress through the progression of the manuscripts’ production for noble readers of the late fifteenth century.

145 Notably, individually colored woodcuts can indicate patronage and/or ownership, though to a lesser degree than stylistic qualities of related manuscript images.
Despite adjustments to political and social structure before and during this period, miniatures from the French manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith” adhere to the values of chivalry so integral to the High Middle Ages. Through allegory, symbolism, and overt references, the images present a steadfast dedication to the noble preservation of the Christian faith and its institutions.

In all cases “Fortress of Faith” images must be interpreted as representations of late medieval Christian sentiment. They embody the anti-Jewish and anti-Islamic thought of the period via their use of established symbolism, but traditional iconographic features, such as the popular Judenhut and exotic curved swords, play only a limited role in conveying meaning in this unique body of images. Images of the “Fortress of Faith” are not simple reflections of the text. Comparison of the transcription of the words and the development of the images from the manuscript of Louis of Bruges to that of Edward IV yields two very important conclusions. The transcription indicates little concern for reinterpretation and sometimes even appears careless, as there are minor errors in spelling and the execution of the script. The miniatures conform to a basic formula but make meaningful departures as the body of images grows.

The recognition of the images of the “Fortress of Faith” as an evolutionary body calls for an image-focused examination of the work in its various manuscript iterations. This new approach and resulting interpretation will respond to some currently unanswered

---

146 One recent scholar, Rosa Vidal Doval, keeps the miniatures in context but only analyzes the opening images from the Burgo and Paris manuscripts. She addresses the allegorical impact of the fortress image and its possible development by Espina himself, but she only addresses two illuminations directly. See Rosa Vidal Doval, “El muro en el Oeste,” 143-169. The present study proceeds from Rodriguez Barral’s and Vidal Doval’s scholarship, addressing the larger body of images in their ability to polemicize, denigrate, and elevate various religious identities.
questions concerning the patronage of the French manuscripts. More importantly, it will broaden the scope of the work’s influence beyond traditional and unilateral explanations. In addressing the “Fortress of Faith’s” unusual and unexpected popularity within the Burgundian court, it considers the adaptation of an encyclopedic text to entertain more prevailing interests of romance and chivalry.

In exploring the implications of the castle theme from the manuscripts it is necessary to consider the ways different viewers might have read the symbol. Given their disparate vantage points, the tower undoubtedly connoted different meanings for clerical and lay readers. For the text’s creator, the image of the fortress brought quotations from Scripture to life. Though the opening words, “Turris fortitudinis a facie inimici…,” are immediately recognized as the words of Psalms 61:4, the “Fortress of Faith’s” allusions to biblical imagery are much richer. Espina’s castle also references Song of Songs 4:4, “As stately as the Tower of David is the site of your Sanhedrin built as a model to emulate with a thousand shields of Torah armor hung upon it, all the disciple-filled quivers of the mighty.”

In this case, the tower is the figurative stronghold of the Jewish people, and the shields are the literal breast-plates of Torah vestments. The disciples, or arrows, are students or impressionable youths destined to serve their faith as in Psalms 127:4-5: “Like arrows in the hands of a warrior, so are the children of youth. Praiseworthy is the human who fills his quiver with them; they shall not be shamed, when they speak with enemies in the gate.”

Espina’s references were assuredly clear to his immediate mendicant audience, and his selection of the opening passage from *Psalms* even specifically engaged Spanish friars in a dialogue linking their mission as defenders of Christianity to their geographic location in Spain. Though it is *Psalms* 61:4, “For you have been a refuge for me, tower of strength in the face of the enemy,” that opens the *Fortalitium fidei*, Espina and his fellow Spanish friars would have recalled the Psalm immediately preceding it as well: “From the end of the land I call unto You, when my heart grows faint. Lead me to a rock that is too high for me [to climb alone].”149 The experience of the itinerant Franciscan in late medieval Spain characterized the “Fortress of Faith” as a monument to Christianity’s long struggle in that region at the so-called “end of the West.” The text referenced the fortified architecture associated with Christian valor during the *Reconquista* and following the crumbling of the Golden Age’s *convivencia*. The Burgo manuscript’s image of a keep amidst four corner towers recalls the late medieval defense of frontiers and estates. The architectural historians, Carlos Sarthou Carreres and Bordejé Garcés, discuss this type of complex as a descendant of earlier lone towers meant to protect frontiers, coasts, and cities. The more complicated groupings of towers erected in late medieval Spain further acted as symbols of authority for their royal, noble, or military owners.150

Dissimilarly, the chivalric tendencies of the northern courts prevented its bibliophiles from connecting the “Fortress of Faith” to any particular place and time. The visual depictions of the fortress in their manuscripts seem more closely linked to Sarthou

---

149 Scherman et al. *Torah*, Ps. 61:3-4.
Carreres’ and Garcés’ “earlier strong towers.” Readers of the French translations embraced the text as a timeless monument and imbued it with the fervent romanticism commonly seen in their luxury objects.

Given Montoya’s enlistment in the kings’ armies, it is reasonable to assume that castles were largely symbolic of warfare for him. The castle depicted in his manuscript adheres to the architectural precedents of concentric castles in Spain. Its torre de homenaje (keep), recintos (fortified areas with surrounding walls atop towers), barrera or barbacano (sections of exterior wall acting as a first line of defense), and foso (moat) are all essential features. While it is entirely possible that Montoya’s miniature is a complete figment of the imagination, it possesses some specific details that further link it to Spanish architectural history in particular. Technological advancement is read in its shift from the square to round outer towers, which were less vulnerable to attack. The dry moat housing the enemies is a marker of geographic specificity. Although Spanish topography often lacked a consistent water supply to fill a castle moat, the cavernous space was useful for preventing mining attacks.

The miniature’s attention to architectural detail reflects Montoya’s tenure as the Bishop of Osma. In 1456, he determined that the castle of Burgo de Osma was insufficient to withstand attack and erected one wall around the city’s plaza and another outer wall capable of enclosing six thousand residents within the city of Burgo. (Figures 63 and 64) It is, however, unlikely that the miniature records the city’s castle as there is no reference to the hill upon which it sits or its inaccessibility in the North and East due
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151 Washburn, Castles, 2.
152 The image of the castle in the arts of the northern courts will be further addressed in Chapter Four.
153 Washburn, Castles, 5-6.
to the adjacent Ucero River. Additionally, El Burgo de Osma’s castle fell under dubious ownership during Montoya’s rule. The complex was under the jurisdiction of the bishops beginning in 1214, probably following the restoration of the city from Muslim occupation. It remained the property of the bishops until 1420, but when Juan II reestablished Osma, he gave its rule over to Alvaro de Luna. Later, Alvaro’s son, Juan, challenged Montoya’s authority there, and eventually, Isabella of Castile granted ownership of the castle and the town to Juana de Luna and Diego Lopez Pacheco, Marquis of Vilena.

Bishop Montoya was responsible for numerous other fortified buildings. One of the fortifications he renovated was the castle of Ucero. (Figure 65) Just fifteen kilometers from El Burgo de Osma, the castle was the property of the local bishops during the fifteenth century, and its ruins bear a striking resemblance to the fortress depicted in the frontispiece of his manuscript of the *Fortalitium fidei*. The ruins and the frontispiece to the Burgo manuscript allude to the triple-walled fortress as it existed during the High
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155 Carlos Sarthou Carreres, *Castillos de España* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, S.A., 1983), 208-209. Isabella’s granting of the city to this pair left both the bishops of the city and the Dukes of Uceda and Frías without any recourse to the structure.
156 Several other fortified complexes of similar appearance exist in the region. Perhaps most visually reminiscent is the castle at Magaña, approximately 100 kilometers from El Burgo de Osma. The castle there is a heavily fortified structure at the apex of a rocky hill with a rectangular keep, double enclosure, and round bucket towers at the far corners. Another example is the fifteenth-century replacement structure Berlanga de Duero, which sits on a gradual slope with a deep ravine. Although Chueca Goitia argues that the outer portions of this complex post-date the execution of the Burgo manuscript (16th century), the site demonstrates a marked familiarity with the already iconic royal castle in Segovia. Berlanga de Duero was a well-known locale of noble conflict during Alvaro de Luna’s lifetime. The castles of Gormaz, Osma, San Esteban and Berlanga de Duero also facilitated communication along the Duero River and served as the gateways to medieval Castile. See Sarthou Carreres, *Castillos*, 213 and 207 and Fernando Chueca Goitia, *Castles in Spain* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1983), 108.
Middle Ages. The beautiful corbels still visible on the building today are reflected too in
the drawing, and the cavernous spaces surrounding the base of the painted fortress allude
to the geography of the region and the singular access to the castle via a drawbridge over
a moat.\textsuperscript{157}

The earlier history of the fortress provides the most significant link to the frontispiece
of the Burgo manuscript. Erected during the thirteenth century, the structure was
originally a stronghold of the Knights Templar. Despite the decline of the Order some
time before Montoya’s tenure, the identity of the fortress seems to have remained an
important feature. In the Burgo manuscript drawing of the “Fortress of Faith” the main
keep is decorated with shields of the Knights Templar indicating Bishop Montoya’s
desire to aggrandize his efforts to restore the glory of the Crusades to the region.

The identification of the Burgo frontispiece with the Ucero castle and Bishop
Montoya contradicts Rosa Vidal Doval’s argument that Espina dictated the nature of this
image to his illuminator. If illuminated, Espina’s personal manuscript may have included
an image of a fortress as well, but it is unlikely to have been illuminated at all, and there
is no evidence linking Espina to a similar architectural structure.\textsuperscript{158} Despite this
oversight, Vidal Doval’s analysis of the function of the fortress image is compelling. She
begins with a discussion of the words from Psalm 61 in the Prohemium and draws on
Ciceronian, Quintilian, and Augustinian definitions of allegory to explain how the
fortress allegory would have worked for the preacher and his audience.\textsuperscript{159}

\textsuperscript{157} Even today, one is able to approach the castle via the carved out landscape. A more
recent collapse does prohibit entry into the castle through the subterranean passage.
\textsuperscript{158} Vidal Doval, “El muro en el Oeste,” 143-169.
\textsuperscript{159} Ibid., 147-154.
Using only the Burgo frontispiece, the first miniature of the Paris manuscript, and Balsarin’s 1487 woodcut, she interprets the fortress as an allegory of both the Church and the body of Christ. Through her discussion, the fortress is equated with the institution of the Church, the defenders of the faith, and the individual Christian, while the enemies are synonymous with the state of society and the attackers of Christianity. Vidal Doval is the first scholar to formally address the 1487 woodcut, provides the most thorough description of the Burgo frontispiece, and even identifies the Vices in the Paris manuscript, but her analysis is restricted in its adherence to her specialty, the text’s medieval Spanish context.\(^{160}\) Such a singular approach is crucial to understanding the “Fortress of Faith’s” initial acceptance by Espina’s Franciscan successors, but broader and more detailed analysis is necessary to recognize the resonance of the tower and other iconographic features for a pan-European audience.

Although the depiction of Christ in the Burgo manuscript is readily recognized as a “Man of Sorrows,” little interpretation exists of the symbols of Christ’s Passion borne by the angels in the surrounding turrets. In surveying each group of angels, the viewer is struck with an accumulation of elements of the \textit{arma Christi}. (Figures 32 and 33) In the lower left tower, two angels carry the moneybag of Judas Iscariot and the column of the Flagellation, while a third exposes the veil of Veronica from Calvary. The True Cross dominates the grouping in the upper left tower and is complemented by the reed, crown of thorns, and the hammer. Angels in the lower right tower present the pincers, and those in the upper right tower bear the ladder, the sponge, and the spear. Above them all, Christ as the “Man of Sorrows” curiously performs the “Coronation of the Virgin.” The

many combined iconographic expressions in the Burgo frontispiece results in a collapsed viewing experience. The events of Christ’s Passion and Resurrection, everyday medieval life, and the coming millennium are inseparable in the suspension of time.

The actual physical landscapes depicted in the illuminated manuscripts are still an important element in introducing the “Fortress of Faith” to a broader audience. The prologue of the *Fortalitium fidei* clearly locates the text in Spain with the words, “in hac misera Hispania…”\textsuperscript{161} The Latin of the Burgo manuscript and its visual attachment to the Ucero Castle further link the manuscript to the clergy, most specifically the bishops of Osma. However, the *Forteresse de la foy* manuscripts and their generic towers in a familiar, yet unidentifiable, landscape work precisely because they cannot be inextricably linked to a singular audience. It was the fortresses’ simultaneous embodiment of the *ecclesia militans* and the *ecclesia triumphans*, which allowed Northern Europeans to embrace the “Fortress of Faith’s” message to all Christians.\textsuperscript{162} At once recognizable and unknown, the fortress was never attached to a particular nobleman but always pressing upon all knighted lords to uphold their duties as protectors of Christianity.

\textsuperscript{161} *Fortalitium fidei*, 1471.

\textsuperscript{162} Rosa Vidal Doval, “The Fortress of Faith,” 73. Vidal Doval addresses this view of the fortress as it derives from Augustine’s interpretation of Psalm 60 in her longer discussion of the fortress allegory in the *Fortalitium fidei*. 
CHAPTER THREE: FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURY EDITIONS OF THE FORTALITIUM FIDEI

1) Introduction

This chapter builds upon the socio-historical and theoretical explorations of the previous chapter. It contrasts the illuminated manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith” with books of the text printed around the same time. Comparative analyses of French manuscripts and Latin incunabula reveal the discrepancies between the usages of each type of text. While the French manuscripts include no evidence of personal annotation, the printed books are usually littered with manicules and extensive underlining. The audience, images, material format, and language of Fortalitium fidei editions are all addressed here in order to elucidate their functions for various fifteenth- and sixteenth-century audiences. Originally published in Strasbourg in 1471, the Fortalitium fidei was reprinted in Basel (1475), Lyon (1487, 1511 and 1525), and Nuremberg (1485 and 1494). It was also printed in Latin in the seventeenth century, and fragments exist from German and Italian editions. However, these vernacular editions are outside the scope of this study.

The overarching goal of this chapter is to provide a richer understanding of the new, and distinctly clerical, audience of the “Fortress of Faith.” In order to accomplish this a number of copies of the Fortalitium fidei are examined, the majority of which are held in
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164 Alisa Meyuhas-Ginio notes the 1629 Latin edition from Lyon, as well as a first Castilian edition in 1479. Please see Appendix II for full citations of all editions located by the present author.
the Bodleian Library and other university libraries at Oxford. This group of early printed books provides an excellent sample as the academic collections at this site received many of their books shortly after they were printed. Their frequent ownership by a single patron or institution affords them an unquestionable provenance and a more predictable audience. I will analyze the evolving material culture of Espina’s book during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. I will consider the book’s changing dimensions alongside book covers, folia, notations, and images to identify the “Fortress of Faith’s” most impressionable readers. My focus on the increasing portability of the text and readers’ expanded access to editions draws upon the practice of analytical bibliography and the pioneering l’histoire du livre method of Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin.

165 Exceptions to Oxford repositories include the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York, the British Library in London, and the author’s private collection in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina.

Through my consideration and detailed description of a sample of incunabula, I seek a better understanding of the printers, publishers, artists, binders, patrons, sellers, owners, and readers of the “Fortress of Faith,” with particular attention to their facility with printed images and mnemonic devices. To do this, I will address the woodcuts of the fortress near the beginning of the 1475 and 1487 editions. These images encouraged readers’ imaginative development of a universal Christian enemy. They reduce the fortress image discussed in Chapter Two to an illustration in which a small number of Jews, Muslims, and demons observe as a heretic literally attempts to unearth the “Fortress of Faith.” (Figure 3) While the woodcuts transparently illustrate the work’s title, they make little reference to the specific claims made against enemies within the text. The plain and inexpensive images and their separation from the text in these two editions, as well as the images in the 1511 and 1525 editions, seem appropriate for clerical readers who certainly composed the majority of owners of the printed copies of the “Fortress of Faith.” However, the transparency, plainness, and lower cost of woodcuts produced for the “Fortress of Faith” do not confirm crudeness or intellectual simplicity. Instead, I read these as “introductory summaries” and “visual puzzles,” similar to Michael Camille’s reading of the woodcuts in Mathieu Husz’s 1485 edition of Le pèlerinage de la vie humaine. They are purposefully linear images capable of conveying a complicated message perhaps not reflected in singular images from contemporary illuminated manuscripts. This conclusion is further important because it

168 Camille, “Reading the Printed Image,” 262-264.
suggests the potential for “Fortress of Faith” woodcuts to initiate the entire visual evolution of the work.

Few texts have the distinction of straddling the boundary between manuscript and print with the success of the “Fortress of Faith.” The text maintained relevancy for new audiences over the course of its production. It simultaneously appeared in manuscript and print; Latin and multiple vernaculars; and with lavish and austere images and bindings. The work was meaningful for missionaries and inquisitors; courtiers and crusaders; and clerics and their lay followers.\(^{169}\) Given the fact that Gutenberg’s printing press came into use near the middle of the fifteenth century, the number of editions of the *Fortalitium fidei* produced by 1525 is notable.\(^{170}\) Despite being a relatively unknown work today, its numerous editions from a very brief period are not surprising given the monastic and mendicant context of the period. However, the work’s simultaneous production in vernacular manuscripts and Latin editions suggests a dual evolution of the

\(^{169}\) As Sandra Hindman and other scholars have argued, the invention of the printing press did not immediately discourage the practice of manuscript production in Northern Europe. In fact, the most prominent bibliophiles of the second half of the fifteenth century continued to commission manuscripts and encouraged their wealthy friends to do the same. This was probably true in the case of Louis of Bruges and Edward IV, as Louis’ library was always impressive, and Edward IV’s grew tremendously after the initiation of their friendship. See Sandra Hindman, ed., *Printing the Written Word: The Social History of Books Circa 1450-1520* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press); Sandra Hindman and James Douglas Farquhar, *Pen to Press: Illustrated Manuscripts and Printed Books in the First Century of Printing* (Baltimore, MD: University of Maryland Press, 1977); and David McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript, and the Search for Order 1450-1830* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

\(^{170}\) However, it is unlikely that the text was reproduced as many times as some lists claim. Alisa Meyuhas Ginio claims there are several more printed editions of the text dated before 1500, but this claim is likely drawn from the archival records where individual copies are held. It is more plausible that despite the best efforts of librarians, archivists, and historians, the dating of many of the books was incorrectly assumed and recorded at the moment of acquisition. This study adopts the prevailing view that the *Fortalitium fidei* was printed in 1471, 1475, 1485, 1487, and 1494.
“Fortress of Faith.” One vein evolved to suit the desires of the Burgundian nobility, while the other developed in answer to the needs of the clergy.

Although the Franciscan movement did not initially receive the same support and supervision as the Dominicans, by the fifteenth century both orders were well-established tools of the Church and remained particularly so during the Inquisition. Mendicants straddled the line between the rich and the poor as they lived like the common man but held the ear of the most powerful. Drawing upon polemical scholarship and popular rumor, the most successful preachers also exercised a keen sense of rhetoric to invigorate the Christian fold. Their persuasive arguments cajoled support for the Church’s political agenda, while their humble lifestyle assuaged doubts concerning their intentions. Their constant visual and verbal presence made the mendicant orders invaluable tools for the royal and political rulers of the high and late Middle Ages.172

---


The advent of printing afforded new opportunities for communication within the mendicant orders. While preaching remained the primary means of reaching the frequently illiterate masses, the availability of resources beyond memory and manuscript provided preachers with ever-increasing opportunities to develop their sermons for growing audiences.\textsuperscript{173}

The life of the “Fortress of Faith’s” author, Alonso de Espina, is largely a mystery, but a few key facts are of consequence. The historical evidence allows some assumptions regarding his monastic education, his life as a preacher, and his proximity to the Spanish monarchy of the late fifteenth century. His position as regent of studies at Salamanca indicates his breadth of influence regarding neophytes, and his dedication to the Franciscan devotio moderna brought him into contact with the poor Christian laity, as well as powerful royals and nobles as he traversed Castile. Like other itinerant preachers from the thirteenth century forward, during his lifetime Espina was most influential as a devout man of rhetoric.

Late fifteenth and early sixteenth century mendicant use of the “Fortress of Faith” was, in many ways, much more akin to and appropriate to the text’s original creation. Given the lack of images in Espina’s extant manuscripts and their general tone, it should be assumed the preacher was far more concerned with the rhetorical education of his religious colleagues than he was with visual communication to a broader audience. Furthermore, friars found lavish book illustration, such as that seen in the French manuscripts of the text, to be superfluous to their mission. Instead, their reading

preferences and preaching styles reveal a penchant for mnemonic and meditative images. The development of print in the late fifteenth century fostered both and provided greater efficiency in communicating ideas to their lay audiences.

The invention of book printing allowed a faster and wider spread of learning beyond the monastery walls. The nature of the wood block ensured the reduction of expensive illuminations to mechanical prints. When executed adequately, wood block prints could convey the summary message of a text on a single page. Previous use of wood block images was limited to holy pictures and playing cards, but the fusion of the wood block and printing press techniques provided the perfect impetus for combining word and image with effective piety. Wood block prints could be especially appealing because they adhered to Gregory the Great’s call for images as the “books of the illiterate” without allowing them to pass into the realm of Bernard of Clairvaux’s “monstrous distractions.”

Drawing upon the newly proposed timeline of production of the “Fortress of Faith,” this chapter advocates a shift in understanding the visual development of Alonso de Espina’s text. Some sustained interest in the manuscript miniatures exists, but art historical scholarship completely neglects the woodcuts of the incunabula. Moving

---

174 See Kimberly Rivers, *Preaching the Memory of Virtue and Vice: Memory, Images, and Preaching in the Late Middle Ages* (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2010).


forward from my initial review of the manuscript miniatures, I ultimately accord greater influence to early woodcuts of the incunabula. Historically, scholarship on the “Fortress of Faith” dates the French illuminated manuscripts of the text after the Strasbourg and Basel editions of 1471 and 1475.\textsuperscript{177} If the manuscripts’ dating in the late 1470s or early 1480s is accepted, it is necessary to consider the extent of influence of the 1475 woodcut over the grand manuscript illuminations now in Valenciennes, Paris, London, Brussels, Vienna, and Brooklyn.

2) The Printed “Fortress of Faith,” the \textit{Fortalitium fidei}

Editions of the \textit{Fortalitium fidei} fit within general trends of incunabula production. Books originating from presses in Germany or German-speaking regions were very frequently intended for members of secular clergy or monastic houses. Despite the erudition of many of these buyers and their awareness of Venetian book-printing for university audiences, they frequently purchased the canonical texts issuing from Strasbourg, Basel, and Nuremberg.\textsuperscript{178} Significantly, the first three printed editions of the \textit{Fortalitium fidei} came from these three cities. Examination of the physical evolution of early \textit{Fortalitium fidei} editions requires a much more concise and thorough cataloging of the extant volumes than currently exists in publication. This study attempts to provide that in Appendix III. Although, there are surely more copies than related records, such an endeavor provides a better platform for exploration of the editions produced between 1471 and 1525. While Appendix III and most of the study provided here indicates

\textsuperscript{177} See Fifield, “The French Manuscripts.”
Fortalitium fidei editions were, indeed, aimed at clerical and monastic audiences, there were likely some interested secular readers. As Eberhard König demonstrates in his discussion of the marketing of the printed Bible, printers were not blind to the broader clientele they might accumulate as they traded their books at major ports and fairs across Europe.179

The descriptions of each edition, which follow, are derived from a study sample including incunabula currently housed at the Bodleian Library and Queens College Library in Oxford, the British Library in London, the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York, and the author’s personal library in Mount Pleasant, SC. The data collected from examinations of these books is included in full in Appendix IV. Comparative analyses of these books from between 1471 and 1525 provide the immutable facts of each edition and yield conclusions about individual readers.

The Editions from the 1470s: 1471, Strasbourg, Johann Mentelin180 and 1475, Basel, Bernhard Richel, before May 10, 1475 (Figure 68)181

180 GW 1574; HC *872; Goff A-539; BMC I 55; Pr 210; BSB-Ink A-450; CIBN A-280; Oates 78; Rhodes 67; Sack, Freiburg, 130; Schorbach, Mentelin, 4; Sheppard, 150.
Hans Meyer of Leipzig originally dated this edition to “not after 1462,” working from the copy now at the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. Ritter, K. Ohly, and V. Sack adhered to it in their production of incunabula catalogs for Frankfurt. The BMC and the GW dated the edition to “not after 1471,” and their assertion is supported. The typography in this edition, the type of paper used, and the dual column format all place the edition somewhere between 1466 and 1473 in the context of Mentelin’s work. While there is one “1462” notation in the rubric examined by Meyer, all of the other notes of purchase fall between 1471 and 1475. Additionally, it is unlikely that Mentelin would have printed the edition a year after the text was composed, and the date “1461” appears in the body of the third volume: “presens annus domini 1461 est.” Finally, in 1965 F.R. Goff illuminated the copy examined by Meyer under an ultra violet light revealing a falsification of the date. The discrepancy of the dating for the edition proved problematic for Schorbach but is now readily accepted as 1471.
Johann Mentelin’s 1471 folio edition of the *Fortalitium fidei* consisted of two hundred forty leaves: eight dedicated to the reader’s rubric and two hundred thirty-two for the body of the text. The entire text is printed in two columns, but the rubric uses fifty-one lines of text, while the main body employs only forty-nine lines. The paper is of a very high quality, originating at the Gallicon mill near Basel and bearing a barred block “C” water mark.\(^\text{182}\)

Excepting the actual printing of the text in this edition, it presents much like a manuscript.\(^\text{183}\) Being quite large and lacking printed pagination, this first Latin edition of

---

\(^{181}\) *GW* 1575; *HC* *871*; *Goff* A-540; *BMC III* 735; Pr 7522; *BSB-Ink* A-451; *CIBN* A-281; Rhodes 68; Sack, *Freiburg*, 131; Schramm XXI 13, 26 and pl. 553; Schreiber V 5291; Sheppard 2364-5. The 1475 *Fortalitium fidei* was certainly printed before May 10, 1475 as records indicate the Harvard copy of this edition was originally purchased on that date, and the Freiburg copy was rubricated in that year. See Walsh, 1140 and Sack, 131. The Morgan Library and Museum identifies the work as both the first illustrated book printed in Switzerland and the first book printed in Basel. These assertions are actually drawn from the British Museum Catalog and Weisbach’s *Basler Bücherillustration*. The British Museum publication states that this was the first book ever printed at Basel by Richel and that the book was not published later than 1474, while Weisbach claims that it was the first illustrated book printed in Switzerland and that it was printed in 1476. See *BMC III* 735 and Werner Weisbach, *Die Basler Buchillustration des XV. Jahrhunderts* (Strassburg: Heitz and Mündel, 1896), 12. Prior to the realization of the *Fortalitium fidei* as the first illustrated book, Richel’s 1476 *Speculum humanae salvationis*, possibly illustrated by the same artist, held this status. The first illustrated book in the world was Augsburg printer Günther Zainer’s 1471 *Legenda aurea*. See Sheila Edmunds, “From Schoeffer to Vérard: Concerning the Scribes Who Became Printers,” in *Printing the Written Word: The Social History of Books circa 1450-1520*, ed. Sandra Hindman (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1991), 35.

\(^{182}\) Karl Schorbach previously connected the paper and watermark to Strasbourg, but Kahn describes the watermark differently and provides a historical precedent for the new attribution. The same paper was previously used for Gutenberg’s printing of the *Catholicon* at Mayence in 1460. Several other printers used the same paper, including Mentelin, working between 1468 and 1472. See J.L. Kahn, “Mise au point sur un incunable strasbourgeois célèbre: Le *Fortalitium Fidei* d’Alphonse de Spina imprimé par Mentelin en 1470,” *Annuaire de la Société des Amis du Vieux-Strasbourg* 12 (1982), 24.

\(^{183}\) Frequently, bindings, marginal notations, catalogue entries, and tables from manuscripts and incunabula of the period are indistinguishable. Saenger and Heinlen
the text is exemplary of the overlapping features of manuscripts and incunabula during
the early years of printing. The majority of the text is printed in black with spaces left for
major section headings and larger initials. Often the missing words and letters were
manually rubricated in simple red script. The first four volumes begin anew at the top of
the next available leaf (folio 1v, folio 38r, folio 61r, and folio 147v), and each verso is
marked to indicate its volume at the top center of the leaf. The transition from Book
Four to Book Five is much more abrupt, indicated only with the red printed words,
“Explicit liber quartus. Incipit liber quintus,” on folio 214r.

The dimensions of the 1475 edition are slightly reduced, but surviving copies are still
strikingly similar to contemporary oversized manuscripts. There are wide margins, and
the text of the book is printed in two columns of red and black ink and includes a
woodecut on [a2r]. The codex is rubricated throughout, and the ink signatures of single
sheets are sometimes preserved. The headings of single books are printed in red, and the
initial spaces are left open for painted embellishments.

---

184 Because the 1471 edition of the Fortalitium fidei was not paginated when it was
printed, all specimen examinations of this edition will designate folio 1 as the leaf on
which the prohemium begins. In red, the text begins, “Incipit phemiu sq laudes dine
anotat i initut quela au tronu maiaestatis dei et poniten schetis...” and is followed by an
enlarged “T” to begin the familiar, “Turris fortitudinis a facie inimici...”

185 The BMC collation will be used for discussing the 1475 edition of the Fortalitium
fidei.

186 The printer covered five incorrect chapter headings in the second volume with the
correct words on supplementary strips. Folio 126r: “De heresieorum qui dicunt
heresieorum qui negant confessione valere ad remissione peccatóy.” “On the heretics
who deny that the admission of sin yields forgiveness.” Folio 127r: “De heresieorum qui
negant cofessione fieri homini.” “On the heretics who deny the confession made to a
man.” Folio 128r: “De heresieorum qui asserunt confessionem fiendam solu curato sicut
propria sacerdoti.” “On the heretics who assert that only confession made to one’s own
The prohemium begins on folio 1r with three red lines, a space for the “T” of *turris,* and “*urris fortitudinis a facie inimici*” printed in black. (Figure 69) The tables, which are sometimes bound before and sometimes bound after the actual text, comprise eight leaves. The prohemium begins as standard on the following leaf.

At the conclusion of the prohemium a woodcut of the “Fortress of Faith” is included filling the remainder of its column. (Figure 3) Volume one begins on folio 3r and ends on folio 39r. Volume two begins on folio 39v and ends on folio 62r. Volume three

---

187 Just after the completion of the tables is an inscription:

“Undecimum mirabile accidit in ciuitate segebien ano dni M.cccc.lv regnante dno Johe in tenera etate sub tutrice inre sua dna katherina castelle regina. Tunc iudeo quida medicus emit sactissimum corpus xpi a quodam cupido sacrista ecclie sacti facundii eiulde ciuitate Judeus ergo ille sacramentu illus accipiens et fuis immundis mambi ptractas ad synagogam cum al ris fuis compliciba pduxerut et in bulientum aquam sepe picientes in altu elevabat ante oculos eoy. Nui miraculu manifestum cognoscentes et timentes sapnum qs cis posset li hoc ad aures...Secundum mirabile accidit...”

After noting the reign of the young John II under his mother, Catherine’s, regency, the passage continues to recount some miracles. It appears the owner or printer of the book saw some specific historical events as suitable for connecting to the encyclopedic volume, as he inserted these events immediately preceding the prohemium of the printed text.

188 The woodcut is examined in detail below. See the section entitled “Printers, Publishers, and Images.”

189 “Incipit liber primus in quo cotinent tres consideraciones.” “Here begins the first book which has three considerations.” Below is a blank space for an initial (6 lines long) and then printed in black “c det ordo i psenti libro quinqu erut pciales libri qsi qnz tarres fortalicii fidei inexpugnables. Primus erit de vera xpi militu amatura i y fide catholice excellencia. Secunda erit y bello falsoru xpanoy i heticoru et ea et eoru astucia. Tercia erit de bello iudeoy ...” “The present book is divided into five principal volumes in reflection of the five inexpugnable towers of the fortress of faith. The first will be about the armor of Christian knights and the excellence of the true Catholic faith. The second will be the war of false Christians and heretics and their cunningness. The third will be the war of the Jews...”

190 “Incipit lib secole qui e de bello hereticoru.” “Here begins the second book, which is on the war of the heretics.” There is a blank space for an initial and then in black
begins on folio 62v and ends on folio 138v. Volume four begins on folio 139r and ends on folio 160v. The fifth volume in this edition begins in the second half of the right column on folio 160v, rather than at the beginning of a new folio, and ends on folio 222v.

**The Editions of the 1480s: 1485 (October 10), Nuremberg, Anton Koberger** and 1487, Lyons, Guillaume Balsarin

In the 1485 edition large, solid initials begin each section. (Figures 70, 71, and 72) The tables are found on the first eleven printed pages with the Prohemium immediately following. The printer left spaces to indicate the *considerationes*, and the remaining text

```
“[A]ntiquo in libris legima gentiliuz milites humanaz venerantes glam generole diusa monstrous genera ...” “In ancient books…”
```

```
“Incipit liber tercius de Judeorum bello contra fidei fortalicium.” “Here begins the third book of the Jewish war against the fortress of faith.” Then there is a blank space for an initial and, “[H]erticoy bello qsi periculosiori soluto cu sit a familiaribus inimicis latet emissu Judeoy velana…” “The war of the heretics is in danger of dissolving when the enemy is hidden among the rich Jewish enemy…”
```

```
“Incipit liber quartus de sarracenoy bello.” “Here begins the fourth book on the Muslims’ war.” Then there is a blank space for an initial and in black, “[V]iriliter ut dea tradidit dissoluto iam expiri oportet in hoc libro qro sarracenoy vires quid lez cont mostru fidei fortalicium possint.” “…in this fourth book on the Muslims against the fortress of faith…”
```

```
“Explicit liber quartus. Incipit liber qntus.” “Here ends the fourth book. Here begins the fifth book.” A single line is skipped, and volume 5 begins. There is a blank space for an initial and then in black, “[D]issolutis hereticoy iudeodeoy et sarracenoy bellis restat expiri in h libro qnto et ultimo hui volumes de demonu viriba qd lez possint etra nr m fidei fortaliciu. Et ut meu possem explicari…” “The weak wars of the heretics, Jews, and Muslims end in this fifth book, and the strength of the demons against the fortress of faith is seen…”
```

```
GW 1576; HC *873; Goff A-541; BMC II 427; Pr 2044; BSB-Ink A-452; CIBN A-282; Sack, Freiburg, 132; Sheppard 1496. Figures 69, 70, and 71.
```

```
Figures 73, 74, 94, 95, and 96.
```

```
“Incipit prohemiu fortalicij fidei: conscripti y quedem doctorem eximiu ordinis minoy. Anno dni M.cccclix. in partilu occidentis. Et primum ponit scribentis intentio. Turris fortitudinis a facie inimici. Tu es one de...” “Here begins the prohemium of the fortress of faith: senator and former teacher of the Minor order. In the year of the lord 1459… And for the first time puts the writer’s intention. You are a strong tower in the face of the enemy…”
```
is printed in black. Koberger’s edition is the first to include printed folio numbers.

The prohemium begins on folio 1r, and the first volume begins on folio 2r. Volume One ends in the left column of folio 26v, and volume two begins in the right column. Volume Two ends in the left column of folio 41v, and Volume Three begins in the right column in the same manner as the transition between the previous two books. Volume Three ends on folio 99r, and Volume Four begins on folio 99v. Volumes Four and Five begin and end in the left and right columns respectively of folio 145v. The final volume ends on folio 154v. The last printed lines indicate the printer and the date of the edition: “Anno incarnate deitatis. M.cccclxxxv.vi. Ydus octobris. Indictone.iii. hic liber (que fidei fortalicij editor intitulauit) impssoria arte Nurembergh Impensis Anthonij koberger inibi ciuez e complet

Guillaume Balsarin’s 1487 tabula is composed of fourteen pages printed in black with small spaces for initials. Pagination is printed on some of the rectos of the principal text. The Prohemium begins on fol. 1r with a large initial space left for the “T” of “turris.” The Prohemium concludes approximately one third of the way down the left column of fol. 2r. (Figure 73) A woodcut similar, but not identical, to the woodcut from

---

197 “Tabula fortalicij fidei.” “Incipit in qua pmo ponut cuiuslibz librli osideratones.cu...” The tables end with the same passage as the 1475 edition. “[D]ecimn mirabile ac...”

198 “Incipit liber primus in quo continent tres cosiderationes.”

199 “Explicit liber primus fortalicij fidei. Incipit secundus qui est de bello hereticoy.” “Incipit liber secundus qui est de bello hereticoy. [A]ntiquoru in libris legitimus gentiluz...”

200 “Incipit liber tercuis de iudeoy bello contra fidei fortalicic. [H]ereticorus bello quasi...”

201 “Incipit liber quartus de saracenoy bello. [V]iriliter ut deus tradidit...”

202 “Incipit liber quintus i ultima tractans de bello demonum contra fidei fortalicic. [D]issolutis hereticoy iudeoy i saracenoy bellis. Restat expiri in hoc libro...”

203 “In the year of our lord, 1485, the sixth day of October. Third edition. This book (entitled the Fortalitium fidei) was printed by Anton Koberger in Nuremberg...”
1475 is inserted just below it. Not quite a mirror image of the earlier woodcut, the new one is clearly based upon it and sustains the message.\textsuperscript{204} The lack of larger spaces between sections of the incunable indicates a greater efficiency and economy with which books were being printed. Volume One begins on folio 2r and concludes on folio 40r. Volume Two covers folio 40v to folio 64v. Volume Three fills folio 64v to folio 147v. Volume Four fills 148r to folio 219r, and Volume Five fills folio 219r to folio 234v. The text ends in the left column of the final verso with the mark of its Lyonnais printer.

(Figure 74)

**The Final and Most Portable Edition of the the Fifteenth Century: 1494, Nuremberg, Anton Koberger, February 25, 1494**\textsuperscript{205}

The 1494 edition of the *Fortalitium fidei* is the first quarto edition of the text and, therefore, the most portable edition from the fifteenth century. Small spaces are left for initials and are often marked with smaller letters throughout the book, but many editions are not embellished beyond the printing. The increased portability of editions of the *Fortalitium fidei* through the end of the fifteenth century should not go without mention. The movement toward more compact books is in line with major trends of the period but should also be noted here as it relates to increased reader engagement. The coincidence of smaller books with greater volume of reader inscriptions is of particular interest to this study as it seeks to determine the late medieval and early modern reception of the work.

Folio 1r begins with the word “Prologus” and then, “*Incipit phemiu fortalicij fidei...Anno dni. M Ccclix. in ptibus occidentis. Et primu ponit scribentis intentio...*”\textsuperscript{206}

\textsuperscript{204} This woodcut is discussed in detail below. See the section entitled “Printers, Publishers, and Images.”

\textsuperscript{205} Figure 99
A space is left for an enlarged initial “T” of turris, and the printed text continues, “urris fortitudinis a facie inimici. Tu es one deus meus qui facis magna i iscrutabilia i mirabilia…” The prologue continues onto folio 2r and ends with a small break in the text.

This space is immediately followed with the words, “Incipit liber primus in quo continentur tres consideratioes. Et de foy do in qnti libro quqz erut qtiales libri quali quiqz turres fortalicij fidei inexpugnables. Primus erit…” Volume two begins on folio 48v and ends on folio 76v. Volume three begins on folio 77r and ends on folio 185v. Volume four begins on folio 185v and ends on 269v. As in earlier editions, volume five begins immediately after on folio 269v, and it ends on folio 289v. Below the final “Amen,” the date and printer are noted: “Anno incarnate deitatis milliesimo quadringeresimo nonagesimoquarto vicesimaquinta die mensis februarij. Hic liber (que fidei fortalitii editor intituluit) impssoria arte Nuremberge impensis Antonij koberger inibi ciuem est consummatus. Laus deo.”

3) Printers, Publishers, and Images

The material evidence illuminates a clear path of increasing portability and expanded dissemination for the “Fortress of Faith.” The simultaneous development of imagery in the editions is of equal importance. Given the scarcity of information about

---

206 “Here begins the prohemium of the Fortress of Faith…In the year of our Lord, 1459, in the west. And the writer’s first intended point…”
207 “A strong tower against the enemy, you are one God who does great and perfect miracles…”
208 “Here begins the first book, which has three considerations. And of faith in five books, which represent the five inexpugnable towers of the fortress of faith. The first will…”
209 “In the year of the lord, 1494, twenty-fifth day of February. This book (entitled the Fortalitium fidei) was printed by Anton Koberger in Nuremberg, there is a perfect citizen. Praise God.”
woodcut artists during the period, the biographies of the printers and publishers are the most fruitful avenue for approaching the woodcuts.

As the director of one of the first printing shops in Europe, Johann Mentelin (ca. 1410 - 12 December 1478) naturally influenced the trajectory of printing culture in the fifteenth century. He was born at Sélestat around 1410. In 1447 he became a citizen of Strasbourg and was named “enlumineur et notaire de l’éveche” and was also a member of the painters’ and goldsmiths’ guilds. His work as an illuminator brought him into contact with the new world of print leading to his education on the subject at Mainz. He established his workshop in Strasbourg in 1458, and in 1460 he published the first volume of a Latin Bible following Gutenberg’s technique. His editions are known for their oversized elegance and their distinctive Gothic round-hand type, and his prints are reasonably traced through printed catalogues of the period.

---


211 “Johannes Mentelin.” It is unclear whether his apprenticeship in printing occurred in Mainz or Strasbourg, but historians generally accept that in either case it happened during his tenure as a calligrapher and illuminator under Gutenberg. See Edmunds “From Schoeffer to Vérard,” 27.

212 Kahn, “Mise au point,” 23. Mentelin’s workshop was located at 9 Rue de l’Epine. Despite his contribution to the development of printing in Strasbourg, the only public dedication to him is a bust at the Place des Étudiants. See Kahn, “Mise au point,” 28. Figure 81.

213 “Johannes Mentelin.” Adolf Rusch and then Johann Pruss took over the workshop after Mentelin’s death. In 1521, the early printer’s grandson, Johan Schott, inaccurately declared him the inventor of book printing.
Mentelin’s shop is associated with forty-two printed works between circa 1460 and 1476, including the works of ancient authors and medieval poets, as well as many *summae* and theological treatises. Such texts were established parts of the canon and enjoyed consistent patronage.\(^{215}\) His decision to publish an edition of the *Fortalitium fidei* remains unexplained, but it is notable that Mentelin printed the first edition of another anti-Jewish polemic from Spain in 1470. The *Scrutinium scripturarum* was the work of Chancellor-Bishop of Castille, Paulus de Sancta Maria, formerly known as Salomon Halevi of Burgos, whose commentaries on Nicholas of Lyra, Mentelin also printed in 1470-1471.\(^{216}\) The forging of a connection between late medieval Castilian texts and Mentelin’s audience is undeniable, but the absence of an extant manuscript from which Mentelin worked precludes any speculation as to who introduced the printer to such texts.\(^{217}\)

Kahn refutes the idea of Mentelin’s aides traveling to Spain to find manuscripts for him to print since there were many suitable and interesting options closer to home.\(^{218}\) Additionally, he argues that a Spanish audience was not responsible for the *Fortalitium fidei*’s introduction to Germany because Spanish patrons were more greatly engaged with

\(^{215}\) Kahn, “Mise au point,” 23. Some of the most important were the Latin Bibles of 1460 and 1463; the German Bible of 1466; and the original editions of St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, Aristotle, Isidore, and Avicenna’s “Canon.”

\(^{216}\) Ibid., 27.

\(^{217}\) Ibid. Kahn suggests multiple scenarios that could account for the lack of a manuscript. Often, manuscripts were destroyed after an edition was completed during the fifteenth century. He seems willing to accept this hypothesis for the *Fortalitium fidei*, especially considering the first edition was printed within an approximate decade of the work’s composition. However he does speculate that the manuscript survived until the 1870 fire at the Bibliothèque du Temple Neuf. The holdings of that library were once recorded at the Escorial in Madrid, but the list, which could have proved its receipt of a *Fortalitium fidei* manuscript, was destroyed in the Escorial’s fire of 1671. See Kahn, “Mise au point,” 27-28.

\(^{218}\) Kahn, “Mise au point,” 27.
Rome, by then a thriving printing center. Furthermore Spanish patronage of the edition would yield many more Spanish owners of the individual copies than are known. On the other hand, Espina was unknown among Mentelin’s regional audience. With neither a Spanish patron nor a German or Alsatian audience, the modern reader is left to speculate on Mentelin’s agency in selecting such a work for print. Kahn argues that Mentelin’s sponsorship of the work marks him as a man of learning and contemporary thought, and the subsequent eight printings in Germany and France before 1630 along with the 1522 Italian translation support the early printer’s identification as a smart entrepreneur and printing trendsetter.

Whatever his reasons for printing the *Fortalitium fidei* in 1471, the quality of its typographic and compositional execution rank it among Mentelin’s most impressive editions. As McKitterick notes, Mentelin’s products often required the involvement of

---

219 Kahn, “Mise au point,” 27. Kahn’s research found that of the approximately ninety known surviving examples of the 1471 edition of the *Fortalitium fidei*, only three were found in Spanish libraries: one in Barcelona and two in Madrid.

220 Ibid., 28.

221 Ibid. Mentelin’s agency and savvy in selecting the text was not without precedent. As other scholars have noted, Colard Mansion, Günther Zainer, and Johann Bämler all printed editions after accessible manuscripts. For a brief summary, see Edmunds, “From Schoeffer to Vérard,” 39 fns 46-48. Edmunds draws on Joseph B.B. van Praet, *Notice sur Colard Mansion, libraire et imprimeur* (Paris, 1829); ibid., *Recherches sur Louis de Bruges*; and Hellmut Lehmann-Haupt, *Schwäbische Federzeichnungen: Studien zur Buchillustration Augsburgs im XV. Jahrhundert* (Berline and Leipzig, 1929), 187-190, no. 8. The four incunabula that followed were modeled after Mentelin’s edition. Additionally, there were also four Lyonnaise editions executed following the editing of the Dominican Guglielmus Totani. Like Meyuhas-Ginio, Kahn lists editions appearing in 1500, 1511, 1525, and 1629, but the editions from 1511 and 1525 are the two that are known today. The Italian translation, *Fortalizio delle fede*, was published in Carmagnole in 1522. However, the title’s inclusion in early Italian library catalogues is the extent of study devoted to the edition.

222 The *Fortalitium fidei* was the nineteenth work off of Mentelin’s press and the first printed with the type 6 of Proctor. The characters are considered very attractive and notably sharp. See Kahn, “Mise au point,” 24.
the reader for them to become accessible. His and other early printer’s works left the
tasks of rubricating and pagination to book owners. However, Kahn argues that in
Mentelin’s *Fortalitium fidei*, the rubricator was expected to fill the blank spaces with the
titles and subtitles of important paragraphs. Separate leaves with the titles were sent as
instructions to the rubricator. Since these leaves contained the same information as the
tables accompanying the book, they were destroyed after the rubricator completed his
work.

The exact relationship between Mentelin’s and Bernhard Richel’s editions of the
*Fortalitium fidei* is unclear. Both maintain the appearance of contemporary manuscripts,
but only the 1475 edition includes a woodcut, which is greatly simplified from, but
formulaically similar to, the Burgo manuscript’s frontispiece. At present it is impossible
to determine if the second edition was modeled exclusively on Mentelin’s or if a
supplemental manuscript or image was in play. However, the circumstances and
practices of the second printer are crucial to reconstructing the text’s visual development.
Along with Berthold Ruppel von Hannau, Richel is among the earliest known printers in
Basel.

---

223 McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript and the Search*, 34. For Mentelin’s words, refer to his
printing of Augustine, *De arte praedicandi* from Strasbourg, not after 1466.
224 Kahn, “Mise au point,” 23. Kahn notes that some copies of the 1471 edition were
bound with the instructional rubric and the reader tables leading several reputable
catalogers and historians to declare that Mentelin’s edition of the text contains two
hundred forty-eight leaves. He mentions the error in the *Gesamtkatalog der
Wiegendrücke*, Pellechet, Polain, and Schorbach and its more recent correction in the
225 Peter F. Tschudin, “Basle Letterpress Printing: The Cradle of Agricola’s Main
(February 1994): 169-171. Berthold Ruppel von Hannau is viewed as the likely origin of
printing in Basel. He resided in Basel from the late 1460s and may be connected to a
According to Weisbach, a Swiss master of whom little is known executed the woodcut inserted in the 1475 edition. The artist was working in Basel around 1470, but it is unknown how many woodcuts can be adequately attributed to him. A 1935 letter addressed to the Morgan Library Director Belle Da Costa Greene identified the woodcut as the work of the same master that illustrated Richel’s German translation of the *Speculum humanae salvationis, Spiegel menslicher Behältnis*, of 1476.\footnote{This letter is dated August 23, 1935 and signed “H.W. Tauber,” a German antiquarian who was offering the sale of the book to the Pierpont Morgan Library.} Also in 1935, Hind’s *Introduction to a History of a Woodcut* attributed the woodcuts of Richel’s 1474 Bible to the master of the 1476 *Speigel*.\footnote{Arthur M. Hind, *Introduction to a History of a Woodcut: with a detailed survey of work done in the fifteenth century* (London: Constable, 1935), 325.} (Figures 85) If both Da Costa Greene and Hind were correct in their attribution of the woodcuts, then it becomes apparent that a single artist executed the woodcuts for Richel’s most important editions, the 1474 Bible and the 1476 *Spiegel menslicher Behältnis*, as well as the 1475 *Fortalitium fidei* under examination here. The identification of one artist with three different works over the course of three years reveals an established relationship between printer and artist and provides significant insight into Richel’s workshop production.\footnote{Other similarities observable amongst the Bible, *Fortalitium*, and *Mirror* also indicate a sustained, consistent approach to incunabula production in Richel’s workshop. For instance, descriptions of bindings for his Bible share qualities with the bindings of his *Fortalitium fidei*, possibly indicating the use of the same binder to compile subsequent books produced in his workshop. See H.P. Kraus, *The Cradle of Printing: From Mainz and Bamberg to Westminster and St. Albans: One Hundred Incunabula and Manuscripts Important for the Development of Printing* (New York: Kraus, 1955), 46.}

Reproductions of the woodcut accompanying the 1475 edition of the *Fortalitium fidei* abound. (Figure 3, 82, 83, and 84) Usually noted first because it represents the

---

\footnote{Tschudin, “Basel Letterpress Printing,” 169. Richel died in 1482.}
beginning of book illustration in a Swiss-German center, analysis of the image is limited to its pairing with the text in only the most topical manner. A more sensitive evaluation of the woodcut below attempts to debunk this standardized reading of the image. However, *The Illustrated Bartsch Series'* description of the print as “A Four-Sided Tower Guarded by Two Christians and Attacked by Jews, Heathens and Demons” will temporarily suffice while the text is further examined via its material culture of production and dissemination. (Figure 69)

Although Richel printed his edition of the *Fortalitium fidei* in Basel, masters from another printing center were probably highly influential in his development, particularly with regard to his incorporation of woodcuts. His Latin Bible of 1474 and his *Spiegel menslicher Behältnis* of 1476 demonstrate significant influences from the presses of Günther Zainer and Johann Bämler.

The visual connection between Zainer’s and Richel’s woodcuts is demonstrated through compositional analyses of individual frames. The centrality of the “Tower of Babel” in Zainer’s *Speculum* image and of a columnar idol pedestal in his 1472 *Das Goldene Spiel* recalls the enemies’ encirclement of the tower in Richel’s *Fortalitium fidei* woodcut.229 (Figures 86 and 87) Stylistic analysis of woodcuts from the books of both masters suggests different artists, though with a similar repertoire of compositional options.

Bämler’s editions are a more likely source of stylistic inspiration for the artist behind the *Fortalitium fidei*. Examination of his 1474 *Melusine* woodcuts reveals a

---

229 The full Bartsch citations for the Zainer images are *Das Goldene Spiel*, Augsburg, Günther Zainer, 1472/151 “Four Men Dancing Around a Column” fol. 40r [2.277] and *Speculum Humanae Salvationis*, Augsburg, Günther Zainer, 1473/247 “The Building of the Tower of Babel” fol. 187r [2.482].
number of similarities. The proportional relationship between figure and architecture in “The Building of the Castle,” “Raymondin Seeing Melusine in Her Bath and Sending Away His Brother, the Count of Forest,” and “Melusine Leaving the Castle” bear a striking resemblance to the ratio observed in the *Fortalitium fidei*. (Figures 88, 89, and 90)

Bämler’s *Melusine* is also a fine example of the frequent reuse of woodcuts and blocks to produce a variety of different images for printing. Of the seventy-two illustrations included in the text, fifteen are repeated, and the repetition of both human and animal figures is notable. A very similar horse appears in five consecutive woodcuts within the text demonstrating the application of a single model to illustrate a seemingly limitless number of situations. (Figure 91) It is likely Richel’s artist also valued pattern reuse. The similarities between his tower and the tower at the façade of a church illustrated in Werner Rolewinck’s *Fascicolus Temporum* of circa 1474 suggest the possibility of a similar mode of selecting from old images to construct new ones. (Figure 92) While early art historians once deemed this so-called lifting of visual elements as demonstrative of a lazy artist, more recent research and an underlying belief of the present study redefine the practice as an effective use of a recognizable visual vocabulary to communicate new ideas to a broader audience.

---

230 The full Bartsch citations for the Bämler woodcuts are *Melusine*, Augsburg, Johann Bämler, 1474/66 “The Building of the Castle” [3.169]; *Melusine*, Augsburg, Johann Bämler, 1474/80 “Raymondin Seeing Melusine in Her Bath and Sending Away His Brother, the Count of Forest” [3.183]; and 1474/88 “Melusine Leaving the Castle” [3.191].

231 The full Bartsch citation is Werner Rolewinck, *Fascicolus Temporum*, Cologne, Nikolaus Goetz, after October 1473, 1474/177 “Church” [8.328].
Richel’s connections to Zainer and Bämler are not limited to compositional and stylistic comparisons. Adrian Wilson and Joyce Lancaster Wilson’s scholarship on the *Speculum humanae salvationis* provides an interesting perspective for the evolving chain of production of one of the most prominent printed texts of the fifteenth century.¹²² Eleven printers were responsible for the publication of sixteen editions of the *Speculum* in Latin, Dutch, French, and German before 1500. Each of these editions included woodblock illustrations, and it is Zainer’s 1473 edition of the text that links him with Bämler and Richel.²³³

Zainer printed his edition in Augsburg at the Benedictine Abbey of Saints Ulrich and Afra. Initially trained as a scribe, he later established himself as a printer in Strasbourg and moved to Augsburg in 1468. There he enjoyed the support of Abbot Melchior for a number of years.²³⁴ In 1473, he published his *Speculum humanae salvationis* with forty-five chapters and one hundred ninety-two woodcuts of uniform style and rubrication.²³⁵

During this period of Zainer’s production, he was not the sole printer working at the abbey. Rather, Abbot Melchior invited a number of Augsburg printers to the abbey in the hope of training the monks in the processes of printing. One of these printers was

---


²³⁴ The restrictive guilds of Augsburg were wont to allow new printers to practice freely in the area, but Abbot Melchior was able to acquire the necessary permissions for Zainer. The influential abbot was instrumental in expanding the monastery’s book collection following the German monastic reform of the previous two decades. He established a scriptorium and eventually installed a press within the walls of the monastery in order to avoid guild interference. See Wilson and Wilson, *A Medieval Mirror*, 207; Eberhard König, “New Perspectives,” 151-152, and Steingräber, *Die Kirchliche Buchmalerei Augsburgs um 1500* (Augsburg: Verlag Die Brigg, 1956).

²³⁵ Fifteen of the woodcuts were repeated.
Johann Bämmer, who printed at the abbey using his own type beginning in 1473. Zainer is considered the more senior printer of the two, but it is their employment of the same woodcut illustrator, the so-called Bämmer-Master, that is of consequence here. Woodcuts from Zainer’s 1473 *Speculum* are attributed to the Bämmer-Master, and Zainer’s historical tendency to work with the same craftsmen indicates a potentially extensive visual influence exerted through the distribution of the 1473 *Speculum* and other Zainer editions. (Figure 93)

The *Speculum* blocks were undoubtedly influential as they were reused in Reinhard’s Lyon edition of 1482 and Hurus’ Saragossa edition of 1491. Even when the blocks were not directly transferred into new editions, the images maintained a certain legacy. In 1476, the first German translation of the *Speculum* emerged from the Richel workshop in Basel. The *Spiegel menslicher Behältnis* included new woodcuts, which referenced Zainer’s blocks but took greater direction from the *Biblia Pauperum* in its arrangement of text and image. (Figure 94) Given the stylistic similarities among their editions’ woodcuts and the historical evidence linking their workshops, it is reasonable to assume that Zainer, Bämmer, and Richel all worked with the same woodblock artisan or

---

236 Wilson and Wilson, *A Medieval Mirror*, 208. Anton Sorg also printed at the abbey during this period.

237 Colum Hourihane, *The Grove Encyclopedia of Medieval Art and Architecture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 230. Hourihane even states that the Bämmer-Master and Bämmer, himself, who was trained as an illuminator and later produced woodcuts, demonstrate some similar stylistic qualities.


241 Ibid.
workshop in the 1470s. Such a conclusion affords a clearer picture of printing workshop practices during the period while also illuminating some of the specifics of Richel’s career.

One further detail about Bämler is worth noting. Like many early printers, Bämler worked as a scribe before he established his printing business. This particular scribe-turned-printer rubricated several books printed in Strasbourg for Swabian patrons. Significantly, all four of the books in which Bämler’s hand is identified issued from the press of Johann Mentelin. Although the 1471 *Fortalitium fidei* is not among these works, there remains the possibility that Bämler became familiar with the text while rubricating Mentelin’s editions and later introduced it to his contemporary, Bernhard Richel.

---

242 Similarities are also apparent between the 1475 woodcut of the “Fortress of Faith” and a woodcut in Leinhart Holle’s 1483 *Buch der Weisheit der alten Weisen*, illustrated by Bidpai. The woodcut entitled, “The Dog Carrying a Piece of Meat Sees His Reflection” demonstrates a similar use of line and treatment of landscape and architectural features. (Figure 95) This is particularly interesting given that Muther drew a stylistic connection between Holle’s Bidpai artist and Bämler’s woodcut artist from his early period in Augsburg. See Muther, *German Book Illustration*, 46. However, Martha Tedeschi speculates that Holle may have simply tried to emulate the Augsburg style in order to gain new clientele. See Martha Tedeschi, “Publish and Perish: The Career of Leinhart Holle in Ulm,” in *Printing the Written Word: The Social History of Books circa 1450-1520*, ed. Sandra Hindman (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1991), 64.

243 The chain of influence seems to have further traveled to the printing shops of Lyon. The first illustrated book printed in Lyon was a French translation of the *Speculum* executed from Richel’s German edition by the Augustinian monk, Brother Julien Macho. Martin Huss printed *Le Mirouer de la Redemption* in 1478 using the blocks from Richel’s edition. The French edition was republished in 1479, 1482, 1483, and 1484 attesting to the popularity of the text among the French and ensuring the visual legacy of both Zainer’s and Richel’s editions. See Wilson and Wilson, *A Medieval Mirror*, 208.

244 The books in which Bämler is identified as the rubricator are: an Eggstein Bible (H. 3037; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Bibel-Slg. 20155); Mentelin’s Aquinas, *Summa theologica* (H. 1454; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 20 Inc. s.a. 1146a); and two copies of Mentelin’s Augustine, *De civitate Dei* (Manchester, John Rylands University Library, Inc. 3.A.8, and Chantilly, Musée Condé, XXX1.D.11). The rubricator attribution can be found in Victor von Klemper, “Der Augsburger Drucker Johann
The 1485 *Fortalitium fidei* edition from Nuremberg did not incorporate a woodcut as its predecessor from Richel did. Slightly less than one third of the column is left blank under the opening words to volume one. (Figure 72) Since this does not occur at the beginning of any of the other volumes, the reader is left to speculate on the printer’s choice. It seems reasonable to assume Koberger was working from the 1475 edition out of Basel and simply copied the formatting without inserting an image. The text continues as expected to describe the tome in general and to outline the first *consideratio.*

Koberger’s reasons for producing two different unillustrated editions of the *Fortalitium fidei* may stem from his business-minded approach to publishing. Following family tradition, Koberger’s (ca. 1445-3 October, 1513) original profession was as a goldsmith. The first dated volume to emerge from his press was Alcinous’ *Platonis Epitome* (24 Nov., 1472). From then until 1504 his workshop produced more than two hundred editions of various types of works and cultivated the skills necessary to make and distribute books on an international scale. The director of more than one hundred men working on up to twenty-four presses in Nuremberg, Koberger also owned paper mills, which produced the paper for his editions.


245 “I detur ordo in presenti libro quingz erut partia-“ followed by the standard print “*les libri quali quinaz turres fortalicij fidei inexpugnabiles. Prima erit…*” “*De armatura dim fidelium in generali. Et ponutur hic lex genera armoy spualium.*” “On the armor of the faith in general. And put here the laws of spiritual armor.”


247 Wallau, “Anthony Koberger.” Several factors including the prevalence of contract work, social and political unrest, and plague likely precipitated the closing of Koberger’s Nuremberg printing house. In addition to his shop in Nuremberg, Koberger employed other printers in Basel and Strasbourg before 1504, and his works were further printed on
printers derived from his flexibility as a contract printer, financial backer, curator, retailer, and/or wholesaler.\textsuperscript{248} (Figure 96)

Koberger’s works, which were predominantly folios, demonstrate excellent print quality and design. The texts frequently incorporate images and could be specially executed to include painted images and letters, manual rubrication, and lavish bindings if desired.\textsuperscript{249} He is best known for printing Hartman Schedel’s \textit{Liber Chronicarum}, which he executed under contract. His work on that text and its two thousand woodcuts demonstrates his competency working in mixed media, but his editions of the \textit{Fortalitium fidei} do not reflect this breadth of talent.\textsuperscript{250} (Figures 97 and 98) Neither of his editions of the treatise incorporated visual images of any kind. The reasons for their absence are unknown, but if Koberger was truly attuned to his local market of monks and clerics, he is likely to have considered woodcuts a frivolity for this particular text.


\textsuperscript{249} Wallau, “Anthony Koberger.”

\textsuperscript{250} Ibid. The woodcuts for the \textit{Nuremberg Chronicle} were based on the drawings of Wolgemut and Pfeidenwurf. The extensive decoration of the text had significant implications for the further development of woodcuts, particularly those of Koberger’s godson and friend, Albrecht Dürer.
Guillaume Balsarin’s 1487 edition from Lyons returned to the woodcut of 1475 with slight adjustments. Balsarin was born in Lyons. After his apprenticeship in the same city, he worked there from 1479 forward, although his earliest known publication is from 1482. He was later named King’s Printer, and his printing house was administered under his son, Jacques, from 1507 to 1527. While little else is known about Balsarin or his engagement with the *Fortalitium fidei*, his printing of the text indicates the popularity of the text in northern Europe in the late 1480s. More particularly, his inclusion of the slightly adapted woodcut reveals both his personal access to the text and his employment of an artist to assist in reproduction.

Little is known of the printer Jean de Romoys, but the publisher for the 1511 and 1525 editions was a well-established businessman. Stephano, or Étienne, Gueynard’s name is associated with a number of important editions from the sixteenth century, and he is known to have worked with Guillaume le Roy (1494-1529), whose woodcuts and printing designs bear similarities to the sixteenth-century editions of the *Fortalitium fidei*. The woodcuts, with their shift in focus toward the *arma Christi*, are in keeping with the period’s trend toward meditative images.

A significant number of images accompany the 1511 and 1525 editions of the *Fortalitium fidei*. The printed words on the opening folio are red, and the page is bordered with black and white vessels, flowers, foliage, and masks. (Figure 99) In the top

---

251 The 1487 woodcut is examined in a comparative analysis with the 1475 woodcut below. See the section entitled “Word and Image in the Printed Text.”
253 Gueynard’s list of editions includes biblical texts, as well as works of theology, philosophy, polemic, and the arts. For specific comparison of designs and woodcuts, see Princeton’s 1512 *Opus regale* by Vivaldi.
left corner, in place of the “F” of “Fortalitium,” there is a small box with an architectural frame and the heads of three people. The largest head appears in profile on the left. The man wears a hat that curves into a point at the front, and his hand pages through a book. The other two heads face him in profile. They also wear hats, but neither the hats’ points nor the men’s hands are visible. All three men have full, pointy beards. Printed below and next to them are the words, “[F]ortalitium fidei in vniuersos christiane religionis hostes Judeorum i Saracenorurn no inualido breuis nec minus lucidi compendij vallo rabiem cohibens fortitudinis turris no abs re appellatum quinz turriuz inexpugnabilium munimine radians: succincte admodum i adamussim quinz partium librorum farragine absolutum.”

The immediate mention of the Jews suggests a possible identity for the boxed busts described above.

A centralized woodcut is framed in a simple square. On the right side of the square, a robed man kneels in prayer beneath a wooden cross. The cross rises out of a hill and has another cross at its base. A ladder leans against the left side of the cross, which is topped with a simple banner reading I.N.R.I. The nails of the crucifixion are visible with the whips of the flagellation hanging on either side. The spear, which pierced Christ’s abdomen leans on the cross’ left arm, while the vinegar and gall-filled sponge leans on the right arm. The crown of thorns rests near the intersection of the cross. Printed in red below the woodcut are the words indicating the publisher of the edition, “Uenundantur a Stephano gueynard...” The verso of the opening page is left blank.

254 “The fortress of faith, Christianity, is the enemy of the Jews and the Saracens…The strength of the tower is derived from its five impregnable towers which radiate outward in protection. The structure of the fortress is reflected in the five books comprising the text...”

255 “Printed by Stephano Gueynard...”
The sixteenth-century editions of the *Fortalitium fidei* are the first to include title pages for the text. Two aspects of this new element should be addressed. Firstly, the addition of the title page points to the evolution of printing and its mercantile context. The title page affords the printer and/publisher an opportunity to market himself within the literate community. It could also attract new buyers to books, which might otherwise go unnoticed. Secondly, and more importantly for the present purpose, the title page of the *Fortalitium fidei* sets the tone for reading and contemplating the text. The words printed on this opening page demonstrate a marked difference in the Christian response to attacks on the faith. A change in the syntax exhibited in the opening lines of the fifteenth-century editions suddenly positions Christianity as the righteous aggressor rather than the aggrieved victim. The new verbal tone and the meditative image on the title page immediately engaged the reader in the defense of Christianity.

This edition is also notable for its apparent typographic error, which ends with a folio labeled *Liber quartus*. Despite the scant documentary evidence concerning each of the fifteenth-century editions, the printer for this edition demonstrates an awareness of the text’s history as he listed the earlier known printers of the text on the final leaf.

Pagination of the text begins with the Prohemium on the tenth printed page, which is executed entirely in black ink.256 (Figure 100) Grape vines, foliage, flowers, a wood motif, a goblin’s head, and a centaur are all elements of the border. The text begins with the “T” of “Turris” elaborated in a small square.257 Both horizontal elements of the “T”

256 *Incipit prohemiu in quo divine laudes anno tant i mittitur querela an tronu maiestatis dei i ponitur intentio scribentis.* “Here begins the prohemium in which there is divine praise sent from the throne of God…”

257 The text that this decoration begins reads “*Turris fortitudinis a facie inimici. Tu es one deus meus: qui facis magna et inscrutabilia et mirabilia quoru no est numerus.*
end in downward facing beast heads. The “T” appears otherwise like a tree. A winged man kneels on the left side and seems to insert something into the trunk. A basilica-style building with a wooden roof and three windows and a large open doorway on the façade stands to right of the tree. The prohemium fills the first two folia.

The first volume of the text begins on folio 3r. (Figure 101) The leaf is heavily bordered in the same manner as folio r. The arma Christi image reappears at the top left inside the border, and four smaller images line the inside of the right border. In each of these images, a robed man looks down into an open book and carries a long, vertical element in his right hand. From top to bottom, the men hold a sword, a spear, an axe, and a cross-staff. Each man has long hair and a full beard. The text begins about halfway down the page with a decorated “U.” An eagle’s head caps the upper right end of the letter, and a bearded and rayed head peers out from beneath the eagle’s beak. In the curve of the “U,” a haloed, robed, and beardless man kneels in prayer. A book lies before him, but he appears to make eye contact with the head beneath the beak. The first volume continues through folio 67r without further illustration aside from some enlarged decorated letters.

The second volume begins on folio 67v and bears the same border images and armed men described in volume one moved to the inner left of the frame. (Figure 102) The

\textit{Tu...}” “A tower of strength in the face of the enemy. You are one God, who unquestionably does great and wonderful things beyond number. You…”

\textit{Ut detur ordo in presenti libro qingz erunt partiales libri quasi qingz turres fortalicij fidei inexpugnables. Primus erit de vera Christi militu armatura: i de fidei catholice excelletia. Secundus erit de bello falsorum spianorum et hereticorum contra...Tertius erit de bello iudeoy...” “To describe the organization, there are five parts of the books as there are five inexpugnable fortified towers of faith. The armor of the true soldier of Christ shall be the first, and then one of the excellence of the Catholic faith. The second will be a war against heretics and false Christians...The third will be a Jewish war…”
decorated letter on this page is an “A” with a large vessel wedged in its center. Inside the letter, a haloed, Christ-like figure stands at the right. He points to two other figures facing him on the left. These figures wear robes and hats and have full beards. As in volume one, some letters are enlarged and decorated though only to a minimal degree. Volume two ends on folio 105v.

The third volume begins on folio 106r. (Figure 103) The borders and images of armed men appear as they did at the beginning of the first volume. The text begins with a decorated “H.” The left side of the “H” is a decorative column. Under the lower half of the “H” a man with long hair and beard and flattened hat is visible. He looks at and gestures toward a book in his right hand. The volume continues as the previous ones did and ends on folio 239v.

The fourth volume begins on folio 240r and opens with same decoration as the beginning of volume two. (Figure 104) The decorated letter on this page is an “E.” It is decorated with some foliage and the vessel described in the “C” initial of the second volume. Christ stands at the right and looks at three robed, hatted, and bearded figures on

---

259 “Antiquorum in libris legimus gentilium milites humanam venerantes gloriam generose diversa monstrous genera destruxille. Sicut...” “We read in books of educated Greek soldiers who revel in their glorious human destruction of diverse monsters. Like...”

260 “Hereticorum bello quasi periculosior soluto cu fit a familiarib inimicis latenter commissium. Iudeorum velana progeniesnon erubelcit temptare si posit nostrum fidei fortaiicum pro viribus expugnare. Ac...” “The danger of the heretics lies in their familiarity, which allows them to secretly commit evil acts...” This particular argument of the “Fortress of Faith” is central to the analysis of the manuscript miniatures addressed in Chapter Two and the overarching argument discussed in Chapter Four.

261 The “E” comes from the word “extradite” although it appears the space was meant for the “V” or “Viriliter” as the connected line of text reads, “iriiliter vt deus,” or “and courageous God.”
the left. Most of the larger letters on the page are decorated minimally as in the previous volumes, but a few include human busts. Volume four ends on folio 346v.

The fifth volume begins on folio 346v in the same visual manner as the first and third volumes. (Figure 105) There is a decorated “D” comprised of a column for its straight element and leaves forming its upper and lower curves.\footnote{262} The most robust part of the letter is a grotesque mask with exaggerated facial features and an ugly expression. Within the “D,” Christ, at right, points at another man on the left. The man is bearded, heavily clothed, wears a hat, and carries some paper. The rest of the decoration reflects the earlier volumes, and the volume ends on folio 371v with a note about the edition’s publisher and date and a registrum of the font.\footnote{263}

4) Word and Image in the Printed Text

The interaction of the images with the printed text was as much a product of readership as it was of its physical compilation. According to Muther, printers with previous exposure to woodblocks were most likely to include illustrations in their editions, but the present research also indicates some printers’ ability to anticipate their market audience.\footnote{264}

The woodcuts opening the 1475 and 1487 editions of the Fortalitium fidei require further attention for several reasons. Firstly, they have been discussed only topically, and the 1487 woodcut is rarely mentioned at all. Presumably this is the case both because the Fortalitium fidei editions were never the subjects of a sustained investigation into...

\footnote{262} “Dissolutis hereticorum iudeorum et saracenorum bellis. Aestat. Experiri in hoc libro quinto y ultimo huius voluminis de demonum virib ...” “The wars of heretics, Jews, and Muslims then are feeble. The last chapter of this volume is about the demons…”

\footnote{263} “…Impesis specrabilis viri magri Stephant gueynart. Die. xi. mensis Octobus.”

\footnote{264} Muther, German Book Illustration, 1.
material culture and because manuscript miniatures previously received greater seniority in the hierarchy of art historical study. That the woodcuts were crude imitations of miniatures was likely a quick assumption. However, as scholars such as Michael Camille have shown, woodcuts in incunabula endow meaning in creative and sophisticated ways that frequently outwork contemporary manuscript miniatures.\textsuperscript{265} The previous assumption requires revision particularly in the context of the \textit{Fortalitium fidei} because its woodcuts are meaningful images in their own right.

Most published descriptions of the 1475 woodcut hearken back to its inclusion in the \textit{Illustrated Bartsch} series, which identifies an uncolored version of the woodcut as “A Four-Sided Tower Guarded by Two Christians and Attacked by Jews, Heathens and Demons.”\textsuperscript{266} (Figure 69) It is easy to imagine how this title came to be accepted, but the words do not accurately reflect the content of the image or the book it accompanied. Upon closer examination, it becomes clear that the “guarding Christians” carry shovels, and one even attempts to unearth the tower. These figures do not resemble the Church fathers and monks who support the fortress in the illuminated manuscripts. Instead, they must represent the heretics, figures who are mysteriously absent from the woodcut descriptions. Furthermore, the illuminated manuscripts of \textit{La Forteresse de la foy} present the heretics with shovels, referencing historical characterizations of heretics as figures who undermine the foundations of the true Christian faith.

A review of roughly contemporary woodcuts depicting shovel-bearers delineates the difference between foundation makers and foundation breakers. The woodcut depicting

\textsuperscript{265} Camille, “Reading the Printed Image,” 259-291.
\textsuperscript{266} \textit{Illustrated Bartsch: Anonymous Artists 1457-1475 German Book Illustration}, Volume 80. 1475/659 [21.553].
“The Building of the Tower of Babel” in Günther Zainer’s 1473 *Speculum humanae salvationis* includes a figure digging away the earth in the lower right corner of the frame. (Figure 86) The black-capped man toils to support rather than weaken the ground upon which the tower is being erected. Similarly, a man in the foreground image of “The Building of the Castle” from Johann Bämler’s 1474 *Melusine* digs at a remove from the base of the castle. (Figure 88) In both woodcuts, the man with a shovel or pick clearly poses no threat to the edifice. The same cannot be said for the heretics who use tools and even their bare hands to unearth the tower in Richel’s *Fortalitium fidei* image.

The carefully incorporated woodcuts of the sixteenth-century editions operate quite differently from those of 1475 and 1487. As already noted, the increased focus on meditative practice and the reintroduction of the *arma Christi* are perfectly aligned with trends of the period, but analysis of the later images should not be curtailed. The meditative aspects of the images confirm the intention of Étienne Gueynard to market the books as a clerical and scholarly commodity. The illustration of the *arma Christi* was a natural choice, and its pairing with images of haloed men armed with swords, scepters, axes, and cross-staffs suggest the universal responsibility of Christians to uphold the faith through work, fight, and prayer.

The early printed books reviewed in this study reveal the primary patrons of fifteenth and sixteenth-century editions of the *Fortalitium fidei* as monks, clerics, and academics. They also indicate the later provenance of many editions. The most striking element of the data presented in Appendix III is the current geographic distribution of the incunabula in public collections. While modern collecting and library curating must be taken into account, the overwhelming number of copies surviving in German repositories is notable.
German collections house more than two and half times as many copies as any other country with the United States as their distant second. The books’ decreased presence in other countries suggests a lack of sustained interest in the text both from its country of origin, Spain, and the court locations for which it was produced in lavish manuscript form.

In the eleven books examined here, two copies can be definitively placed in German monastic settings, and one is explicitly tied to an academic, while another can be traced from a monastery into a book collector’s library. Four others retain details of their individual sale on the modern open market. Several books bear the marks of multiple readers, and they collectively reveal three major types of reader interest: preaching values and methods, scriptural and theological studies, and concerns about each of the enemies examined in the text. One of the books draws attention to both heretics and Jews, but among the half of the sample concerned specifically with enemy activity, most readers only highlight or annotate a single enemy.

Within each volume, readers highlight various specific elements. Books One and Two apparently appealed to readers in tandem. The first volume is more theoretical in its appreciation of theological, scriptural, and rhetorical knowledge as the means for

267 The provenance of the Pierpont Morgan Library’s ChL 1371 from 1475 provides the most precise record of initial sale of the edition. It includes an inscription presumably from the rubricator. It indicates the purchase of the book the before the Ascension of the Virgin (August 15) 1475 at Blauberren, a small town in Württemberg.

268 This is, of course, a very small sample of the surviving incunabula of the “Fortress of Faith.” While it is a start at understanding the breadth of the work’s influence across Western Europe, further study should be pursued. Appendix III is a preliminary and ongoing effort in that vein. While the appendix currently provides the shelfmark, institution, location, and year of each copy, a more expanded study should include available provenance records and notes about images inserted on paper, parchment, or vellum after the text’s purchase.
effective preaching. The second volume sustains that appreciation but also places a greater focus on the role of the sacraments in rooting out heresy, particularly within the Church hierarchy. The active audience for Book Three highlights individual aspects of the alleged Jewish character, as well as the rhetorical and physical means of eliminating them. In Books Four and Five the wars against Christianity and the biography of Muhammad were of note to some medieval readers as were the origin and behavior of the demons. When Books Three, Four, and Five are read as fundamentally linked, their greatest commonality is revealed. Late medieval and early modern readers of the “Fortress of Faith” sought an understanding of their enemies via classification. Their desire to find this along with the inaccuracies and clumsiness of their attempts reveal nothing truthful about medieval non-Christians but suggest a great deal about the Christians themselves.

The variety of color and detail in the washing of the 1475 “Fortress of Faith” woodcuts further suggests a range of owners and readers. Those left pristine or minimally colored indicate audiences less engaged with the images, while those with greater details in the coloring reflect an interest in the use of images to instruct alongside the text. Perhaps most interesting are woodcuts aggressively washed with only a few colors. The sloppy, almost violent, application of color in some instances leaves the modern reader to ponder why the images were enhanced and by whom.

Few fifteenth- and sixteenth-century printed books have survived in their original bindings. Although the majority of these books are now rebound with the marbled papers and austere leather covers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, surviving original bindings offer further encouragement for studying the incunabula as objects of material
culture. For example, the Bodleian Library’s BOD 4° F 7 Th. Seld. still wears an intricately decorated white, leather cover. (Figure 106) Of particular note is the presentation of three Virtues to the reader. The cardinal virtue of Justice and the theological virtues of Faith and Hope are personified and labeled in Latin. As discussed in Chapter Two and Four, the Virtues were a popular means of communicating religious and social values to Christians, and the three presented here are no exception. They remind the reader what he seeks as a pious Christian reader of the “Fortress of Faith,” and the annotations inscribed in the editions confirm readers’ attempts to be successful in this respect. Furthermore, the presence of the Virtues on this sixteenth-century book cover underscores the visual culture of the period. Although the allegorical use of the Virtues and Vices is more explicitly developed in the earlier French manuscript miniatures, their appearance here indicates their sustained use in a dialogue about piety and sin.

Much remains to be explored to reach a thorough conclusion about the audience of the *Fortalitium fidei* between 1471 and 1530. The current sample is representative, yet preliminary, in this respect. Should a more complete study of *Fortalitium fidei* incunabula be pursued, a holistic approach incorporating text, image, annotation, and binding is of the utmost importance.

**5) Conclusion**

Three main points emerge from this chapter. First, all material aspects of “Fortress of Faith” editions must be considered in order to determine the work’s broad
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impact. A review of the Latin text’s evolving style of execution and increasing portability place it squarely within trends identified by scholars working on the early modern transition, or more accurately, exchange between manuscript and print. This, along with records of ownership and patterns of annotation, indicates a primarily clerical or scholarly audience for the text during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Second, the production and function of incunabula images is quite different from, though certainly not inferior to, that of manuscript miniatures from the same period. The miniatures from the French manuscripts adopted allegorical conventions from contemporary theater, employed extensive iconographic symbols, and appealed to the sophisticated visual vocabulary of elite readers. These images guided the reader in a more specific manner than the woodcuts of the incunabula. The printed images are instructive less as an explanation of the text than as a directive for properly reading it. Their effectiveness as mnemonic devices, puzzles, and meditative foci charged the audience with greater responsibility in reading.

Finally, in some ways the evidence presented here suggests a dual evolution of manuscript and print versions of the “Fortress of Faith,” but the limited audience of the manuscripts suggests their production as more of an experiment. Unlike other contemporary cities, Ghent and Bruges were prolific sites of manuscript and print production through the fifteenth century. The patronage of fifteenth-century court members, such as Charles the Bold; Margaret of York; Mary of Burgundy; Edward IV of England; and Louis of Bruges, fueled the extended production of lavish manuscripts in these two centers.\textsuperscript{270} Elsewhere, the sustained and increasingly efficient transmission of

\textsuperscript{270} Hindman, \textit{Pen to Press}, 121-122.
the Latin text’s woodcuts in published editions indicates print as the dominant medium for the work, even if contemporary manuscript miniatures prove more interesting for strictly visual analysis.

The present reconstruction of the order of the “Fortress of Faith’s” production in manuscript and print identifies Valenciennes, BM Ms. 0244 and the 1475 edition as the seminal works in the distribution of the text.\textsuperscript{271} (Figures 3, 14, 82, 83, and 84) The influence attributed to the Valenciennes manuscript and Richel’s edition does not discount the depth of meaning conveyed through the specificities of the miniatures in the better-known Paris manuscript and its relatives in London, Brussels, Vienna, and elsewhere. It simply reminds the reader of the isolated audience of the French manuscripts.\textsuperscript{272} On the other hand, the woodcuts from the 1475 and 1487 editions enjoyed a larger and more diverse readership.


While identifying either the Valenciennes frontispiece or the 1475 woodcut as the archetypal image behind all of the fifteenth-century manuscripts and editions is probably impossible, their general relationship to each other and the later images remains important. Following Hindman’s arguments about copied miniatures and the related practice of using painting and sculpture fragments as models, it is logical to assume an experienced illuminator could transfer his miniatures onto blocks for use inside printed editions. Prints were frequently used as inspiration for later prints, and some were even the inspiration for new miniatures. See Hindman, \textit{Pen to Press}, 79, 102, and 121.

\textsuperscript{272} This isolation is even more poignant given the disparities in manuscript illumination styles between the Ghent-Bruges school and that of Germany. As Camille notes, manuscript audiences in Germany were far more familiar with pen and ink drawings and washes of color than they were with the luxurious court styles of Belgium. It seems that the German readers would have received the Burgo manuscript illuminations well and
The visual evidence suggests the 1475 woodcut inspired the visual program of the French manuscripts. The second Latin edition maintained the original language and visual austerity presented in the earliest extant manuscript. (Figure 1) The woodcut emerges as the crucial starting point for adapting the “Fortress of Faith” image for new and different audiences. The printer and artist connections presented above provide a likely path for the evolution of the tower image in both print and manuscript, but the reduction of the Burgo image to the 1475 woodcut also conveyed a message more in keeping with the work’s originally intended and eventually realized audience. The elimination of the complicated symbolism of the Latin manuscript in favor of a schematic drawing allowed the artists and readers to focus more specifically on the enemies of the “Fortress of Faith.” The format of the woodcut placed the heretics, Jews, Muslims, and demons in more meaningful positions of attack. (Figure 3) For example, in the frontispiece from the Valenciennes manuscript, the artist moved the enemies out into the larger picture plane and began to more fully develop them both in terms of their nature and their agency in assaulting Christianity. (Figure 14) In all of the manuscript miniatures, Christians are present to defend the “Fortress of Faith,” but these representatives are absent from the 1475 and 1487 prints. The Christian abandonment of the fortress underscores the imminent danger of its demise, thereby more effectively reminding readers of the purpose of the text.
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were also preconditioned for reading woodcuts. See Michael Camille, “Reading the Printed Image,” 267.
CHAPTER FOUR: HISTORY MEETS MEMORY

1) Introduction

This chapter examines the “Fortress of Faith” within the context of memory studies. It argues the text and images shaped public memory, by adapting stories and images to locations and events with which they had not been previously associated. First, it addresses theories concerning medieval myth, legend, and memory formation, as well as the visual and theatrical modes through which they were communicated. It then turns to how the “Fortress of Faith” communicated and engendered specific beliefs through both word and image. A consideration of the types of legends perpetuated and the work’s methods of doing so for various audiences leads to a bipartite exploration of contemporary manuscripts and incunabula of the text. In particular, this study will examine two myths as they relate to the “Fortress of Faith”: blood libel and host desecration. The miniatures from the manuscripts described in Chapter Two and their relationship to medieval theater and medieval iconographic tropes are part of a much larger discussion concerning the role of images and theater in shaping public memory and thought during the late Middle Ages. Analysis of “Fortress of Faith” woodcuts and their ability to function as mnemonic devices reveal their contribution to memory development, particularly of the clerical reader, during the period.

This chapter focuses largely on representations of Jews in the “Fortress of Faith,” particularly in illuminated manuscripts, and the chapter does so both self-consciously and strategically. The scholarship on negative representations of Jews from the Middle Ages is vast, and a large part of that body recognizes the development of a “hermeneutical Jew” within the continuous assault on the actual Jewish minority. The “Fortress of Faith”
provides the perfect opportunity for reviewing the resulting academic focus placed on the historical and the hermeneutical Jew. Such a review is also the basis for understanding the text’s treatment of all other non-Christians, a theme most fully explored in Chapter Five.

In order to understand the impact of the “Fortress of Faith,” the distance between reality and perception for medieval and early modern readers must be addressed. Despite Espina’s authoritative tone and seemingly truthful encyclopedic account of hundreds of events and personal characteristics, the modern reader can unearth a host of questionable details in the text. At the heart of this discrepancy is the phenomenon through which belief supersedes historical fact over time. This phenomenon is not specific to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but some of its particular manifestations in the “Fortress of Faith” demonstrate the text’s perfect alignment with popular myths and legends from the period. The adoption of established formulas and the focus on outcomes and resolutions as opposed to specific plotlines indicate a wholesale acceptance of communal memory as more important than historical accuracy. Furthermore, the “Fortress of Faith’s” gathering of a large number of regional myths with common features collapses time for the text’s readers. Sheer volume erases the distinctions among individual events while retaining the psychological horrors associated with the acts.

Communal memory is transferred via a number of forms, which foster varying degrees of adaptation over time. Due to its production in manuscript and printed forms over the course of about fifty years, the “Fortress of Faith” enjoyed written, oral, and visual transmission. None of these modes is completely separable from the other two, and they often complement each other. However, each also has specific properties,
which bear meaning on the text. On its most basic level, the written text offers the smallest opportunity for exploring evolving interpretations among its direct readers. This limitation is immediately recognizable through a brief examination of the manuscripts and printed books, which proceed from the oldest Latin manuscript. Excepting standard abbreviations, the printed editions directly transmit the text, and the French manuscripts do not err from the original in their translation beyond a few instances of sloppy transcription.

In its various forms, the “Fortress of Faith’s” message could be transmitted orally and visually to its “readers.” The use of the Latin “Fortress of Faith” as fodder for sermons to the laity assumes a secondary layer of interpretation as the text was verbally communicated from the folia through the mendicant into the audience hall. Similarly, the vernacular text was likely read aloud from luxury folios in court settings. The interjection of visual images and their relationship to theatrical display and clerical meditation in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries complicate interpretation further reminding the modern reader of the interwoven nature of written, oral, and visual communication in shaping historical memory.273

Sharing information via the written word is anything but a static process. Ideally from the author’s perspective, the writer records his thoughts, and the reader absorbs those thoughts in the manner originally intended. Of course, the written word is still somewhat subject to interpretation, and both the dynamic qualities of language and
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273 For more on orality and collective reading, see Elizabeth Morrison and Anne D. Hedeman, eds., *Imagining the Past in France: History in Manuscript Painting, 1250-1500* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2010).
varying intellectual capacities of readers allow for significant departures from the original content of any given text.

Verbal communication of ideas, whether based on written texts or oral culture engender a more fluid transmission of knowledge. This transmission relies on both the speaker’s ability to process and present information and the reader’s ability to comprehend and apply the presented information in some meaningful way.

Studies addressing the transition from manuscript to print recognize the potential for texts to recall images and images to recall texts. Nellhaus credits classical authorities with recognizing the necessity for an art of memory. Both writing and images were revived for this purpose in the twelfth century and remained popular into the seventeenth century. Mental images could break down basic arguments, frequently using personifications to embed meaning. Eventually these same mental images were adapted into physical images. These layered images required repetitive and self-referential interpretation to stabilize memory, and this intensive process of interpretation ensured the codependency of text and image.

Visual communication can occur discreetly or in conjunction with information communicated via written and oral modes. As completely autonomous vehicles of communication, images wield great power and can shape readers’ thoughts. As semi-autonomous vehicles of communication, images help readers to consider and interpret

---

texts and beliefs with greater depth. At stake in this study is whether the images included in manuscripts and incunabula of the “Fortress of Faith” are better classified as completely or semi-autonomous according to these definitions. The extent of their power must be determined in order to understand and calculate the impact of the Fortalitium fidei for late medieval and early modern readers.

Theatrical display provides perhaps the most variables for communicating information and shaping communal memory. Even when an established script is employed, meaning is subject to the actors’ reading and execution of a scene, the crew’s execution and employment of staging elements, and the audience’s reception of the scene. Each performance is specific to its moment in time and the people involved. The transient nature of performance can effect an ephemeral experience of the material, but a community audience can consolidate familiar visual and oral cues from a series of performances into a universal memory of the event. Although the “Fortress of Faith” was never performed as a play, this study draws upon theatrical and literary studies alongside visual analysis to demonstrate the influence of theater on the illuminations of the Forteresse de la foy manuscripts. A similar interchange of artistic forms is visible in theatrical and visual representations of the Hell Mouth in the Middle Ages. (Figures 107 and 108)

2) The Contents of the “Fortress of Faith”

The precise relationship between word and image in the “Fortress of Faith” is difficult to ascertain due to the dynamic nature of the text’s production between 1458 and 1525. Furthermore, varying levels of both verbal and visual literacy among readers deny the possibility of uniformity in interpreting this relationship. Generally, this study argues
that while the miniatures of the Latin manuscript in Burgo are primarily illustrative and perhaps historical in nature, the miniatures and woodcuts from later manuscripts and editions present theoretical concepts. Over time these later images develop an autonomy, which allows them to prod the reader in new and distinct ways. The language and composition of the text is static aside from translation into French, and possibly German and Italian. However, the images evolve, effectively communicating important themes and concerns for specific audiences. Both types of image ask the reader to consider the most dangerous threat to Christianity, but the woodcuts from 1475 and 1487 explicitly highlight heretics, while the miniatures of *La forteresse de la foy* present Vice as the lifeblood of all of the enemies. Neither of these concepts arises forcefully from the written or printed text. Even a glance at the tables indicates the Jews, or perhaps Muslims, as the greatest concern for Christians.277

The text of the “Fortress of Faith” presented Jews in all of the negative manners typical of the period.278 Although he was no more eloquent than his predecessors dating back to the 12th century, Alonso de Espina is noted as an important influence on Iberian anti-Judaism largely because he compiled so much of the works of Peter Alfonsi (12th century), Ramón Martí (13th century), Alfonso de Valladolid (14th century), and others. While the Christian battle against the heretics is characterized as the most perilous, it is really merely an extension of the discussion about Jews. The bulk of Espina’s attack on heretics is a critique of Spanish converts, or *conversos*, who were previously Jewish. In

277 The visual addition of the Vices is clearly attributed to the “Fortress of Faith’s” patronage for the northern courts. The nobility associated with the French translations were accustomed to these and other allegorical personifications of abstract concepts.
278 The scholarship of Alisa Meyuhas-Ginio, Steven McMichael, and J.M. Antón Monsalvo, noted above, is particularly concerned with the verbal representation of the Jews in the “Fortress of Faith.”
Espina’s mind Jewish converts were essentially still Jews as he did not trust their stated reasons for conversion or their behavior in the world around him. Espina’s treatment of the Jews, however, suggests he believed they were less aware of their own sinfulness. According to the friar, their blindness prevents them from seeing the strength and great grandeur of the tower in resisting the enemy. The dissolution of their battle is clear, and their alleged confusion is presented in twelve considerations in the third volume of the text.279

The first six considerations are specifically concerned with Espina’s understanding of Jewish knowledge and belief. First, he attacks “the blindness of the Jews and their nebulous knowledge.” He then moves directly to a critique on their “doctrine of the Talmud” and the “diversity of Jews in their faith and credence.” Individually, he addresses the attacks of the Jews with arguments about Mosaic law, the Gospels, and natural science.280 His approach is in keeping with traditional Christian attempts to attach righteous use of those three types of belief solely to Christians.281
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279 Royal MS 17 F VI, folio 126 recto and verso. I have chosen to draw the bulk of my translations from the French Forteresse de la foy, MS Royal 17 F VI and VII (British Library) for several reasons. First, working from a French illuminated copy of the text allows the greatest demonstration of interpretive changes to the work from the time it was written through the end of the fifteenth century. The nuances of translation and evolving images offer a great deal of valuable information about the reception of the text over time. Secondly, this particular manuscript is the most accessible of the suite of French translations.

280 Royal MS 17 F VI, folio 126 verso. The quotations here are direct translations from the first leaves of the volume, which lay out the entire discussion of the battle against the Jews. Each Consideration is fully discussed later in the volume, and any deeper examination of them in this study will refer to the appropriate folia.

281 For more in-depth explorations of Espina’s treatment of some of these issues, see Monsalvo, “Algunas consideraciones” on blindness and the Talmud and Steven McMichael, The Friars and the Jews on Mosaic law.
Considerations Seven and Eight examine the psychological character and related actions of Jews, arguing for their cruelty and self-conceit.\textsuperscript{282} The principal points of the seventh consideration are broken down into the cruelties of the Jews against Jesus Christ, against their lords, and against the Christians, a hierarchy similar to Dante’s presentation of sin in \textit{Inferno}. Seventeen cruelties are generally described in the subheadings, but specific occurrences follow each. Jews are presented as a dangerous nuisance in Christendom, threatening society through their professions, beliefs, and malice toward Christian neighbors, particularly children.\textsuperscript{283} Six examples of Jewish self-conceit or complacency are further noted.\textsuperscript{284} In the ninth and tenth considerations, historical events are discussed. First the “expulsions of the Jews and their great ignorance” are detailed. A purported list of the “miracles that happened to the Jews and their obstinate malice” follow.\textsuperscript{285} Finally, Espina made suggestions for subjugating the Jews and eradicating Judaism in the last two Considerations. The text discusses the “obligations of the Jews according to canon law and royal ordinance,” as well as the “conversion of Jews at the end of the century.”\textsuperscript{286} This study focuses most explicitly on the cruelties and self-conceits of Considerations Seven and Eight and also briefly considers the material on subjugation and eradication from Considerations Eleven and Twelve.

Like many writers of the period, rumors and legends of blood libel and host profanation fascinated Espina. He recorded accounts of these events almost to the point of obsession in his volume on the Jews. In his mind, accusations confirmed guilt, and he

\textsuperscript{282} Royal MS 17 F VI, folio 126 verso.
\textsuperscript{283} Royal MS 17 F VI, folio 220 recto – 233 recto.
\textsuperscript{284} Royal MS 17 F VI, folio 233 recto – 242 recto.
\textsuperscript{285} Royal MS 17 F VI, folio 126 verso.
\textsuperscript{286} Royal MS 17 F VI, folio 126 verso.
recorded a number of events in the *Fortalitium fidei*, some of which still maintain a presence in local communal memory today. Drawing together internationally recognized accusations and less-established local charges, Espina wrote persuasively about the causes for concern over Jewish practice. He capitalized on the popularity of the mysterious death of Little Hugh of Lincoln, placing it prominently among other accounts. The appearance of Thomas of Monmouth’s *The Martyrdom of St. William of Norwich* in the mid-twelfth century gave rise to many other accusations but none so infamous as the “Martyrdom of Little Hugh of Lincoln,” which was later recounted by the Prioress in Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales*.287 The detail and popularity of this accusation informed other less familiar accusations listed in the same section of the text. The juxtaposition of well-known and unknown tales reflects the transmission of both blood libel and host desecration myths across Western Europe as discussed by Miri Rubin.288

Acceptance of the blood libel accusation by “Fortress of Faith” readers did not rely significantly on images of such events. A brief examination of images from the period reveals overlapping and borrowing of standard features. While a rood screen *Murder of William of Norwich* seems to convey some specific details from his martyrdom, the Nuremberg Chronicle image of the event is a more generic representation. (Figures 109 and 110). A late drawing of the crucifixion of Adam of

287 Thomas of Monmouth, *The Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich*, eds. Augustus Jessopp and Montague Rhodes James (Cambridge, U.K., 1896). The martyrdom of Little Hugh became the subject of a ballad transcribed in *Hughes de Lincoln: recueil de ballades Anglo-Normande et ecossoises relatives au muertre de cet enfant commis par les Juifs en MCCLV*, ed. Francisque Michel (Paris, 1834). Of course the murder of Simon of Trent from 1493 eventually surpassed the story of Hugh of Lincoln in popularity, most notably because it was recorded in Hartmann Schedel’s *Nuremberg Chronicle* of the same year.

Bristol provides another generic image of the event while focusing on the Jew needlessly prodding at the boy’s limp body. (Figure 111) The grotesque elements of the images increase as ritual circumcisions are incorporated into blood libel images of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. This addition is the most striking element of the Nuremberg Chronicle image of Simon of Trent and is repeated at the bottom of an engraving of another event in northeastern Italy. (Figures 112 and 113)

While poignant in their own right, it was really a combination of oral and literary repetition of the myths, as well as a collection of tangentially related images that primed readers for Espina’s selections. In varying ways, they responded to all of the incredible features of the blood libel. The story of the “Jewish Boy in the Oven” confirmed the malicious capacity of the Jewish male. Recorded in the *Cantigas de Santa Maria* and the late fourteenth-century “Vernon Miracles,” as well as the stained glass at Bourges cathedral, the tale centers around a Jewish boy who naively receives communion on his way home from school one day. (Figure 23, Figure 114, and Figure 115) Upon hearing of this, his father becomes enraged and throws his son into the house oven only to later find him protected under the mantle of the Virgin Mary. The identification of the victim as a Jewish boy allowed Christian audiences to contemplate the character of the Jewish father outside of the standard Jewish-Christian conflict. Once the Jewish man was recognized as a willful abuser of his own child, it could easily be surmised that he would treat Christian children with even more malice out of his spite for Christianity.

People looked to this same perceived animosity toward Christianity as evidence for allegations of Jewish host profanation. Espina incorporated this into his text with even greater specificity than he did the blood libel. Rubin notes Alonso de Espina’s
personal engagement with the host miracle narrative in the “Fortress of Faith.” The most famous narrative of host desecration is the “Host Miracle of Paris,” or the “Miracle of the Billetes” from Saint-Jean-en-Grève in 1290. Propagated throughout France in the Actes de Paris and the Chronicles of Saint-Denis (1285-1328), religious leaders and mystery plays rehearsed the story in Italy, France, and England. Apparently a group of monks Espina met in Medina del Campo in the 1450s familiarized him with the 1290 “Miracle of the Billetes,” and it made enough of an impression for him to include it in his treatise a few years later. Espina also took a particular interest in the desecration accusation from Segovia, recording it as one of the seventeen cruelties of the Jews. The moment of the host’s elevation in the Segovia account is even illustrated in the Burgo manuscript, which suggests its greater familiarity among Espina’s immediate audience. (Figure 116)
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289 Rubin, Gentile Tales, 46.
291 Rubin, Gentile Tales, 46.
The phenomenon of host profanation stories was apparently slow to surface in Spain, but the case in Segovia and another in Guardia were the loci for intense religious fervor and conflict in the fifteenth century. Vincent Ferrer’s 1410 itinerary through Spain set the tone for a series of anti-Jewish acts in Iberia. Jews were killed, their properties were confiscated, and their synagogues were repurposed as churches. However, Ferrer is not responsible for all of the anti-Jewish sentiment of the early fifteenth century.

Not long before his arrival in Segovia, Bishop Juan de Tordesillas of said city conspired with the Dominican prior from La Santa Cruz to accuse Jean II’s court doctor, Meir Alguades, of purchasing a Eucharistic wafer in order to abuse it. Drawing heavily on the Paris case of 1290, the account goes that the Jewish doctor carried the wafer into the synagogue, where after attempting to boil it, he elevated it for his accomplices to see and, likely, in mockery of the moment of elevation during the Mass. Legend claims the walls miraculously shook until they cracked in response to Alguade’s actions. The wicked Jew then allegedly returned the host to La Santa Cruz and confessed. Under advisement of the bishop, the queen-mother had the involved Jews arrested and tortured and then dragged, hanged, and quartered on the plaza. The synagogues were confiscated, and the Jews were expelled from their ghetto.

---

292 For the purposes of examining the “Fortress of Faith,” the Segovia accusation is more relevant, but the Guardia case should be noted as it ignited the process of the Jews’ expulsion from Spain in 1492 as the Dominican Thomas de Torquemada convinced los reyes católicos of the Jews negative influence over the marranos.

293 Despina, “Les accusations de profanation d’hosties portées contre les juifs” *Rencontre. Chrétiens et Juifs* 22 (1971),168-169. The synagogue described in the account bears a striking resemblance to Santa Maria la Blanca de Toledo, which was a synagogue before it was a church.
Although the miniature of the elevated host of Segovia depicted in the Burgo manuscript specifically appealed to fifteenth-century Castilian readers, the bulk of host profanation images relied on their lack of specificity to appeal to a variety of audiences in the late medieval and early modern world. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, numerous similar accounts of host desecration appeared contemporaneously throughout Europe. The stories cast the male Jew as the perpetrator, aided by his ignorant wife and children, discovered by lay and clerical Christians, punished by the Christian mob, and obliterated from memory through the establishment of new, Christian symbols. In this way they offered a sense of communal drama in Christian society that promoted miraculous visions and conversion, while also making the Jew more conspicuous. As concern for the protection of the host from outsiders grew, belief and practice took different paths. The narratives grouped Jews with heretics, attacking their presumed carnal understanding of the world and converting them through witness of host miracles.\(^{294}\) However, the narratives were often more successful in legitimating local crusades and expulsions than they were in promoting actual conversion.

Jews were repeatedly used as a blank canvas upon which doubts about Christianity and its ritual practices were painted. The hermeneutical Jew of the Middle Ages is particularly apparent in depictions of alleged host desecration. Despite the confirmation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, Christian doubt continued to grow concerning the actuality of the presence of Christ in

\(^{294}\) In *Gentile Tales*, Rubin argues that the “Host Miracle of Paris” should be interpreted as an exemplum of numerous narratives arising and gaining popularity independent of one another. She identifies a basic formula for host desecration and resultant violence that appears in Paris, Rinfleisch, Armleder, Korneuberg, Pulkau, and other cities. Rubin, *Gentile Tales*, 40.
the Eucharist. Christians yearned to see the blood emerge from the host so that they might experience the miracle of Transubstantiation through the senses. The only acceptable way for Christians to view the blood of Christ was via host miracles. Sometimes host miracles were linked to clerical vision and intense spiritual experiences, like those illustrated in popular images of the Mass of Saint Gregory or Chancellor Rolin’s vision of the Madonna. (Figures 117 and 118)

Gradually, under the purveyance of Cistercians and mendicants, these positive host miracles transformed into host profanation events occurring in response to Jewish instigation. (Figures 119 and 120) In this way, tales of host desecration and the images created to commemorate them reveal Christian doubt under the guise of Jewish

---

295 Depictions of the bleeding host have lead to a body of scholarship that assumes an implicit connection between the Eucharist and all blood-related issues of the late Middle Ages. However Caroline Walker Bynum’s work has recently made great strides in problematizing this assumption, discussing Christ’s complete presence in the accessible forms of the wonder-host and the blood relic. Ultimately she argues that the host became the choice focus because it distanced Christians from the horrors of Christ’s suffering. See Caroline Walker Bynum, “The Blood of Christ in the Later Middle Ages,” Church History 71, no. 4 (2002): 685-715 and Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).

296 Host miracles were not unheard of before 1215, but the reaffirmation of Transubstantiation at the Fourth Lateran Council clearly prompted a spike in their circulation, as Despina counts only six miracles before 1200 and nine more before 1250 but 43 between 1250 and 1350. See Marie Despina, “Les accusations” 152-153.

297 For a more thorough timeline of this shift, see Despina, “Les accusations,” 151 and 153. Two things should be noted about Despina’s article. She treats the ritual murder and host desecration charges interchangeably for her purposes of identifying the onset of medieval anti-Semitism. Secondly, she even argues that these events did not factor into the Jews’ expulsion from England in 1290. This is an interesting claim when considered alongside the timing of English ritual murder accusations and their popularity only long after their alleged occurrences. For example, William of Norwich died in 1144, but Thomas of Monmouth did not record his alleged ritual murder until 1150 and later. Little Saint Hugh of Lincoln died in 1255, but his legend became so popular it even appeared in Geoffrey Chaucer’s fourteenth-century Canterbury Tales via the Prioress. It seems both legends were known locally at first but continued to gain popularity even after the Jews were completely eradicated from England.
profanation. In these stories, a Jew procures the holy wafer and attempts to destroy it by stabbing or boiling it. In response, the wafer begins to bleed or emits a Christ child from the steaming cauldron. The miracle leads to the immediate conversion of the Jew or his death by fire. Despina notes German accusations as early as 1247, but the first record of such a crime dates to the Paris “Miracle of the Billettes” noted above.

Texts and images of host desecration rely heavily on the formula of a few wildly popular tales. Perhaps the most famous case study for representations of Jewish desecration of the Eucharist is the Paolo Uccello predella for the altar of Corpus Domini in Urbino. Installed below Joos van Ghent’s Communion of the Apostles, this narrative panel has been studied by numerous scholars both within and outside of art history. Both parts of the altar emphasize the miracle of Transubstantiation with the large, upper

---

298 Marie Despina’s and others’ arguments suggest anti-Semitism was simply an unfortunate byproduct of Christian dogma and guilt. It was more acceptable, convenient, and safe to name Jews as messiah-murderers and host desecraters than it was for Christians to ask about Christ’s sacrifice and real presence. Others, such as Caroline Walker Bynum, are reluctant to say Christians needed affirmation via these miracles. Rather, Christians were addicted to seeing the blood. See Marie Despina, “Les accusations,” 150-151 and Caroline Walker Bynum, “The Blood of Christ,” 685-714.

299 Rubin, Gentile Tales, 41-43.

300 Despina, “Les accusations,” 155-157. Drawing on a letter from the chronicler Jean de Tilrode (1298), Despina recounts the tale of a Jew named Jonathan who, in 1290, was accused of profaning a host. It was said he purchased the wafer from a Christian woman who received it in her Easter communion. Amongst his Jewish companions, Jonathan belittled Christian belief in real presence, and they all attempted to destroy the wafer. They eventually divided it into three pieces and threw it into a boiling cauldron only to witness it transform into the body and blood of the Savior. The later Jewish chronicler, Joseph ha-Cohen recounted how Jonathan’s neighbor accused him, how his wife and children were tortured in his presence but later baptized, and how he died clutching his Torah. Boniface VIII later transformed the Jew’s house into a chapel to commemorate the miracle, an action that would be repeated many times over in response to host miracles. It was believed the host later reconstituted itself and was preserved in the church of Saint-Jean-en-Grève.

panel depicting the first and doctrinal miracle of the host, and the smaller, lower panel
depicting the miracle of a host’s survival of a desecration attempt. (Figure 121) The
narrative of the predella is illustrated in six contiguous scenes that outline a Jewish
family’s sneaky acquisition and attempted destruction of the host followed by their
capture and execution. (Figures 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, and 127)

The subject of the predella was, at first, considered surprising in Italy. However,
Lavin has argued that the story depicts one of a number of legends that circulated after
the 1264 official institution of the Feast of Corpus Domini. She believed that it was most
closely related to the programs of the Host Miracle of Paris documented in 1290.302 This
particular miracle was propagated throughout France in the Actes de Paris and the
Chronicles of Saint-Denis (1285-1328). The legend certainly entered Italy before 1348,
when it was recorded in the Chronicles of Giovanni Villani. Religious leaders and
mystery plays continued to rehearse the story in Italy, France, and England. Lavin
argued that the predella revealed the anti-Semitic attitudes of the work’s civic patrons.
She used the message of the 1290 Host Miracle, the preaching of Franciscan friars
against the Jews, and the early fifteenth-century migration of Jews from Iberia into Italy
as evidence for a growing concern about the increasing proximity of this marginal, yet
financially successful group. She also argued that the predella’s juxtaposition with the
main panel of the altar demonstrated options, such as conversion, and consequences, such
as execution, available to Jews within a Christian society.

302 The “1290 Host Miracle” comes from Saint-Jean-en-Grève, Paris. It is the first full
tale of host desecration, and the earliest existing document of it was recorded in 1299.
For a full account, see Miri Rubin, Gentile Tales, 40-47
Past and recent studies in anti-Jewish imagery have argued that Jews were the likely choice for host desecraters because they had already relegated themselves to the edges of society through their refusal of Christianity. However, the preceding and contemporary popularity of blood libel accusations must be recognized as a powerful influence in legitimating host desecration accounts. Just as one child was substituted for another, the Christian sacraments were inserted into the tales as objects of victimization. The blood of the Jewish boy, the Christian child, and Christ himself required no differentiation as they all fell prey to the Jewish abuser.

303 Tethered to this refusal of Christianity was the Jewish practice of moneylending. Despite the established connection between the profession and the supposedly inherent characteristic of Jewish greed, historians have shown that Jews entered into such work due to lack of options and were often taxed well beyond the standard burdens placed upon their Christian contemporaries. For examples, see Robert Stacey, “1240-1260: A Watershed in Anglo-Jewish Relations?” *Historical Research* 61 (1988): 135-150 and Giacomo Todeschini, “Franciscan Economics and Jews in the Middle Ages: From a Theological to an Economic Lexicon,” in *Friars and Jews in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, eds. Susan E. Meyers and Steven J. McMichael (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2004), 99-118.

304 Studies examining the connections among Christian and Jewish manuscripts, authors, and illuminators indicate some key instances of Christian ignorance of Jewish practice, which may have influenced the fabrication of and belief in stories implicating Jews in ritual murder and host profanation. The nature of the medieval illuminator’s profession allowed for artists to work on manuscripts of many types. A single illuminator could create the illustrations for secular and religious works and could also simultaneously work for Jewish and Christian patrons. The use of similar images to infuse very different meanings for specific readers was largely successful, but there were some instances of confusion. For example, the reuse of a decorative pattern from a Eucharistic pressing iron to embellish a Hagaddah illustration of the Passover matzoh yielded no concern. However, a Hagaddah illuminator’s use of a bubbling cauldron to demonstrate the preparations for Passover could be deemed problematic because of its likeness to the same illuminator’s depiction of a cauldron used to commit blood libel. For more on this subject, see Michael Batterman, “Bread of Affliction, Emblem of Power: The Passover Matzah in Haggadah Manuscripts from Christian Spain,” in *Imagining the Self, Imagining the Other: Visual Representation and Jewish-Christian Dynamics in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period*, ed. Eva Frojmovic (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2002), 53-90 and Rubin, *Gentile Tales*, 72 n. 7.
As David Biale, Caroline Walker Bynum, Clifford Davidson, and others theorize, blood was at the center of the medieval Christian experience.\(^{305}\) It was seen as a medium for redemption and, therefore, the focus of intense devotion via both the biological and spiritual body of Christ.\(^{306}\) The Savior’s mutilated body in works like the *Röetgen Pièta*, for instance, inspired fervent devotion as the viewer contemplated his suffering. (Figure 128) The Man of Sorrows confronted the viewer with both the horror of Christ’s crucifixion and the promise his resurrection entailed. (Figures 129 and 33) Even the miracle of the Bleeding Host of Dijon left the viewer in wondrous awe. (Figure 130)

For the author of the “Fortress of Faith,” the Jews’ terrible provocation of holy blood was a recurrent theme around which he based much of his argument against them. He identified the famous Parisian account of 1290 as the reason for the 1306 expulsion of the Jews from France and argued the extreme reaction to the profanation should be mimicked in Spanish politics.\(^{307}\) Despina suggests Espina’s fixation on this event was sufficient influence for Thomas de Torquemada to institute the former’s recommended measures in Segovia after his installation as prior of the Dominican convent there.\(^{308}\) The inclusion of the miniature of the Segovia incident in Montoya’s manuscript supports this theory. Unlike the Transubstantiation-confirming images and stories of host profanation

---


\(^{307}\) Rubin, *Gentile Tales*, 46.

from England and France, which had expelled their Jewish populations by 1400, images from Spain could be interpreted as local records of Jewish crimes, which Spanish Christians needed to prevent.  

Christian attempts to monitor, control, and punish Jewish behavior date to the early medieval world. Following the letters of Paul, early theologians primarily sought to explain the role of Jews in a Christian society, but legal codes, such as those of the Visigoths, demonstrate a markedly different interest in mitigating the behavior of Jewish neighbors. Later theologians, like Anselm of Canterbury; Odo of Tournai; Bernard of Clairvaux; Peter the Venerable; and Peter Alfonsi, were major voices in developing the issue during the tenth and eleventh centuries. They were all concerned with the relative validity of the Augustinian Doctrine of Jewish Witness under new historical circumstances.  

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, demographic explosion, new religious movements, the rise of scholasticism, and new legal code with significant incorporation of the Visigothic rules fully ignited the conflict between Christianity and Judaism. Under Innocent III, part of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) was directed toward dealing with Jews residing under Christian dominion. As part of the Church’s larger goal to control interpretation and learning, Christians were prompted to investigate and control Jewish practice in the name of their faith. In agreement with the scholastic goal of creating a

---

311 This influential doctrine will be discussed at greater length below, but generally Augustine argued for the protection of Jews until the Second Coming. They would remain blind until that time, but they must be kept as living witnesses to the Old Testament and the covenant between God and man.
perfectly ordered Christian society, the council created a Jewish code of conduct to ensure Christianity would not be disturbed. Pronouncements of the council for Jews included restrictions on usury, required tithes and identifying clothing, limitations on public appearance and office, and subjection to secular rulers for various issues. The letters of Innocent III reveal his personal ambivalence toward the Jews as he advocates for the protection of those non-Christians not plotting against Christianity but also expresses fear over the ends Jews might pursue in order to defeat Christianity.312 Eventually Christian leaders and the majority let fear guide them despite any instances of peaceful coexistence, and the code created during the Fourth Lateran Council provided legal means of alleviating their fears.313 Ultimately the codes rooted in Visigothic legislation were adapted as a means of limiting, subjugating, torturing, and expelling Jews from their homes, most systematically in late fifteenth-century Spain.

312 The following sample of letters convey Innocent III’s mixed feelings. They are printed in Latin and English in Solomon Grayzel, The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century, ed. Kenneth Stow (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary in America, 1989). “An Edict in Favor of the Jews,” from September 15, 1199 includes a mix of Augustinian treatment of Jews and expectations of Christian piety (pp. 92-95). Letters “to the King of France” from January 16, 1205, “to Alphonso, King of Castile” from May 5, 1205, and “to Philip the illustrious King of France” from October 9, 1208 advise the kings of France and Spain on how to treat their Jews (pp. 104-109, 112-113, and 132-133). Letters “to the Archbishops and Bishops of France” from 1215-1216 concede Jews are not always required to wear identifying clothing, and crusaders are forbidden from hurting them (pp. 140-143).

313 Some examples of the dissolution of ambivalence among Christian leaders are found in the correspondences of Gregory IX and Innocent IV concerning the use of the Talmud. In 1239 Gregory IX (r. 1227-1241) wrote to the archbishops of France naming the Talmud as the cause of Jewish perfidy and advocating for its confiscation. In 1244 Innocent IV addressed supposed Jewish blindness and the dangers of the Talmud in a letter to the king of France. See Grayzel, The Church and the Jews, 240-243 and 250-253.
Historical law codes justified the discriminating actions taken against non-Christians, but contemporary judicial sources demonstrate attempts to reassure Christians of the righteousness of those actions. Trial accounts from the period are quite variable, sometimes revealing very little about alleged crimes and motives. Conversely, accusations, verdicts, and punitive measures were often given careful attention. As such, documents, legends, and images recording the administration of justice became more important to communal memory than the truth concerning a crime that may or may not have been committed. This phenomenon of memory is reflected in the constant accusations against heretics, Jews, and Muslims in the “Fortress of Faith,” and it was clearly effective given the popularity and authority ascribed to the text. Its readers adapted its message via their attention to historical outcomes represented in word and image.

To return one final time to Espina’s arguments in Considerations Seven and Eight, verbal and visual representations of host desecration are a fitting example, which can be observed within and outside of the “Fortress of Faith.” Images of host desecration crafted public memory and provided tangible justifications for the trials and violence sanctioned against non-Christian neighbors. Significantly, these tales and

---


315 Rubin’s work on the host desecration narrative that swept later medieval Europe demonstrates the power of legend and image to blend recorded judicial outcomes with rumor and popular belief.
images depict the alleged crimes alongside their resolutions. (Figures 119, 120, and 126) The Burgo manuscript’s image of the elevated host from Segovia captures the moment in which the miraculous quaking cracked the synagogue walls and informed the Jews of their fatal mistake. (Figure 116) However, most images of similar events depict the Jews’ public execution as a more explicit resolution.316

As discussed earlier, Alonso de Espina was well versed in polemic and drew from a long tradition of Christian defense. However, it was likely his attention to temporal issues, which positioned the “Fortress of Faith” as an extremely influential text in a relatively short period of time. His small, yet undeniable, role in the final moments of Alvaro de Luna’s life must have lent credibility to his project.317 Then his treatment of conversos within the larger work demonstrates a thoughtful, though now unpalatable, consideration of the interrelatedness of non-Christians and their particular relationships in fifteenth-century Spain. Finally, Espina’s adoption of myth, such as the host profanation miracle he encountered at Medina del Campo, indicates his awareness of the power of popular thought and his access to it as an itinerant.

Perhaps Alonso de Espina composed the Fortalitium fidei with Spanish preachers and their audiences in mind. This is certainly the argument of Rosa Vidal Doval, and like the arguments of Alisa Meyuhas-Ginio, Steven McMichael, and Ana Echevarria on the author’s intentionality, it is a good argument. It is not, however, the argument propelling this study. Instead, the rapidly expanded audience of the “Fortress of Faith” is the center

316 Robert Ian Moore and David Nirenberg have shown that as the ideas and strategy of the Church infiltrated medieval Christian society, mob violence became a social norm. See Moore, The Formation and David Nirenberg, Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996).
317 Echevarria, The Fortress of Faith, 47-49.
point. The evolution of the images in subsequent copies and editions of the “Fortress of Faith” prove the adaptation of the text’s message for new people in different places, and this adaptability is precisely responsible for the work’s success well into the sixteenth century.

Although there is no evidence linking Espina to the miniatures of the “Fortress of Faith,” visual images from the manuscripts and incunabula were a significant source of content beginning with the text’s earliest audience. The focus on non-Christian, in particular Jewish, behavior prompted international discussion, and the French manuscripts’ presentation of the Jews as a more general adversary of the Church appealed to diverse audiences.\(^{318}\) The combination of images of generic non-Christians with the encyclopedic specificities of the written text expertly fostered the fabrication of local and universal memory for the Christian public.

The oldest extant manuscript of the text is tied to the late fifteenth-century Bishop Pedro de Montoya of Osma, but how he came to own it and the circumstances of its illumination are unknown. In any case, its frontispiece is the least experimental of the group of miniatures. As Rosa Vidal Doval notes, the frontispiece is more faithful to the words of the Prohemium than any of the other images of the “Fortress of Faith.”\(^{319}\) However, minute details within the image allude to the personal values of Montoya in addition to the message preached by Espina. The shields adorning the central tower are easily recognized as those of the extinct Knights Templar, but their identification becomes more palpable when one recognizes the fortress as a depiction of a local Templar castle restored during the tenure of Bishop Montoya. The miniature draws

\(^{318}\) Paulino Rodriguez Barral, _La imagen del judío_, 212-214.

\(^{319}\) Vidal Doval, “El Muro en el Oeste,” 144.
together the past, present, and future as it renders Templar history, clerical leadership, and the defense of Christianity on the local Castilian stage. (Figures 1 and 65)

Rosa Vidal Doval’s work is the most recent comprehensive historical approach to the “Fortress of Faith.” Her primary focus is the *converso* issue in late medieval Spain, and the bulk of her exploration is devoted to the second and third volumes respectively dedicated to heretics and Jews. In both her dissertation and book, her approach is almost exclusively historical and literary. However, in her 2005 essay, she enters the realm of art history as she examines the Prohemium and identifies the fortress as an architectonic allegory.\(^{320}\) Here she considers various mental associations of fortresses, towers, and castles for late fifteenth century audiences. Drawing on the Prohemium’s borrowing from Psalm 61 and late medieval literary tradition, she treats these associations as relatively universal. However, as a result of her specialty, she provides only a brief foray into visual analysis with the Burgo manuscript frontispiece. Her conclusions about the illumination of this manuscript and her minimal discussion of the related manuscripts and editions reveal her adherence to issues of patronage and artist/author identity. This study evaluates the same images and others with a more comprehensive art historical approach, particularly focusing on reception and memory theory in the visual and performing arts.

Although the miniatures from the French “Fortress of Faith” manuscripts are not the primary focus of Vidal Doval’s or Meyuhas-Ginio’s scholarship, their arguments are most informative to this study, especially when considered alongside the Templar context handed down from Montoya’s manuscript. Vidal Doval’s identification of the fortress as an architectonic allegory and Meyuhas-Ginio’s characterization of the text as a lingering

\(^{320}\) Rosa Vidal Doval, “El muro en el Oeste.”
monument to the crusader mentality say as much about the text’s elite northern audiences as they do about their Spanish mendicant one. In his discussion of the origin of the knights Templar, M.C. Barber argues they were, “fired by the enthusiasm for cleansing the Church and Christian society… and by the success of the First Crusade.”

This legacy of the Templars found a particular appeal in the “Fortress of Faith’s” northern audience, who in the fifteenth century still retained an affinity for the ideal of the crusading “soldier of Christ” and enjoyed a sophisticated visual and allegorical vocabulary as evidenced in the miniatures at hand. The chivalric and devotional mentalities of the northern nobility and their associates emulated the Templar model in that their knights were expected to fight the physical enemy (non-Christians) and the spiritual enemy (sin/vice) for Christ.

The utility of fortress symbolism extended beyond the earliest Spanish readers of the “Fortress of Faith.” Depictions of the namesake tower in French manuscripts of the text reveal a new, yet equally powerful, adaptation of the architectural symbol. As faithful Christians, patrons of art and architecture, and remnants of the memorialized feudal system of medieval Europe, men like Louis of Bruges and Edward IV could interpret castle imagery using a wealth of personal experience and sentiment. While the simplified idea of the three estates was quickly becoming complicated, the owners of the illuminated manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith clung to the values of the lord/vassal

---

323 Ibid., 32-33.
324 Production of the “Fortress of Faith” in various German print shops and placement in German libraries also suggests a universal appeal of the text beyond Spanish preachers and rulers. The appeal of the fortress motif for the German audience is less visually secure but still suggested by the woodcuts in the 1475 and 1487 editions.
relationship even as the system was disintegrating. Their devotion to the Order of the Golden Fleece and their relationships with each other are evidence enough of this fact. The castle was the long-standing symbol of the security of that value system, and the diminished use of the structure as a tactical security feature could not erase such memories. Late medieval people encountered fortified architecture in abundance, and nostalgia proved stronger than practicality. If Louis of Bruges played as great a role in the distribution of these manuscripts as previous scholars have argued, the erection of the Bruges belfry tower’s upper stage in the 1480s must be noted. The octagonal tower is strikingly similar to the towers in the miniatures of several copies of the *Forteresse de la foy*. (Figure 131)

3) Mixing Media and Iconography - Remembering the “Fortress of Faith”

The fortress image is further addressed here as an essential element in the distribution of the *Fortalitium fidei* to different audiences across Europe. Fortified architecture was a familiar point of reference not only due to its presence in the physical landscape or its representation in religious sources including Scripture, post-biblical writings, exegesis, and theological treatises. The utilization of the castle as an allegory for intangible concepts was established by the second half of the fifteenth century. Alternately symbolizing Jealousy, Love, Perseverance, and other ideas, the castle was a particularly favored symbol in artistic production for the courts of Northern Europe. (Figures 132 and 133)
The grandest legacy of the medieval castle allegory hails from Guillaume de Lorris’ and Jean de Meun’s *Roman de la Rose* (1225-1278). In this chivalric tale, a rose is allegorized as the protagonist’s love interest entrapped in the Castle of Jealousy.

Roughly contemporary with the early composition of the *Roman de la Rose*, Robert Grosseteste’s *Chasteau d’Amour* (c. 1230-1240) employed the same symbols to write about chivalry and courtly love. His allegory was widely used in luxury objects of the courts beginning in the fourteenth century. Frequently appearing in manuscript miniatures and ivory carvings, knights gently charge a fortress from which beautiful maidens toss roses to defend the structure and their chastity. (Figures 134, 135, and 136)

While the “Fortress of Faith” draws upon the tradition of medieval romance in its use of a castle allegory, the text’s images ultimately exchange the loveliness of ivories for the immediacy of performance. Graham Runnalls, working on French mystery plays, theorized spectacle was more valuable than written text in medieval theater. Several elements of “Fortress of Faith” images indicate a similar elevation of image over word for some late medieval audiences. In fact, in the case of the text at hand, there is ample reason to treat images as theater and vice versa.

Formally, Flemish miniatures of the “Fortress of Faith” most closely resemble the theatrical construction of “The Castle of Perseverance.” Directions for the intended staging of the Macro Play survive in both verbal and pictorial form. (Figure 137)

---

325 Guillaume de Lorris worked on the poem from 1225 to 1245. His contribution ends with the rose inside the castle and the dejected lover on the outside. Jean de Meun resumed work on the text between 1269 and 1278 creating the character of the Old Woman employed by Jealousy in the poem. The former was a significant later influence for multiple female characters in Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales*.

Although scholars still debate the interaction of the players with the audience in the “Castle of Perseverance,” all of the surviving evidence clearly advocates for a centralized physical edifice upon and around which the action of the play is performed. In his discussion of the Vienna 2535 and 2536 miniatures as images of fifteenth-century arena theaters, Merle Fifield describes the space as “a tri-centric stage: a centerpiece, a place enclosed by barrier, and an outer ring of action.” (Figure 57) A similar wooden platform is depicted in Brooklyn Museum Accession 11.506 leaving the viewer to wonder if the image is also a remnant of theatrical practice. (Figures 15 and 16) If the Vienna and Brooklyn miniatures visually transmit the public customs of late medieval theater, then the illuminations from Valenciennes, Paris, London, Brussels, and Brooklyn must do so as well, even if less directly. (Figures 4-17) Most important among these

---

327 Henri Rey-Flaud used medieval theatrical production records to reconstruct the installment of theaters in the round in French public spaces meant to house several thousand people. See Henri Rey-Flaud, Le Cercle Magique: Essai sur le Theatre en rond à la fin du Moyen Age (Paris: Gallimard, 1973), as well as Peter Houle, “Stage and Metaphor in the French Morality: ‘L’Homme Juste et L’Homme Mondain’,” The Chaucer Review 14 no. 1 (1979): 3. However, Rey-Flaud and Houle discount the value of manuscript miniatures in such reconstructions. Other scholars including Richard Southern and Natalie Crohn Schmitt demonstrate otherwise in their discussions of The Castle of Perseverance. The exact intent of the drawing associated with this text is still debated, but Southern’s theory that the drawing represented the plan for a medieval theater is frequently cited in studies of the morality, while Natalie Crohn Schmitt more recently argued that the drawing is more likely the suggested plan for a set. Regardless of the more precise characterization of the drawing, neither argument hinders Fifield’s proposed connection between the play and the manuscript images at hand (see next footnote). See Richard Southern, The Medieval Theater in the Round: A Study of the Staging of the Castle of Perseverance and Related Matters (London: Faber and Faber, 1958) and Natalie Crohn Schmitt, “Was There a Medieval Theater in the Round? A Re-examination of the Evidence,” Theater Notebook XXIII (1968-69): 18-25.

328 Merle Fifield, “The Arena Theaters in Vienna Codices 2535 and 2536,” Comparative Drama 2 no. 4 (1968-69), 260. Fifield’s scholarship demonstrates a sustained interest in the “Fortress of Faith,” but the connection to the Castle of Perseverance is only explicitly made with Vienna MS 2535 and MS 2536.

are the Paris, London, and Brussels manuscripts as they precede those of Vienna, are the product of the same atelier, make explicit use of female allegories for Vices, and populate the fortress with “good” figures.

If the “Fortress of Faith” miniatures truly depict the staging of fifteenth-century morality plays, then the visual interpretation of the miniatures is largely dependent upon readers’ exposure to such performances. Given the popularity of morality plays at the end of the medieval period, one can assume a general awareness of the overlap of the “Vice” figure and those of the “Seven Deadly Sins.”

According to Fifield the traditional understanding is that “the typical moral play [is] a Battle of Vices and Virtues over a passive victim who starts in innocence, falls into temptation, and is redeemed by the Virtues…” In other words, the morality play’s protagonist is the Battle. This theatricalized struggle between moral right and wrong is rooted in Prudentius’ fourth-century Psychomachia, which evolved into a crystallized vision of the internal battle between good and evil overlaid on every Christian soul. However, Fifield argues that the English moralities divorce themselves from their forebear, the Psychomachia, in advocating for the existence of free will. He contends that Man is the protagonist and that the Virtues need man’s support. If Fifield is correct in linking the “Fortress of Faith” to the staging of the Castle of Perseverance and in viewing Man as the protagonist

---

330 As Robert Withington and his predecessors note, the figure of “Vice” is later transformed into the “Devil” figure frequently encountered in miracle plays. Robert Withington, “The Ancestry of the ‘Vice’,” Speculum 7 no. 4 (1932): 525-529.
332 Houle, “Stage and Metaphor,” 16.
333 Fifield, The Rhetoric of Free Will, 1.
334 Ibid., iv. Fifield’s conclusion also draws on the early characterization of the “Vice” as a weak servant of the Seven Deadly Sins. See Withington, “The Ancestry of the ‘Vice’,” 528.
in English moralities, it follows that Christian Man is meant as the protagonist of the
“Fortress of Faith.”

Given my agreement with Fifield concerning the connection of the “Fortress of Faith”
to medieval theater practice and the text’s extensive list of host desecration events,
possible connections to the Croxton *Play of the Sacrament* should also be explored. Not
appearing before the mid-fifteenth century, the play was rooted in Gregory the Great’s
sermons but drew more specifically on common sources of the period.335

In the play, Jonathas and his Jewish followers acquire a Eucharistic wafer, which they
nail to a pillar and repeatedly attempt to wound. At one point Jonathas’ hand is severed
upon his attempt to hurl the wafer into a boiling cauldron. The stage directions for the
play explicitly call for the host to bleed along with the Christ figure who appears after the
wafer is deposited in a hot oven.336 The insistence on the display of blood is in
agreement with the period’s focus on the spectacle of Christ’s suffering, but the Croxton
*Play of the Sacrament* goes even further to familiarize the audience with the depicted
events. Lisa Lampert’s examination of the play explains the work’s range in recalling the
universal and the specific. On one hand, it simultaneously invokes the Crucifixion of
Christ and the celebration of the Mass. On the other, it recalls the alleged 1181 ritual
murder of Little Robert of Bury St. Edmunds, whose cult was established to bolster local
support as the shrines of St. Edmund and St. William of Norwich fell into competition

335 Richard L. Homan, “Two ‘Exempla’: Analogues to the ‘Play of the Sacrament’ and
‘Dux Moraud’,” *Comparative Drama* 18 no. 3 (1984), 242.
336 Davidson, “Sacred Blood,” 449. See also, Lampert, “The Once and Future Jew,” 235-
236. (Lampert noted in full below.)
with each other. Furthermore, it recalls the memory of Jews who once resided in the city for the fifteenth-century Christian audience.\(^\text{337}\) (Figure 138)

The banns, or opening proclamation, of the presumed East Anglian play declares itself modeled on an Aragonese host profanation accusation known as far afield as Rome. This claim may simply be in keeping with the transmission of similar legends during the period, many of which are situated in Spain despite the lack of historical evidence to support such claims. The baptism of the Jews at the end of the narrative also aligns the tale with late medieval popular Spanish culture.\(^\text{338}\) In their focus on Eucharistic miracles, fourteenth and fifteenth century altar paintings from northern Spain suggest a greater chance for Jewish redemption. While some Jews are ultimately convicted and burned at the stake, many are saved.\(^\text{339}\) (Figures 119, 120, 139, 140, 141, and 142)

This option was less likely in unforgiving regions of northern and eastern Europe, and it presents interesting avenues for discussion in a Jew-less England. The salvation of English Jews was never at stake given their 1290 expulsion from England, and especially


\(^{338}\) Lampert, “The Once and Future Jew,” 236.

\(^{339}\) Stephen Spector finds the option for Jewish redemption particularly puzzling for another reason. In the play, the Jews are converted upon seeing the host bleed. Spector argues such a vision seems improbable given the rampant belief in Jews’ spiritual blindness. See Stephen Spector, “Time, Space, and Identity in the \textit{Play of the Sacrament},” in Alan E. Knight, ed. \textit{The Stage as Mirror: Civic Theatre in Late Medieval Europe} (Cambridge, England: D.S. Brewer, 1997), 189.
not for an audience in Bury St. Edmunds, from which Jews had been expelled one hundred years earlier. Lampert argues for a communal memory of the alleged ritual murder of Little Robert of Bury St. Edmunds in 1188, which a viewing of the play would have invigorated.340

Outside of their connections to medieval theater, miniatures and woodcuts from the “Fortress of Faith” exert their own influence over the development of the notion of a negative Jewish character. While images attached to Latin manuscripts and incunabula depict the Jews as ineffective, blindfolded nonbelievers, the miniatures of the French manuscripts are not uniform in their treatment of Jewish blindness. As discussed in Chapter Two, the stone-throwing Jew has escaped the bondage of his blindfold and poses a serious threat to the tower. This change precisely illustrates the shift in popular opinion Espina advocated.341 In drawing public attention to the heinous alleged crimes in Consideration Seven, he created an environment in which the long-believed necessary blindness of the Jews he describes in Consideration One could be reconsidered as an intentional act of rebellion against the peace of Christianity.


341 Marginal notations in many printed copies of the “Fortress of Faith” suggest Espina was successful in this endeavor. The present sample study of the printed copies now at Oxford University, the Britis Library, the Pierpont Morgan Library, and the author’s personal collection reveals sustained reader interest in historical Jewish expulsions and accusations of ritual murder and host profanation. They conform to Despina’s observation of the word Jew being ubiquitously synonymous with “bad” from 1298. See Despina, “Les accusations,” 159-160.
In visually communicating this idea, the body of “Fortress of Faith” images plays an important role in shifting visual representations of Jews away from the acceptable blindness of a figure like Synagoga and toward the unacceptable refusal of contemporary Jews to see the truth. The allegory of Synagoga serves as a point of departure for exploring the condition of Jewish blindness, as first described by Paul, and its representation throughout the Middle Ages. The doctrinal foundations of the concept are crucial to understanding how traditional and often anti-Jewish symbolism met with the iconographic convention of the blindfold to extend early Christian discourse on blindness into conversion concerns for high and late medieval Christians.

All representations of Jews in fifteenth-century copies of the “Fortress of Faith” conform to the standard of the blindfolded male. As discussed in Chapter Two, the “Fortress of Faith” proved an ideal backdrop upon which to examine the late fifteenth-century adaptation from the passive types of Jews depicted in the Breviari d’Amor to their representation as dangerous subjects of a quickly evolving xenophobia even, and sometimes especially, in regions, which had been devoid of Jews since the end of the thirteenth century. Between the Latin and French manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith,” the Jews blossom from a small section in the Burgo manuscript illumination to the subject of a full page, and they abandon their passivity in favor of wielding spears at the fortress. (Figures 1, 6, and 11) The women in the middle ground surrounding the tower are, on one level, Vices and, on another, possible Jews. They are labeled with words relating to Jewish sin and bear several of the traditional iconographic symbols of Judaism. The blindfolded men in the foreground are more obviously indebted to the earlier Latin manuscript illumination, but the women and all of the figures’ movements...
intimate that these are not the same innocent Jews who lack the inner eyes to benefit from Scripture.

Dissimilarly, over five centuries of misinterpretation of the woodcuts from the 1475 and 1487 editions suggests an unconscious adherence to the general stereotype of the Jew described throughout the Middle Ages. The static, blindfolded Jews in the woodcuts are undeniably passive figures. In fact, they should be seen as least culpable in the attack on Christianity as their blindfolds prevent them from even witnessing the undermining of the fortress.

Despite general agreement about the metaphorical visual impairment of Jews, the reasons for and sources of their blindness were a constant subject of debate in the early Christian church. Jews were interpreted as carnal and spiritually blind, often as the result of an inherent stubbornness to see and accept the truth. The epistles of Paul communicate a persistent characterization of Jews as figures stunted by their inability to see but promised eventual vision. As in 1 Corinthians 13:12, the Jews “see in a mirror, dimly, but… will see face to face.” They “… will know fully…” Early medieval theologians attempted to explain this same blindness, or obcaecatio, ascribing it with various negative connotations including: “manifestation of passion,” “arrogantia,” “furor,” and “dementia.”

The prevailing interpretation of Jewish blindness emerged from the sermons and writings of the patristic theologian Augustine (354-430). He constructed a salvation narrative that both condemned and preserved Jews. The Jewish crucifixion of Christ was

---

342 NRSV. Italics are author’s emphasis.
343 Moshe Barasch, Blindness: The History of a Mental Image in Western Thought (New York: Routledge, 2001), 45-55.
interpreted as the pivotal moment in which the “chosenness” of the Jews was transferred to Christians. His *Tractatus adversus judaeos* deemed contemporary Jews outdated and mentally incapable of receiving the gospel.\textsuperscript{344} However, in *City of God*, he argued for Jewish preservation. As bearers of the Old Testament and the catalysts of the realization of eternal Salvation, Jews were deemed a necessary evil, as well as living witnesses to the authenticity of Scripture and to the new covenant between God and Christians.\textsuperscript{345}

Treatises and arguments indicate Christian theologians generally tolerated Jews and were content with the displacement, or *diaspora*, imposed upon their wayward forebears. Perhaps a key element in this Christian complacency was the idea that Jews would eventually bear witness to the truth, a concept derived from passages of *Romans* 11:25, which read, “There is a secret truth, my brothers… It is that the stubbornness of the people of Israel is not permanent…” Diverse documents such as the writings of Gregory the Great (540-604) and Isidore of Seville (c. 560-636), as well as Visigothic law codes (7\textsuperscript{th} century) upheld the basic tenet of this verse in recommending Jews be kept as neighbors until their inevitable conversion – even if these neighbors were prohibited from their own ritual practice, limited in their population growth and denied rights to their property.

Although the pervasiveness of the Augustinian “Doctrine of Jewish Witness” implies people believed the blind Jews were not culpable, real interactions between historical Jews and Christians incites considerable debate about the effective reach of


Augustine’s influence over the general populace. It appears that in attempting to elevate the Jews to a preserved status, Augustine effectively constructed a “Jew” who could not be actualized, and Christians eventually responded with punishment and marginalization of the outsider.

Amos Funkenstein has argued that the violence against Jews during the 1096 Crusade alerted Christians to the problem of Jewish existence in Christian society. It identified Jews as an “other” and stripped them of their unique status as witness to God. Under the direction of lower noblemen and knights, multiple Jewish communities along the Rhine fell victim to the riotous violence of armed men, and Jews were forced to choose between baptism and death. Many chose martyrdom, and the high frequency with which forced converts quickly returned to their former religion confirm the nature of their coercion under mortal threat, rather than suggest revelatory vision under pressure.

In spite of increased popular contempt for Jews, theologians continued to urge Jewish protection. The tracts of theologians like Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) and Peter the Venerable (1092-1156) denied that Jews could have intentionally and rationally committed deicide, while Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153) advocated a softened subjection of the Jews, as when he told the English people, “The Jews are for us the

---

346 Funkenstein, *Perceptions*, 172-201 with particular attention to sections II and IV.
living words of scripture, for they remind us of what our Lord suffered.”

Augustinian tolerance and popular sentiment, however, were frequently at odds with one another.

The twelfth century eventually gave rise to the extensive undermining of the Augustinian doctrine of Jewish witness, creating a very complicated environment for Jewish-Christian interaction. Pope Innocent III’s letters reveal some of his feelings about the situation in that they advocate for the protection of those non-Christians not plotting against Christianity, while they also spend a significant amount of time condemning Jews for such acts as disrespecting the Christian sacraments and foreclosing on the Church’s lands and income. In the early 1200s, Innocent III encouraged Christian rulers to impose increasing restrictions on Jews who were allegedly committing illegal and blasphemous acts. By the date of Lateran IV, such instructions ensured the identification of Jews as greedy usurers, unreliable converts and blasphemers that must be identifiable by their clothing in order to protect the Christian population from trickery and sexual contamination.

General opinion in the later Middle Ages teetered between arguments of Augustinian blindness and the purposeful sins of Jews. Justifications for differing arguments might be found in a single source. For example, Psalms could provide interpretive material for two very disparate images concerning Jewish blindness and behavior. Wide reader accessibility to the Psalter accords it great value in conveying visual messages for lay audiences. Psalm 53 reads,

…Fools say in their hearts, ‘There is no God.’/ They are corrupt, they commit abominable acts;/ there is no one who does good./…They have all fallen away, they are

---

In the fourteenth-century *Psalter of Bonne of Luxembourg*, this particular Psalm is prefaced with an image of a “Jew and a Fool” (folio 83v). (Figure 143) The miniature, with its club-wielding fool and big-nosed wine-guzzling Jew, focuses on the iniquitous actions of non-believers. The image implies Jewish intent to harm the sacrament and the fool’s rowdy, yet ineffective, attempt to thwart him.\(^{351}\) Dissimilarly, a suite of images found in multiple fourteenth- and fifteenth-century copies of Matfre Ermengaud’s encyclopedic *Breviar d’amor* continue to make use of the more conservative interpretation of Jewish sin as the result of an involuntary blindness. (Figures 144 and 145) Representations of Jews in the *Breviar d’amor* seem more attuned to the later verses of the same Psalm. In these images, devils draw cloths over the eyes of Jews so as to prevent them from comprehending the prophecies of Scripture. It is their confounded state and how it came to be that receives attention, and there is still the opportunity for God to bring them out of the darkness and into the light. The distribution of the *Breviar d’amor* in France and Aragon through the fifteenth century suggests that the blindness of Jews inherited from ancestral Old Testament figures was still a viable explanation for Jewish difference.

---

\(^{350}\) NRSV Psalm 53.

\(^{351}\) Previous studies of this miniature include Florens Deuchler, “Looking at Bonne of Luxembourg’s Prayer Book,” *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, New Series 29 no. 6 (1971): 267-278; and Strickland, *Saracens, Demons, and Jews*, 138. Sara Lipton’s more recent analysis of this miniature is most important and influential to this study. See Lipton, *Dark Mirror*, 171.
The blindfold conveys a more complicated message than many other anti-Jewish symbols. It errs from the Pauline trope of Jewish blindness, as it becomes a symbol of the obstinate Jewish choice not to see. The peeking Jew of the British Library manuscript demands the reader to ask what was stopping Jews from simply pushing the cloth away from their own eyes? (Figure 11) It cannot be a mere coincidence that in looking at Edward IV’s “Fortress of Faith” we encounter a man who continues to attack Christianity even after the blindfold has been removed. His unveiled eyes suggest exactly the tension, which many have experienced in reading the “Fortress of Faith.” The text is fraught with frustration over the fluid religious status of Jews and former Jews living within Christendom, reflecting both the real socio-religious tensions in Spain and the imagined Jewish infiltration in regions that had effectively expelled Jews as much as 170 years earlier. For late medieval Christians, the blindfold symbolized a missed opportunity for Jews. For modern viewers, it is a visual manifestation of the mounting Christian frustration over the persistent Jewish rejection of Christianity.

The dynamic concept of Jewish blindness was allegorized in the fair maiden, Synagoga. She and her counterpart, Ecclesia, were depicted as two beautiful women at the flanks of the cross, one the unknowing cause of Christ’s demise and the other charged with collecting and preserving the salvific blood. As representative of the Jews, Synagoga perpetually walked the line between good and evil, beautiful and detestable, blind yet noble. Her figural similarities to Ecclesia ensured her appeal, while knowledge of her role in the Crucifixion inspired hostility against her.\(^{352}\) Initially depicted at

---

\(^{352}\) Early studies examining the allegorical figures of Synagoga and Ecclesia and their relationship to medieval Jews and Christians include the Jesuit fathers Cahier and Martin, Paul Weber, Franz Xaver Kraus, Joseph Sauer, and A. Goldschmidt. The subject was
Christ’s left in Crucifixion scenes, the personification of the Old Church appeared in various states of witness as Christ suffered on the cross. In some manuscript miniatures, she watches attentively. In others she averts her eyes or is blindfolded implying she does not fully understand what is happening or her role in the event. (Figures 146 and 147)

Her beauty is reflected in the figure of her companion, Ecclesia, but more specific elements of their representation clearly mark the latter as favored. The dual representation of these allegories peaked in Gothic portal sculpture. (Figures 147, 148, and 149) In this setting Ecclesia is a regal young woman gazing out over her subjects. A beacon of reassurance, she reigns triumphant. The attitude of her body matches her accoutrements of crown, pendant, chalice, and banner. Beautiful and inviting, the New Church exudes a peaceful happiness. With Synagoga, the fair maiden is still present, but something is amiss. She is relieved of her cloak and jewelry, and her staff is broken. Yet, it is the crown tumbling from her unkempt locks, the inverted tablets and, most importantly, the blindfold, which provide the key to identifying both ladies. One rules, while the other has fallen. One bears objects of empowerment, while the other refuses to relinquish her obsolete laws. One sees; the other is blind.

Given Synagoga’s sustained representation as an elegant and beautiful lady who was not quite complicit in Christ’s suffering, she had to be reconciled with the “bad Jews” high and late medieval people believed lived among them. The loss of her crown and cope, the uselessness of the objects she bears, and the blindfold covering her eyes detract from her authority. Like the Mosaic Law she represents, her importance is only facilitated through the presence of Ecclesia, the New Law. Because she cannot be entirely dismissed, she is represented as related, but also somehow subservient to Ecclesia, and the blindfold is key in conveying both of these ideas.353

Like veils and curtains, blindfolds signaled imminent revelatory vision. Surviving images reveal the blindfold as a feature initially reserved for the unknowing Synagoga. However, like the peeping Jew from the London Forteresse, Synagoga was sometimes depicted with her eyes uncovered.354 The Crucifixion miniature in the Psalter of Blanche of Castile aligns with traditional representations of Ecclesia and Synagoga. (Figure 146) On the left, Ecclesia looks toward Christ while displaying the cross staff and chalice. On the right, Synagoga wears a gauzy blindfold and drops the tablet as she

353 In the 1960s Blumenkranz argued that some medieval images conflated Synagoga with contemporary Jews so effectively that Christians began to blame Jews for the suffering of Christ. Later, Camille’s work identified Synagoga as a Christian fabrication meant to transfer Christian doubt about Church image production to Jews. Camille’s assertion was specific to the dialogue between Synagoga and Ecclesia, but his assessment of the Christian need for such a dialogue is now seen as a pervasive, underlying theme of medieval anti-Jewish imagery. See Blumenkranz, Le juif and Camille, The Gothic Idol, 165-194.
354 Nina Rowe discusses the motif of the blind Synagoga at length in her recent book, addressing the influence of early theologians on the visual development of both Synagoga and Ecclesia as personifications of the old and new church. She explains the oscillation in medieval thinking between the interpretation of Synagoga as an ineffective remnant of the past and as an important allegorical witness to the Old Testament and the Passion of Christ. As part of this discussion she addresses a multitude of images depicting Synagoga in varying states of blindness. See Rowe, The Jew, The Cathedral, and the Medieval City, 48, 6, 18, 64, and 70.
averts her face from the scene. There is no indication of the possibility of her witnessing the event. However, in other depictions of the Crucifixion, her blindness is presented differently. On the *Uta Codex’s* Crucifixion page, a decorative frame appears to block Synagoga’s vision, but she makes no attempt to see around it. (Figure 150) Finally in the window of the “Allegory of St. Paul” at Saint-Denis, Synagoga looks directly at a hovering Christ as he removes the veil from her eyes. (Figure 151) Certainly, this image illustrates Paul’s idea of Christian triumph and eventual spiritual vision for the Jews, but Synagoga still carries the posture of the downtrodden making the moment depicted less definitive for the viewer. The varying depictions of her blindness question Synagoga’s agency and prompt the same concerns as the Jew who knowingly attacks the “Fortress of Faith” in miniatures of the text’s later manuscripts.

Because her blindness and beauty are equally powerful qualities, Synagoga is also a suitable starting point for examining women in the “Fortress of Faith.” In the same way that her blindness is transferred to Jewish men as a sign of their obstinate refusal, her beauty is repeatedly attached to the detriment of female characters. The physical attributes of the ahistorical Ecclesia and Synagoga are readily identified in the allegorical Virtues and Vices of late medieval iconography. The two lovely women first associated with the Crucifixion and then seen flanking high medieval portals are re-embodied in the fourteen beautiful ladies, who represent the most basic manifestations of good and evil in the world.\(^{355}\) (Figures 147, 148, and 149) All of these allegorical women helped medieval

---

\(^{355}\) Rowe also discusses the relationship between Synagoga and Ecclesia and the Virtues and Vices. She explains the influence of Prudentius’ *Psychomachia* on medieval thought about the coexistence of Christianity and Judaism, as well as the work’s influence on the development of Synagoga and Ecclesia as recognizable personifications. See Rowe, *The Jew, The Cathedral, and Medieval City*, 45-47.
people sort through important social and religious matters. The depiction of the Vices in the Paris and London miniatures seamlessly translates a specifically anti-Jewish iconography to a general anti-non-Christian iconography. This phenomenon confirms the Vices as crucial to interpreting the meaning of the “Fortress of Faith” for noble and royal audiences.

Theatrical qualities are at the heart of allegorical Vices’ influence over medieval viewers. John D. Cox explores the relationship of devils and Vices in non-cycle plays and sacramental cycles of the late Middle Ages. He is particularly concerned with the Vices’ perceived attempts to divide communities and the ways in which the sacraments were believed to dispel these figures. In his discussion of The Castle of Perseverance, Cox notes the Virtues’ ability to block the attempts of the Vices, as their presentation and frequent pairing indicate. (Figures 152 and 153) However, the “Fortress of Faith” imagery only includes depictions of the Vices leaving the reader to wonder where the saving graces are. If, as Cox argues, the representation of the Vices was intended to convey the “moral imperatives of scriptural history…[and]the positive power of evil in the daily lives of Christians…”, then the “Fortress of Faith” fulfills the goal of the late

---

356 For example, Nina Rowe’s interpretation of the Ecclesia and Synagoga figures from the south portal of the cathedral in Strasbourg credits the women with overseeing the earthly leaders who held municipal court there. See Nina Rowe, “Idealization and Subjection at the South Façade of Strasbourg Cathedral,” in Beyond the Yellow Badge: Anti-Judaism and Antisemitism in Medieval and Early Modern Visual Culture, ed. Mitchell Merback (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 179-202.

357 John D. Cox, “Devils and Vices in English Non-Cycle Plays: Sacrament and Social Body” Comparative Drama 30 no. 2 (1996): 188-219. Cox begins with a recollection of Robert Potter’s argument that the morality play did for the individual what the Corpus Christi cycle did for Christianity as a whole. See p. 188.

358 Cox, “Devils and Vices,” 189.

359 Ibid., 191.
medieval morality play in that it asks the Christian to adopt these morals and persevere against evil every day.\textsuperscript{360}

Cox’s article bears further importance as he uses various plays such as \textit{The Castle of Perseverance}, The N-Town plays, and the Digby \textit{St. Paul} to conclude that the Vices and devils fill effectively interchangeable roles in the theater.\textsuperscript{361} Cox’s arguments about staging evil in pre-Reformation English plays are as relevant to this study as those of Merle Fifield, who links castle-centered plays of the fifteenth century to representations of the “Fortress of Faith.” The latter, as well as Rosa Vidal Doval, reveal the structural symbolism at the core of the “Fortress of Faith,” while the former agrees with the current assessment of all of the enemies as inherently interconnected via the images of the text.

While all seven venial sins are represented in each of the Paris and London “Fortress of Faith” miniatures, four Vices are more easily recognized: Pride, Avarice, Gluttony, and Wrath. Pride is the only male Vice represented, and Avarice, Gluttony, and Wrath are identifiable through characteristic symbols and gestures. All of the Vices display what Cox describes as “a perverse sense of fellowship in their mutual commitment to the destruction of others,” but it is useful to consider the reasons why the four noted above are so prominent.\textsuperscript{362}

\textsuperscript{360} Cox, “Devils and Vices,” 191.
\textsuperscript{362} Cox, “Devils and Vices,” 208.
According to Augustine, pride is the worst of the venial sins because it represents the sinner’s complete self-imposed divorce from God.\(^{363}\) The representation of Pride as a male is rooted in philosophical and theological ideas about free will. Following Aristotelian thought, in particular, only a man could be capable of such a grave sin. A woman is more likely to fall victim to one of the other vices due to her biological status as an underdeveloped male.\(^{364}\) Although illustrations of the _Psychomachia_ include representations of Pride, or _Superbia_, as both male and female figures, the “Fortress of Faith” miniatures cling to an interpretation of pride as a male trait.\(^{365}\)

Manuscript and print production of the “Fortress of Faith between 1460 and 1525 reveals a complete adherence to intellectual trends of the period. The combination of the centralizing fortress element and the encroaching Vices reflects theatrical choices from the late fifteenth century, and the hierarchical representation of the Vices as they relate to the reader’s own tendencies anticipates the humanist push of the early sixteenth century.\(^{366}\) The reader was required to reason through his own venial temptations in order to protect his soul and the whole of Christianity. At least as dangerous as any external threat was that of the Christian’s susceptibility to sin.\(^{367}\) The use of the Vices in theater, literature, pageantry, and art was not limited to the popular audience. As


\(^{365}\) Kimminich, “The Way of Vice,” 79.

\(^{366}\) Cox locates this mental shift in England in his examination of the sacraments in late medieval English non-cycle plays. Cox, “Devils and Vices,” 210-211.

\(^{367}\) This requirement aligns well with Eva Kimminich’s suggestions about the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century’s new interest in human behavior and responsibility. See Kimminich, “The Way of Vice,” 77 and 83.
demonstrated in Wood’s scholarship on late medieval tapestries, visualizations of the Vices and Virtues were also a means of warning noble and royal readers against sin as early as the fourteenth century.\(^{368}\)

Although less sophisticated than the visual allegory of the Vices, there were several other iconographic markers of Judaism employed in images of the “Fortress of Faith.”\(^{369}\) The blindfold was an important means of marking Jews even though the garment had no physical basis in reality. Some items of clothing, however, were rooted in physical experience. The *Judenhut*, or pointed hat and the cloth badge were commonly used to identify Jews in medieval images, but even these symbols must be interpreted with important caveats in mind.

The *Judenhut*, or in Latin *pilleus cornutus*, was an accepted symbol for denoting Jewishness. (Figures 154, 155, 156, and 157) Ruth Mellinkoff first dated a modified version of the hat appearing some time around the mid-eleventh century, and Sara Lipton contends she can trace the hat at least back to 1015.\(^{370}\) It was certainly in popular use by


\(^{369}\) Joseph Reider introduced the discussion of many of these markers in his foundational study of medieval Jewish-Christian relations, including the denigrating capabilities of images and the opposition of the Church to the Jews. See Joseph Reider, “Jews in Medieval Art,” in *Essays on Anti-Semitism*, ed. Koppel S. Pinson (New York, NY: Conference of Jewish Relations, 1942), 45-56. Mitchell Merback has argued that Reider’s work also inspired studies of the submission of art to the purposes of medieval religion and the belief in the fantastic, but these avenues are of lesser relevance here. See Merback’s introductory remarks in Mitchell Merback, ed., *Beyond the Yellow Badge: Anti-Judaism and Antisemitism in Medieval and Early Modern Visual Culture* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2008), 1-14.

the end of the twelfth century and remained so throughout the Middle Ages. The *Judenhut* did not necessarily carry negative meaning. The hat could signify a “bad Jew” from the Old Testament or contemporary social life, but it was equally useful in distinguishing Old Testament prophets and patriarchs, upon whose shoulders New Testament figures and medieval Christians were said to stand. (Figures 156 and 157)

Reduced to its most basic features and purpose, the *Judenhut* can be read as part of a long history of identifying difference through headwear. In images, the pointed hat of the Jews is functionally no different from the Phrygian cap of the ancient period. (Figure 158) While either could engender a negative reading of its respective wearer, the hats were simple identifiers at their most basic level.

It is nearly impossible to differentiate between when the *Judenhut* was actually worn and when it was the invention of the medieval artist. The lack of uniformity in the hats’ representation raises legitimate questions about their visibility in medieval society, while their persistently pointed shape is difficult to ignore. Historical documents and Jewish communities’ behavioral patterns suggest some groups wore the pointed caps by choice. Other artifacts, such as coins and coats of arms, could represent willful Jewish use of the *Judenhut* or an imposed identifier from the outside. The indeterminable exact use of the hat is likely rooted in its varied use in different locations with disparate

---

371 Lipton, *Dark Mirror*, 16-24.
372 Sara Lipton describes the “oil can type.” Sara Lipton, *Images of Intolerance*, 16.
373 Lipton argues that because Jewish communities were so small, they integrated with their surrounding communities and may have worn pointed hats as regular dress while under the rule of groups such as the Persians or the Assyrians. See Lipton, *Dark Mirror*, 18-19.
374 For a more thorough discussion of costume-oriented signs of Jewishness, see Marie Piponniere and Perrine Mane, *Dress in the Middle Ages* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 114-125.
religious, social, and communal values. The hat’s appearance and lack thereof in
different images of the “Fortress of Faith” agree with such an assessment. While the
blindfolded Jews of the Fortalitium fidei woodcuts wear the Judenhut, the Jews in the
miniatures in the Latin and French manuscripts of the text are hatless henchmen attacking
the tower. The danger they pose to the fortress is not connoted through their clothing,
least of all head gear.

In some ways, the representation of the Jews in manuscripts of La forteresse de la
foy seem like another phase in a long tradition of Christian attempts to mark Jews as
deviant outsiders. The attempted implementation of cloth badges to identify Jews in the
Middle Ages is a telling example of this failure.375 This practice was derived from the
concerns embedded in the Visigothic codes of the seventh century and revisited
numerous times in the following centuries.376 Derivative laws were decreed as part of the
Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, but requirements were enforced to varying degrees
across high and late medieval Europe.377 Assuredly, the cloth badge was an effective
way to identify Jews in particular locations, but it functions more universally as an
iconographic marker in images of Jews. Medieval people would have recognized the
badge in the images regardless of how prevalent it was in their everyday lives.

375 The classic study of the Jewish badge is Guido Kisch, “The Yellow Badge in
376 See “The Oath of the Jews in the Name of the Prince,” “That a Christian Should Not
Receive Any Sort of Gift from a Jew Against the Faith of Christ,” and “That Christian
Slaves Should Not Serve Jews or Adhere to Them,” in The Jews in the Legal Sources of
the Early Middle Ages, Amnon Linder (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1997),
279-281, 299-301, and 303-305.
377 Despite the fact that the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 decreed that all Jews and
Muslims would henceforth be required to identify themselves in dress, little evidence
exists to suggest that badges or hats were the primary means of doing so. Furthermore, it
is difficult to gauge the degree to which this decree was enforced.
The Jewish badge appears frequently in “Fortress of Faith” images. The captive Jews of the Burgo manuscript wear the red *rouelle*, while the woodcut figures are inscribed with only a simple circle.\textsuperscript{378} The Jews of the Paris and London manuscript wear the yellow badge.\textsuperscript{379} In all of these instances the badge speaks minimally to the character of the Jewish enemy. They are simply a shorthand for identification, while the physical actions, or inaction, of the Jews constitute the medieval commentary on their threat to Christianity.

Despite the density of verbal and visual attacks medieval Christians made on their Jewish contemporaries, scholars increasingly concede the purpose of these attacks was not ultimately to bring Jews down but to raise Christians up. This realization was not possible with traditional “Jewish art history,” which from its founding in the 1940s until fairly recently focused predominantly on iconography. Michael Camille’s work stands out as a leading influence in suggesting the revolutionary idea that medieval images of Jews were not representations of Jews at all. Instead, the surviving images should be read as reflections of the doubts and fears Christians harbored about themselves.\textsuperscript{380}

\textsuperscript{378} For more on the red *rouelle*, refer to Rodriguez Barral, *La Imagen del judío*, 51-53.


\textsuperscript{380} See Michael Camille, *The Gothic Idol*, 164-194. In this seminal work, Camille discusses the reasons why Church authorities sought to define Jews as idolaters despite their adherence to the Second Commandment. In actuality Jews had already accused Christians of idolatry via their representations of the Virgin and Christ. Christian authorities refuted these accusations, saying Jews were simply incapable of understanding how Christian images functioned. Visual representations of the Jewish Synagoga, allowed Christians to rebut accusations of idolatry and prohibited Jewish
Many other historians and art historians studying a range of media have come to similar conclusions. Recent collections of essays, such as Mitchell Merback’s *Beyond the Yellow Badge: Anti-Judaism and Antisemitism in Medieval and Early Modern Visual Culture*, indicate the breadth of interest in this overarching argument. When visual programs are understood as intentionally trying to mitigate and confront Christian problems, then they cannot be understood as outright persecution of the Jewish “Other” no matter how unfortunate the outcomes were for Jews.

4) Mental Metaphors, the “Fortress of Faith” as a Mnemonic Device

The features of illuminated miniatures in French manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith” seemingly offer an infinite number of permutations for symbolic meaning. The tower symbol, the types of people represented, the costumes and gestures, the recognizable iconography, the landscapes, the composition, and the inscriptions are layered such that interpretation ranges from basic illustration to a bombardment of questions for the reader. The woodcuts of the incunabula take the opposite approach but also prompt the same range of interpretation. Their reductive approach to the material could easily be read as a simplistic attempt to illustrate the main idea of the book, but the defense via the gap between Jewish verbal communication and Christian visual communication.


382 Merback, *Beyond the Yellow Badge* includes essays by Merback, Elizabeth Monroe, Kara Ann Morrow, Eva Frojomovic, Anne Harris, Jacqueline Jung, Nina Rowe, Debra Higgs Strickland, Pamela Patton, Vivian Mann, Paul Kaplan, Annette Weber, and Shalom Sabar.

383 This is where Merback and the other authors begin to problematize the terms anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism, essentially arguing against the existence of anti-Semitism in a cultural situation, which does not actually examine real Jews.
contemplative lives of their intended clerical audiences suggests otherwise. If the woodcuts were meant to be simple, straightforward illustrations of the text, there would be little reason to include them at all. However, when understood as mnemonic devices, the woodcuts become an integral part of clerical reading. They prompt more sensitive considerations of the text’s messages.

“Forrest of Faith” woodcuts offer a mnemonic device and then an object of meditation as the visual subject matter changed to reflect changing values between 1475 and 1525. The 1475 and 1487 woodcuts clearly align with the design of the manuscript miniatures as they include four distinct groups of figures around a lone tower. The woodcuts in the 1511 and 1525 editions are quite different. The tower and enemies are eliminated, and readers are directed toward elements of the arma Christi, a shift in keeping with devotional trends of the period. In considering these woodcuts as a body of inextricably linked images, it is necessary to address the retention of the meaning conveyed by the earlier images as they were omitted from newer editions.

The fifteenth-century woodcuts of the “Fortress of Faith” are mnemonic according to Mary Carruthers’ qualifications because they draw upon the readers’ collective memories while also creating a new memory via the contemplation, or “cogitation” over the image. Furthermore, in addition to their intended clerical reception, these woodcuts were likely the design of a cleric. The previous chapter’s

---

384 Carruthers, The Craft of Thought, 3-4. This study follows from Carruthers’ reevaluation of Frances Yates’ work. While she acknowledges the important contribution of the earlier scholarship, Carruthers breaks with Yates in saying that the “art of memory” was not meant to simply help one repeat information but to enable one to creatively engage with remembered material when questioned. See Yates, The Art of Memory and ibid., “Architecture and the Art of Memory,” Architectural Association Quarterly 12 (1980): 4-13.
discussion of monastic print shops and its proposal of Bämler as the professional link between Mentelin’s first edition of the *Fortalitium fidei* and Richel’s second is an important step in understanding the woodcuts as a product of specifically monastic thought. The 1475 image and its close relative from 1487 incorporate some of the iconographic elements used in the opening miniature of the Burgo manuscript. However, there is little historical or visual evidence suggesting the woodcut artist’s familiarity with the exact image. The woodcuts are better interpreted as a monastic reader’s structural visualization of the arguments in the “Fortress of Faith.”

They allow the reader to simplify the text’s main characters to their most essential qualities if the *Fortalitium fidei*’s message is taken as a serious warning about enemies of the faith. The demons poke fun, the Muslims always lurk on the periphery, the Jews are incapacitated, and the heretics undermine Christianity at every turn.

Such a reading of these figures is in alignment with other contemporary uses of symbolism. Present in the sixteenth-century *Fortalitium fidei* woodcuts, depictions of the *arma Christi* worked similarly, reminding the medieval audience of Christ’s brutal sacrifice without actually depicting it in any detail. (Figures 101 and 103) Solitary renderings of the implements of Christ’s torture signified his final moments and negated readers’ need to see his wracked and wounded body. The use of the *arma Christi* in sixteenth-century “Fortress of Faith” images was not novel. The weapons appear in the hands of both the attackers and defenders of the fortress in manuscript illuminations.
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385 Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought*, 10. “Monastic memoria… crafting memories also involved crafting the images in which those memories were carried and conducted, the artifice of memory was also, necessarily, an art of making various sorts of pictures: pictures in the mind, to be sure, but with close symbiotic relationships to actual images and actual words that someone had seen or read or heard…”
angels’ presentation of them in the frontispiece to the Burgo manuscript is particularly noticeable, but in that instance they are better interpreted as important companion symbols to Christ’s presentation as the Man of Sorrows. (Figures 32 and 33) This iconographic formula was popular in late medieval Spain and should not be read as mnemonic in function.

As demonstrated in the previous two chapters, much of the symbolism from the Burgo miniature was transposed in the illuminations of the French manuscripts and the woodcuts of the 1475 and 1487 editions. However, in the sixteenth-century Lyonnais editions, the arma Christi are the only familiar element. It seems the images of these later editions were adapted to be more in keeping with the Reformation and Counter-Reformation values of thinkers like Luther and Erasmus. The frequent early modern subjection of image to word resulted in the suppression of once traditional religious scenes in visual and theatrical displays. Often, when images were not entirely eliminated, they were reduced or reformulated to convey ideas mnemonically.

In the case of both the fifteenth and sixteenth century woodcuts, the reader is meant to contemplate the image’s meaning via sustained examination. For the fifteenth century images, the tower besieged by its enemies kept readers mindful of the overarching argument of the text. The sixteenth century prints functioned more readily as devotional images. Drawing on late medieval devotional practice for both the elite and commoners, the woodcut artist for the 1511 edition of the Fortalitium fidei prompted readers to move beyond the singular and vengeful message of the text to the more universal remembrance of Christ’s sacrifice. (Figures 159 and 160) Although the “Fortress of Faith’s” depiction of the weapons is less explicitly tied to the blood of Christ
due to the absence of the bleeding heart and the gaping wound, the reader is still meant to contemplate the image’s meaning via sustained reading, introspection, and visual examination.

5) Conclusion

The “Fortress of Faith” employs three different approaches to communicate the gravitas of the Church’s assault by non-Christians. All copies of the text verbally accuse heretics, Jews, Muslims, and demons of a host of crimes. Their sheer volume begins to convince the reader of the sinfulness of each non-Christian. Images from the incunabula act as mnemonic devices, which the reader may use as the centerpoint of his meditative reading. Manuscript miniatures of the text speak to a more specialized audience as they utilize allegory, metaphor, and theatrical experience to engage courtly readers.

While a substantive portion of this chapter examines the treatment of the Jews within the “Fortress of Faith,” the intent behind the approach is to analyze their presentation as the model for the treatment of each group addressed in the text. The Jews are the lens for examining basic concepts of Christian self-definition. The relationship of the Jews to female figures, as addressed above, is a first step in exploring this process, and further steps to that end are taken in the final chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE: ONE ENEMY TO DEFINE THEM ALL

1) Introduction

This chapter situates the “Fortress of Faith” within medieval readers’ changing conceptions of non-Christians and the Christian self.\(^{386}\) It discusses the late medieval conflation of outsider groups. Authors, artists, and audiences of the “Fortress of Faith” all failed, though perhaps strategically so, to make important distinctions among non-Christians. This phenomenon reveals a great deal about medieval modes of viewing and thought, but it is not isolated to the Middle Ages. Many historians see the virulent anti-Semitism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as firmly rooted in the anti-Judaism of the Middle Ages.\(^{387}\) Others illuminate important connections among early American immigrant groups, and still more discuss the complicated relationship between the interactions and representations of Jews and African Americans in the first half of the

---

\(^{386}\) These changing perceptions are often referred to more simply as the conception of the self versus the “other.” Although the term “other” has been widely popular in some of the most important studies of medieval religious relations, some scholars are now avoiding the term because of the harsh binary it creates. See Nina Rowe, “Other,” Studies in Iconography, Special Issue Medieval Art History Today—Critical Terms, 33 (2012): 131-144. Ultimately, however, I consider the term applicable in my discussion of the “Fortress of Faith.” In the body of images associated with the text, it is precisely the lack of distinction among the various non-Christians that ensured the work’s success for a wide range of readers. The Christian self is placed in direct opposition with a vague and singular non-Christian “other,” rather than a number of different types of non-Christians.\(^{387}\) See Joshua Trachtenberg, The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and Its Relation to Modern Anti-Semitism (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943) and Albert S. Lindemann, Anti-Semitism Before the Holocaust (Harlow, England: Longman, 2000). For a broad range of interpretations on the overlap of and distinctions between anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism, refer to Eva Frojmovic, ed., Imagining the Self, Imagining the Other: Visual Representation and Jewish-Christian Dynamics in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2002) and Merback, Beyond the Yellow Badge.
twentieth century. Even the worldwide racial and religious tensions of the present day are difficult thoughts to suppress following a thorough examination of the “Fortress of Faith.” While this study is primarily an exploration of a medieval text and its body of images, this chapter seeks to consider the “Fortress of Faith’s” potential implications about human self-perception and environment in the Middle Ages and beyond.

The interchangeable nature of the “Fortress of Faith’s” enemies, especially the Jews, Muslims, and demons, was previously addressed in Chapter Three’s discussion of the Fortalitium fidei woodcuts, but it bears further scrutiny here. The Jew was the consummate “other” of the medieval period. Images never failed to mark them with special clothing, damning attributes, and disturbing physiognomy. However, to say that Jewishness defined otherness would be to oversimplify and falsify the matter. In The Gothic Idol, Michael Camille argued that multiple groups were negatively implicated through Christian image-making, and more recently, Jacqueline Jung denied the presumed artistic compulsion to imbue Jewish figures with hyper-specific facial features. This argument has found increasing favor in recent years.

Identifying what she deems a “pictorial code of rejection,” Debra Higgs Strickland considers the influence of theology and popular literature in visually defining non-Christians as monstrous. She examines images of sub-Saharan Africans, Jews, Muslims, Mongols and apocalyptic figures, eventually concluding that their once specific defining features could be indiscriminately doled out to other groups for popular consumption. Grotesque physiognomy, violent actions, idolatry, and satanic connections take precedence as the inalienable characteristics of all marginal populations, and any differences that might have existed among these groups are subsumed by their connections to each other as non-Christians. The result is the presentation of a mutant species operating somewhere between human and demonic behavior.

Many studies have treated Jews as a lens for viewing all non-Christians, but this investigation will go further as it demonstrates that Jews were the primary model and device for creating a broad spectrum of “others” throughout the Middle Ages. Ideological isolation from Christians and social marginalization alongside Jews fueled the transfer of detestable physical features, violent histories, polytheistic ritual, and satanic engagement from the most obvious “other,” the Jews, to all remaining non-Christians. In this way, the constant evolution of the “bad Jew” became the device for the propagation of a new, all-encompassing monstrous race.

The “Fortress of Faith” presents a unique opportunity to examine the complexities of identity development in the late medieval and early modern periods. Initially, the “Fortress of Faith” seems to foster the logical extension of a long tradition of anti-Judaism. However, the greatest thrust of this work lies in its ability to forge a visual

---

390 Strickland outlines the development of this phenomenon in her first chapter. See Strickland, *Saracens, Demons and Jews*, 29-60.
relationship among Jews, heretics, Muslims, and demons to declare them inherently linked and equally dangerous to Christian society. In the intentionally repetitive images of the *Forteresse de la foy* manuscripts, medieval readers confront an amalgamated Christian opponent. Shared physical characteristics and engagement in identical acts made heretics, Jews, Muslims, and demons virtually indistinguishable. The blurring of the distinctions among the enemies was not confined to facial features and skin colors as traditional art historical studies in anti-Judaism might suggest. Instead, the “Fortress of Faith” demonstrates a shift from the physiognomic conflation of Jews, Muslims, monsters, and witches to the realization that the actions of Christian enemies had become a more poignant factor in their characterization as arbiters of evil.

Aristocratic and lower-class Christian readers within and outside of Spain adopted this overlapping interpretation of all non-Christians. Their Castle of Love became a Castle of Hate, and an iconography of features became an iconography of actions. Even if the physical work of social cleansing was considered complete in certain countries, Christians recognized their spiritual territory as continually at risk from all outsiders. In the “Fortress of Faith,” the repetitive gestures of enemies in the miniatures functioned in exactly the same manner as the generic faces and clothes of the woodcuts. Attention was directed away from enemy characteristics and toward enemy intention.

2) Form and Content

Although this study confidently interprets the miniatures and woodcuts of the “Fortress of Faith” as an autonomous body of images, the physical text cannot be ignored. Rather, the structural core of Espina’s *opus* should be read as an essential influence for the image-makers and readers of the manuscripts and incunabula of the
fifteenth centuries. The first volume uses only three considerations to discuss the armor of “loyal Christians” and “true preachers” and to glorify the “holy Catholic faith.” However, Espina treated each enemy much more specifically, and he structured each of the enemy volumes identically. Each enemy is treated with appropriate nuance, but the structural repetition of the twelve considerations formally links the otherwise distinct groups, much like the visual relationship drawn among the enemies’ individual assaults in the sequential miniatures.

The use of literary form and visual style to communicate important values was a well-established practice in the medieval world. One need only look at the organizational structures of Giovanni Boccacio’s *Decameron*, Dante Alighieri’s *Comedia Divina*, or Geoffrey Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales* to recognize the successful use of form to convey meaning in the Middle Ages. Accepting that readers of the “Fortress of Faith” understood rhetorical form as content is an important step in fully realizing the sophistication of medieval readings of the “Fortress of Faith.”

Gregory the Great’s frequently invoked argument of images as “books for the illiterate” must be re-evaluated as an oversimplification. A brief examination of Passion imagery shall elaborate this point. Images of Christ’s Passion often depicted his tormentors whipping, stabbing, mocking, and stoning him, familiarizing Christian viewers with the specific means of his torture. Initially, images like these read as simple

---

391 Here, I am thinking specifically of Boccaccio’s use of the frame narrative, Dante’s physical delineation of the spiritual path of man, and Chaucer’s estates satire. Each text maintains a strict adherence to its formal structure in order to instruct or comment upon contemporary issues in the late medieval world.

392 Many art historians have already expressed disagreement with the reach traditionally associated with Gregory I’s words. Perhaps even Gregory the Great would agree that the interpretation of his letter to Serenus of Marseille has been used indiscriminately at times.
narrative depictions of the moments preceding Christ’s death. However, further examination suggests that late medieval representations of the violent moments of Christ’s Passion are equally concerned with a variety of subjects.

Most relevant to this study is the use of Passion imagery to speculate on the safety and stability of the medieval Church. The insertion of Jewish characters, identified by their pointed hats and stereotypical physiognomy, into scenes of the Crucifixion provides the most explicit expression of this fear. Images in alignment with the words of the New Testament recognize the lack of Jewish action during the mocking and Crucifixion of Christ, but there are at least as many images implying Jewish agency at these events. For example, miniatures of the “Flagellation” and the “Mocking of Christ” from a fourteenth-century Bodleian psalter present Christ’s tormentors as non-specific male enemies frozen in various moments of violence. (Figures 161 and 162) However, other miniatures dating to at least the mid-thirteenth century indicate an early preoccupation with marking the same figures as religiously or ethnically distinct. While a turban or other exotic garment was sometimes used as an identifier, the most common means was the Judenhut. Jews were inserted into the history of Christianity almost everywhere via a simple pointed hat.

The men whipping Christ in a “Flagellation” miniature from ca. 1260 are represented in profile to emphasize their hooked noses and threatening grimaces. Their full, curly beards and pointed hats immediately identify them as Jews. (Figure 155) The “Mocking of Christ” from the 1260s Oscott Psalter includes three different ugly faces on Christ’s enemies, but the disgusting delight read in the face of the man in the Judenhut is particularly disturbing. His delirious grin indicates his thorough enjoyment as he whips and crowns Christ. (Figure 163) The pointed hat remained the marker of choice through
the late Middle Ages. Men, who in different costume, might easily stand in for Christian figures are noted as Jews so long as they wear the hat. (Figures 164 and 165) In fact, the only mention of Jews in the Gospel accounts of these events refers to Christ’s taunting moniker as “King of the Jews.”

According to the text, soldiers enact Christ’s torture and death. However, over the course of the Middle Ages, the consent of the people, often identified as Jews, fostered the representation of Jewish agents at these most crucial moments in scriptural history.

The representation of miscreant Jews at the Crucifixion bears great implications for the continued development of perceived Jewish identity during the Middle Ages. Though wildly inaccurate in terms of history and appearance, the ancient Jew in contemporary garb became irreversibly familiar. In Madame Marie’s Book of Images, a Jewish sponge-bearer raises the gall-soaked sponge to Christ’s parched lips. (Figure 166) Stephaton seems otherwise innocuous, but at the time this manuscript was created, he was a powerful symbol of the malevolent Jew. The appearance of his pointed hat in conjunction with his simple act of cruelty resonated powerfully in the medieval Christian imagination.

A sculpture of a “Stoning Jew” from Halberstadt demonstrates the same phenomenon. (Figure 167) Devoid of any visual context, this Jew still manages to convey the threat of his existence. His pointed hat identifies him as a Jew, but it is his gesture of attack that conveys his dangerous character. As he launches the stone, the viewer
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393 Like all other biblical passages noted in this study, readings are drawn from the New Revised Standard Version. See Matt. 27, Mark 15, Luke 23, and John 19.
394 See, for example, the arguments of Strickland and Bale. Strickland, Saracens, Demons, and Jews, 111. Anthony Bale, Feeling Persecuted: Christians, Jews, and Images of Violence in the Middle Ages (London: Reaktion Books, 2010), 79-81.
visualizes his target and is flooded with resentment. The poignant effect of this image is even more significant when considered alongside its biblical antecedent and the legend of the first Christian martyr, Saint Stephen. The “stoning Jew” is first encountered in an episode in John. After attempting to explain his relationship to the patriarchal Abraham, the Jews in the temple, “picked up stones to throw at him, but Jesus hid himself and went out of the temple.” Corresponding images of the episode are not entirely truthful as they depict the Jews in the midst of an imagined attack on Christ’s body. (Figure 168) Legends of martyrdom, like that of St. Stephen, would have reinforced this pseudo-event because it supported the conception of a violent Jewish nature in opposition to a peaceful Christian life. The image of the Jew preparing to throw a stone at the fortress in the London manuscript operates in the same manner. (Figure 56) None of the images is concerned with the historical inaccuracy it engenders.

Images and discussions of heretics, Muslims, and demons echo the misplaced accusation hurled at Jews of the medieval world. The gap between historical fact and contemporary imagination grew wide enough to rewrite communal memories of traumatic events, from both the Bible and contemporary life. Under this practice of historical revision, all non-Christians of the late Middle Ages could be anachronistically associated with the events of Christ’s persecution and death. These associations were not altogether intentional but likely the unavoidable result of fear and confusion. Rhetoric in which all non-Christians were linked as abusers of Christ and the sacraments developed to ameliorate both sensations. The frequent use of this rhetoric in visual and literary
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395 The “Stoning Jew” in Figure 167 was likely part of a larger group depicting the martyrdom of Saint Stephen.
396 John 8:53-59.
media is precisely the reason for the acceptance of the “Fortress of Faith” and other works with similar messages.

Drawing on this rhetoric, writers and manuscript-makers intertwined biblical narrative with contemporary issues, presenting readers with representations of hideous Jews and Muslims. Debra Higgs Strickland addresses the visual overlap of these and other groups in her book *Saracens, Demons, and Jews: Making Monsters in Medieval Art*. In an extensive survey of medieval manuscript miniatures, Strickland identifies a consistent pattern of ostracizing, or othering, non-Christians. The overwhelming visual evidence indicates a complete disregard for racial and religious distinction of individual groups.397

Heretics in the *Bible moralisée* and the *Grandes Chroniques de France* are identified via their actions and punishments rather than their physical features.398 In the first miniature, the men are engaged in undermining Christian doctrine, while in the second, they await punishment for said action. (Figures 169 and 170) Given the nature of heresy, perhaps it is natural for images of heretics to lack ethnic or religious markers. However, miniatures depicting Muslims operate outside these constraints.

These representations move fluidly between domestic and exotic costumes, as well as light and dark skin. Darkened flesh is the most common method for marking Muslims, but a brief survey of manuscript miniatures reveals a lack of consistency in what pigmentation connotes. In Alfonso X’s *Book of Chess*, two men of differing race
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397 Strickland, *Saracens, Demons, and Jews*.
398 For example, see Sara Lipton, “Jews, Heretics, and the Sign of the Cat in the *Bible moralisée,*” *Word and Image* 8 (1992): 362-377 and *Grandes chroniques* images of trials and burnings.
partake in a friendly board game. In this and other images, the Muslim man is presented as a serene figure, with the potential for redemption upon his conversion to Christianity. (Figures 172 and 173)

Other images of Muslims suggest an irreversibly depraved character. In Madame Marie’s “Martyrdom of St. Vincent,” a black man unravels the intestine of the martyr while his tongue hangs out of his mouth in keen anticipation. (Figure 174) The “Confrontation of the Crusaders and the Saracens at the Battle of Dorylaeum” from the Roman de Godefroi de Bouillon does not display the same Muslim blood-thirst, but their obvious defeat at the hands of the crusaders appears as the will of God. (Figure 175) The crusaders charge into battle as a fierce unit, while the unarmored, dark-skinned Muslims appear disorganized and ineffective. The Christians suffer no casualties, while the body parts of the fallen Saracens litter the foreground of the miniature.

Despite the frequency with which Muslims were represented as Africans, dark skin could not be trusted to connote Islam. Fair and dark complexions were frequently used to identify characters as good and evil, respectively. The dark skin of St. Mark’s Alexandrian captors and St. Matthew’s Ethiopian condemners double in noting their geographic background and their malicious character. (Figures 176 and 177) Even more revealing, though, is a fourteenth-century miniature of the “Martyrdom of Saint Maurice.” (Figure 178) Despite St. Maurice’s established identification as a black man, the miniature depicts Maurice and the other martyred soldiers with the fairest of skin.

399 The relatively peaceful coexistence of Christians, Jews, and Muslims under Alfonso X’s reign is reason enough to identify the man on the left as a Muslim, and not simply a man of African origin.
The removal of pigmentation from the saint’s skin along with the darkened skin of his murderers suggests the use of black and white skin as a shorthand for good and evil.

The association of dark skin with evil is rooted in fear and curiosity of the unknown world, often specifically the monstrous races. The sustained interest in the monstrous races believed to live at the edge of the world dates to Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History*. The difference of dark-skinned people aligned them more with these races than their sameness as humans linked them to Christians. As such, despite the occasional presence of actual black people in everyday life, black men were often associated with other monstrous races said to engage in a variety of nefarious activities. In a miniature from the mid-fifteenth century, Ethiopians are represented en route to the Anti-Christ alongside the headless, stomach-faced Blemmyai. (Figure 179)

Images from throughout the medieval world suggest a general interest in monstrosity and hybridity. Medieval sources render the minutia of the individual monstrous races to different ends. A drawing from the Arnstein Bible carefully delineates the features of the Cynocephali, Cyclopes, Blemmyai, Panotii, Artabatitae, Antipodes, Sciapods, Hippopodes, Macrobii, and other races. (Figure 180) This image and a world map from Hartman Schedel’s *Liber cronicarum* suggest an empirical approach to the known and the unknown world. (Figure 181) The map illustrates the late fifteenth-century geographic understanding of the world including landmasses, oceans, and wind patterns. At left, the monstrous races are seemingly expanded as more hybrid and mutant figures are inscribed in a column of boxes. The six-armed man, the fur-
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covered woman, the three-faced man, and the ostrich-headed figure demonstrate late medieval fascination with the endless possibilities of unknown life forms.

Other images of the monstrous races clearly move beyond fascination and into the realm of religious action. The monstrous races as depicted in the tympanum at Vézelay are the prime example of this. (Figure 182) Their depiction around the scene of the Pentecost clearly argues for the conversion of the races to Christianity under the direction of the apostles and later missionaries.\(^{401}\) Even images seemingly unconcerned with the spread of Christianity seem to recognize the possibility of monstrous existence in proximity to the Christian world. A miniature from the *Livre des Merveilles du Monde* purports to represent the monstrous races of Ethiopia among fantastical beasts, but the architecture in the background recalls the skyline of more civilized, perhaps even Christian, cityscapes. (Figure 183)

The above transition is visually supported by the multitude of images in which demons and devils share the physical characteristics of monstrous races and beasts. A large miniature opens a manuscript of the *Speculum humanae salvationis* with a scene joining the Last Judgment with St. Michael’s defeat of the Devil. (Figure 184) The archangel’s wings divide the picture space in half and envelope the fallen angels in the lower region. The largest devil’s awkward stance and disparate body parts are notable. At once Michael supports Lucifer’s weight and clinches his victory over him. The archangel grasps his enemy’s horn to hold him upright, but the protruding horn and its face are not found at the top of the body. Rather they are located on the figure’s buttocks. Michael’s spear is thrust through the face leaving a bloody gash on the chin. A second

head with long hair protrudes from the devil’s neck. The combination of the two faces, the spots on the body, and the four talons on the feet anatomically connect Lucifer to the monstrous races, and the surrounding demons reinforce these similarities. Those to the left have fantastical bodies with feet of talons and enlarged ears reminiscent of the Panotii. To the right, a demon has the head of a canine and an oddly contorted body from which his legs appear to extend in two unrealistic directions. Only the demon at the far right presents in the traditional, expected manner with his humanistic figure, pointy ears, and horns.

Following from the work of Strickland, Sara Lipton, and others, the above analyses demonstrate that the only clear divide between medieval religion, race, and species was the one between beautiful Christian humans and ugly non-Christian monsters. Hieronymous Bosch’s heavily populated canvases of the Passion represent the culmination of this phenomenon. Completely awry from the biblical recitations of the events, Bosch’s paintings offer a delightful tableau of the grotesque human desire for blood.402 In Christ Carrying the Cross, Christ bleeds beneath his crown of thorns and falters under the weight of the cross. (Figure 185) This suffering does not satisfy the pink-robed attacker behind him who raises a whip to lash him as well. In the lower portion of the painting, the two thieves’ bodies become the locus for visible suffering. On the left, the emaciated body of one thief is revealed as his clothes hang in tatters. In fact, the only article firmly attached to him is the binding rope tugged upon by the red-cloaked soldier. The thief on the right is sandwiched between two figures. Although the

402 Debra Higgs Strickland provides the most recent approach to Bosch and representation of Jews, but I have not had the opportunity to examine it thoroughly yet. Debra Higgs Strickland, The Epiphany of Hieronymus Bosch: Imagining Antichrist and Others from the Middle Ages to the Reformation (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016).
monk’s face is sympathetic, and the thief’s kneeling stance suggests his penitence, the most striking feature of this group is the sickly pallor of the prisoner tethered by the Roman.403

From all of the figures surrounding Christ and the thieves, no specific religious or ethnic identity emerges for the viewer. Some are ruddy-faced; some have olive complexions. Some wear the Judenhut or turbans; some wear Roman helmets or hats fashionable to the fifteenth century. Some are ugly by nature; some are ugly by association. The immense variety in the figures’ representation reduces the clues to their identification to wardrobe and action. Quite simply, their medieval costumes and their crazed expressions identify them as killers of Christ.

A similar conclusion is drawn from an examination of Bosch’s Christ Mocked (The Crowning with Thorns). (Figure 186) While none of the figures physically engage in Christ’s torture, they also do not project feelings of sympathy. The tension of the situation is, again, communicated via costume and facial expression. The pleading stares of the figures in the lower corners, the set jaw of the man with the crown of thorns, and the spiked leather collar of the man in the upper right corner convey an uneasy feeling of blood thirst without yet committing any violent action.404

A later Bosch Christ Carrying the Cross demonstrates both the legacy of and the departure from traditional physiognomic stereotypes. (Figure 187) The artist drove the variety of ghastly human facial expression far beyond conceivable reality and heightened

404 James Marrow, “Circumdederunt me canes multi: Christ’s Tormentors in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages and Early Renaissance,” Art Bulletin 59 no. 2 (1977): 175-179.
the horrifying intensity of the Savior’s Passion through a fixation on physical deformity. Caricatures of the perceived natures of non-Christians became grotesque and bestial enough to subjugate the visual memories of Christ and the saints being bound, beaten, teased, and dismembered to a secondary importance. In this painting, the placid faces of Christ and Veronica almost dissolve into the mass of angry, hungry, haunting faces surrounding them. The bulbous noses, wagging tongues, and toothless grimaces become the focus without identifying any particular enemy. Instead, the monstrous faces recall violent actions and supersede Christ’s historical enemies with any and all perceived adversaries of Christianity. 405

Although recent art historical studies are correct in reinterpreting Bosch’s content on its own terms, the temptation to discuss his paintings solely as demonstrations of technical mastery and triumph lingers. Vasari’s identification of the northern miniaturist painters’ virtuosity proved to be even more limiting than Panofsky’s attempt to explain every detail of their paintings in iconographic terms.406 Two important methodological arguments emerge from the discussion of the preceding Bosch paintings. The first is that while Bosch must certainly have been aware of his technical prowess, the idea of him

405 Ibid.

simply “flexing his muscles” is unlikely. Certainly, there were other subjects to be adopted if that were the case. For example, The Garden of Earthly Delights triptych and the central panel of his Last Judgment triptych in Vienna display a multitude of curious creatures but offer little variety or experimentation in their representation of humans. (Figures 188 and 189) Secondly, one must decide if artistic intention or reception weighs more heavily in reading Bosch’s work. If Bosch was, in some instances, demonstrating his range as a painter, his choices do not diminish the viewers’ reception of the content discussed above. Furthermore, one must carefully consider whether or not intention and reception can even be satisfactorily separated to address content. As already noted, Bosch’s faces borrowed and adapted from a large body of images of non-Christians, so much so that the artist’s intention might be understood as entirely subject to viewer reception.

The symbolism and semiotic nature of such medieval viewing suggests similarly sophisticated readings of other types of images and aligns scholarship linking multiple artists and types of media through standard late medieval workshop practice. Art historians have long described northern ateliers as bustling centers of artistic interdependence and exchange. Vellum was prepared in one workshop, lined and ruled in another, inscribed somewhere else, and finally decorated in the artist’s workshop. There, depending on the significance of the manuscript, patron, and miniature, a single image might be executed by several hands. Apprentices were known to set up compositions and provide generic spaces and figures so that masters could insert important details such as portraits and historical markers. The familiarity of similar visual formulae supports theories of master/assistant relationships and also indicates the
circulation of model books, prints, and cartoons in manuscript, print, painting, and tapestry workshops. Legal documents from the period provide a glimpse of typical business practices including the purchase of cartoons, payments for supplies and labor, and dissolution of partnerships. The material aspects of these documents support various theories of artistic collaboration and reveal the economic substructure supporting the activity.  

Although there are no known documents concerning production of the *Forteresse de lay foy*, there are documents attesting to Loyset Liédet’s workshop practices. Scot McKendrik reads the 1460 payment documents for two volumes of illuminations of Mansel’s *Histoire romaines* (Paris, Arsenal, Mss. 5087-88) as the earliest proof of the miniaturist’s prowess as a workshop master. Liédet’s 1469 enrollment in the Bruges confraternity of bookmakers further implicates him as a businessman serving an extended clientele as the head of a lively atelier. Such a workshop could easily illuminate a suite of luxury manuscripts for distribution among an elite circle of patrons. Even in the absence of legal documents concerning their production, the collaborative circumstances behind the production of the *Forteresse de la foy* manuscripts is clear. Ruled and transcribed in the workshops of Jehan du Quesne and, possibly, David Aubert, the appropriate folia were then illuminated in two different workshops: one responsible for the border and another for the large-scale miniatures. In the case of the Paris, London, and Brussels manuscripts, the borders are attributed to the workshop of Lieven van

---

409 For comparison of the scribes’ hands, please see Figures 190 and 191.
The miniatures are also the product of multiple hands. They are attributed to the atelier of Loyset Liédet, and they were likely the work of both master and assistants. The repetitive nature of the miniatures surely facilitated such collaboration. (Figures 4, 9, and 17)

“Fortress of Faith” images were successful for a number of reasons. They reflected the structure of the written text, recalled negative characterizations of non-Christians, and reinforced each other via their repetition. However, another element of them remains to be explored. Something about their visual formula was inherently familiar to the medieval viewer. Although the title and overarching metaphor of the fortress of Christianity is a tempting source with which to credit this familiarity, a review of other medieval miniatures does not support such an assertion. The four most common types of tower images in the Middle Ages are the “Tower of Babel,” the “Heavenly Jerusalem,” the besieged fortresses of chronicles, and the romantic “Castles of Love.” While each of these types shares one or more features with the *Forteresse de la foy* miniatures, none seems to be a direct ancestor.

“Tower of Babel” images are primarily concerned with conveying biblical narrative. The Bedford Hours “Tower of Babel” demonstrates the efficiency of the people working together to build into the heavens from the land of Shinar. (Figure

---

410 Lieven van Lathem’s work and connection to the *Forteresse de la foy* will be explored later in the chapter.

411 The story of the “Tower of Babel” is from *Genesis* 11: 1-9. “Now the whole earth had one language and the same words. And as they migrated from the east, they came upon a plain in the land of Shinar and settled there. And they said to one another, ‘Come, let us make bricks, and burn them thoroughly.’ And they had brick for stone, and bitumen for mortar. Then they said, ‘Come, let us build ourselves a city, and a tower with its top in the heavens, and let us make a name for ourselves; otherwise we shall be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.’ The LORD came down to see the city and the tower,
192) Even as a man is flicked from the top of the tower, those at the base remain fully engaged in their work. In an image of the same scene from John Lydgate’s *Fall of Princes*, men and several levels of the edifice tumble violently to the ground, while a red demon stares out at the viewer from the doorway of the tower. (Figure 193) The “Fortress of Faith” is the inverse of this scenario with the tower being an impenetrable bastion of Christian strength rather than a temple of doom.

Dissimilarly, the “Heavenly Jerusalem” is a consistently peaceful and organized image. A miniature from Haimo’s commentary on the Apocalypse illustrates how the spirit carried [John] away to a great, high mountain and showed [him] the holy city Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God… [with its] great, high wall with twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and on the gates are inscribed the names of the twelve tribes of the Israelites; on the east three gates, on the north three gates, on the south three gates, and on the west three gates. And the wall of the city has twelve foundations, and on them are the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb which is the centralizing element of the composition.412 (Figure 194) The fourteenth-century Bible of Clement VII depicts the city of “pure gold, clear as glass” with the city wall “adorned with every jewel.”413 (Figure 195) While architecture plays a central role

which mortals had built. And the LORD said, ‘Look, they are one people, and they have all one language; and this is only the beginning of what they will do; nothing that they propose to do will now be impossible for them. Come, let us go down, and confuse their language there, so that they will not understand one another’s speech.’ So the LORD scattered them abroad from there over the face of all the earth, and they left off building the city. Therefore it was called Babel, because there the LORD confused the language of all the earth; and from there the LORD scattered them abroad over the face of all the earth.” (NRSV)

412 Rev. 21: 10-14.
413 Rev. 21: 18-19.
in images of the “Heavenly Jerusalem” and the “Fortress of Faith,” the focus of the former remains positive for the viewer.

The illustrated anecdotes of attacked fortresses found in chronicles are more closely related in terms of content, but they do not reflect the format of “Fortress of Faith” images. Generally, the architectural structure is thrust to one side of the composition, and the attack is depicted with masses of inseparable figures either pressing toward the building or engaged in a bloody battle before it. Although individual miniatures often lack the details to identify them as specific battles, they were meant to accomplish exactly that goal. (Figures 196, 197, 198, and 199)

Given the dating, audience, and compositions of “Castle of Love” and “Fortress of Faith” imagery, they are most clearly related. However, the tone of representations of the “Castle of Love” is immediately read as playful and in alignment with the leisure activities of the noble audience. It is less the attack of the knights upon the castle than it is the retaliation of the women inhabiting it that communicates the lightness of the theme. In a single panel of an ivory casket lid, three knights in mail and tunics attempt to breach the crenellated castle wall, but the seriousness of the attack is diminished once the viewer recognizes the weapon of choice for both parties: roses. (Figure 200) One knight ascends a rope ladder, while another launches a bouquet, and a third is preparing to

---

414 General works that discuss this type of luxury object include Paul Williamson and Glyn Davies, Medieval Ivory Carvings 1200-1550 (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2014), Peter Barnet, ed. Images in Ivory: Precious Objects of the Gothic Age (Detroit: Institute of Arts, 1997), and Richard Randall, The Golden Age of Ivory: Gothic Carvings in North American Collections (New York: Hudson Hills Press, 1993). It is also worth noting the Roman de la Rose as a probable influential source for the “Fortress of Faith’s” adaptation of the symbolism of courtly romance to its own, more serious, purpose.
catapult a basket of flowers toward the ladies. The ladies throw roses in an unconvincing attempt to fight their pursuers. An ivory mirror back from around 1450 continues the theme with greater invention. (Figure 201) A figure at left prepares to release a rose, in place of an arrow, from his bow toward a woman who swats him away with her long-stemmed roses. Meanwhile, a woman at center dumps an entire basket of roses over the heads of the attackers below her. Dangerous artillery is openly exchanged for the delightful weaponry of romance. The futility of these chivalrous battles of love is openly addressed on an ivory mirror case, which depicts the abduction of a lady from a castle. (Figure 202) The same materials and organizing architectural structure are present, but the passionate struggle between the male and female parties is entirely extinguished as the knight lifts the willing lady out of her castle window. On the whole, in images such as these, the so-called attack of the knights and the anticipated surrender of the ladies leaves only the castle itself as the referent for the “Fortress of Faith.”

The attacking figures must be otherwise explained, and Crucifixion images are a likely source. Images of the “Fortress of Faith,” like the ubiquitous medieval images of the crucified Christ, are iconic. In fact, they effectively replace the most enduring symbol of Christianity with images of its namesake tower besieged by all of the major enemies of Christianity. Comparison with the above crucifixion images and more contemporary miniatures reveals the fifteenth-century tendency to depict the final moments of Christ’s life as the centralizing compositional element.415 Christ on his cross

415 While similar compositional structures may also be observed in northern panel and canvas painting, such works will not be addressed here as the author follows the established theory, which posits miniature painters as a major influence on their contemporaries working as large-scale painters. For example, see Kren and Ainsworth’s
is usually rendered slightly larger than the flanking thieves. The vertical element of his
cross extends into the lower half of the picture plane connecting him with the remaining
figures in various states of observance, distress, and agitation. The scene is also set apart
from the cityscape, though buildings in the distance may sometimes refer to historical
structures. (Figures 203, 204, 205, and 206)

Two crucifixion miniatures from the second half of the fifteenth century are
especially useful in visualizing the formal and symbolic connection between scenes of the
crucifixion and the tower under siege. Liédet’s fortress miniature pages present an
interesting combination of features from the Crucifixion scenes of William Vrelant
(1460s) and Lieven van Lathem (1471).\(^416\) (Figures 207 and 208) Both scenes include a
central crucified Christ in a landscape apart from the urban world, referenced by the stone
buildings in the background. The figures in the Vrelant miniature are more static than
Liédet’s and also display a more sophisticated use of color and value. (Figure 207) On
the other hand, van Lathem’s figures are clad in the garish colors often associated with
Liédet’s work, and their faces and gestures are more expressionistic in their execution.\(^417\)
(Figure 208) The decorative border of the Vrelant miniature is almost entirely vegetal,
while the van Lathem border’s narration of key Old Testament scenes almost completely
overtakes the marginal vegetation. Despite these differences, both are stylistically related
to the borders of Forteresse leaves. The three artists were contemporaries working in the

\(^416\) Examples of miniatures by Willem Vrelant and Lieven van Lathem were chosen for
comparison here because both miniaturists were contemporaries of Liédet. The three
artists shared patrons, and clear visual influences can be traced through their works.
\(^417\) Liédet’s color palette is mentioned in every survey of his known miniatures. The
judgment seems to have been handed down from nineteenth-century connoisseurs and art
historians.
same circles of patronage, but the relationship between Liédet and van Lathem bears further scrutiny. The stronger visual connection between their works must have been a natural product of their patronage by Charles the Bold between 1467 and 1477.\textsuperscript{418}

The exchange of certain symbols within a relatively constant compositional formula was not simply an attempt at workshop efficiency. Rather, the intended and achieved effect was the evocation of familiar feelings about the doctrinal roots of Christianity and new consideration of the late medieval Christian’s mission. The sophistication of viewing throughout the Middle Ages is undeniable. Personifications of the Church as the fair Ecclesia, the Vices as ladies of the court, and Death as a grisly skeleton were all visual means of approaching abstract concepts. Foremost among these mutable symbols was the body of Christ. As a physical person who fulfilled a spiritual ideal, depictions of his body could convey a multitude of meanings, and worldly symbols often replaced his human appearance to communicate specific ideas about him.

“Fortress of Faith” manuscripts of the 1470s and 1480s focused on the individual groups’ assaults on a tower, but a large part of their success was owed to their reference to more familiar images of Christ’s Passion. While the French translations maintained the original text’s structural divisions, they adopted a distinct visual formula to engage a new audience. The noble reader’s familiarity with Passion and Crucifixion imagery as discussed above is confronted with the replacement of Christ with an architectural element. Unable to dismiss the memories triggered by the thrust spears, the hurled stones, and the nasty taunting, the reader must understand the tower as, not only a stand-in for Christ, but also as a representation of Christ’s church on Earth. The fortress speaks

\textsuperscript{418} Kren and McKendrick, \textit{Illuminating the Renaissance}, 224. Kren further notes the influence of Lieven van Lathem on later illuminators’ compositions and figures.
for both parties as it cries out, “Avenge me!” and condones violence against the perceived killers of Christ and violators of Christianity. (Figure 4)

3) Jews: Meet Heretics, Muslims, and Demons (and Women and Witches)

The miniatures opening each volume of the “Fortress of Faith” reinvigorated the work’s over-arching message. The presentation of the allegorical Christian fortress standing strong in the breach reminded its readers that despite the geographic breadth and imposing dominion of Christianity, the foundation of the faith was under a constant and unified siege, whether apparent or not. The apparent transformation in the mission of the Crusades as discussed in the previous chapter illustrates the cultivation of this sentiment. As the Jews of the Rhineland fell victim to the blind zealots of the Crusades, Christian sentiment shifted toward a perceived righteous triumph over the European descendants of Christ’s killers. Seen in this light, Jews were considered equally as dangerous as the Muslims who had sacked the Holy Land, and attacks against them were considered legitimate both because of their success and because they required less violence than the declared goal of reconquering Jerusalem. As attacks on Jews continued through the Crusades, the prevailing message declared them destroyers of Christianity at worst and financial pawns in the fight at best. Overall, the distraction from reclaiming Jerusalem reveals a growing concern about the nature of one’s neighbors, an issue that is reflected in the historical, literary, and visual treatment of non-Christian groups throughout the Middle Ages.

In short, the mentality fueling the Crusades from the eleventh through the fifteenth centuries is the same mentality responsible for the “Fortress of Faith’s” widespread popularity. The “Fortress of Faith” demonstrates the interchangeable nature
of all non-Christians according to the Christian mindset. Although the lists of crimes are specific to each group, and its miniatures and woodcuts use symbolic markers of religious identity, a single “other” emerges. Similarly dressed and positioned, heretics, Jews, Muslims, and demons appear united in their efforts to destroy Christianity. A solitary tower in an otherwise isolated landscape is the target for their relentless physical and emotional attack.

An additional visual element in the Paris, London, and Brussels miniatures aids in the reader’s understanding of all the enemies as one. The insertion of the Vices must be addressed once more with specific attention to the sinful nature of each human enemy as purported by Espina and accepted by his audience. Jews, heretics, and Muslims can each be paired with an individual personification of vice based upon the attributes with which they are traditionally identified and the descriptions of them within the “Fortress of Faith.”

Again, the Jews provide the most obvious example of this. One symbol that always connected Jews to sin on some level was the moneybag, which was rooted in iconographic programs of Judas’ betrayal but was continually reinvigorated by social tensions associated with contemporary Jewish moneylending. The earliest images of Judas’ suicide include depictions of the purse of thirty coins so as to visually connect his ultimate demise to his avarice. (Figure 209) Over time avarice was interpreted as an innately Jewish trait due to the fact that Jewish-Christian interaction happened predominantly within the financial sector.419 (Figure 210) Despite the reality that rulers

and laws quite purposefully cornered Jews into professions of moneylending, Christians believed that Jews extended loans with excessive interest rates in order to satisfy their greed.\textsuperscript{420} As a result, images of Jews exchanging money did more than simply reflect their role in the local economy. A man holding a bag of coins was first identified as a Jew and then quickly linked to Judas and carnal sin.

In the *Forteresse de la foy*, Avarice (*Avaritia/Avarice*) is repeatedly represented with money as a physical attribute. She may wear a purse, carry a chest, display golden coins in the folds of her dress, or even allow the coins to spill out of a bag onto the ground. In every case, she clearly references the cardinal vice of greed and reminds the viewer of its existence in the world, particularly as a characteristic of neighboring Jews.

The Vices most closely associated with heretics and Muslims may be subtler in visual terms, but a brief consideration of their reputation among noble readers of the fifteenth century reveals the perception of strong connections between alleged heretics and professed Muslims and two discrete Vices. The arrogance of the blaspheming heretic identifies him with Pride (*Superbia/Orgueil*). His refusal to submit to Christian doctrine constantly gets him into trouble, and his familiar appearance allows him to undermine Christian society by posing as a respected member of the community. Unlike the other Vices in the “Fortress of Faith” miniatures, Pride is represented as a man, bringing him one step closer to the knight for whom the manuscript was produced and the males depicted attacking the tower. As a male, sometimes on horseback, Pride leads the other

\textsuperscript{420} Widespread belief in Jewish greed is attested to in medieval accounts of the hardships Jews were said to impress upon good Christians. Additionally, greed is often presented as an underlying issue in tales of blood libel and host desecration. For examples, refer to the accounts of the martyrdoms of William of Norwich and Adam of Bristol, as well as the Parisian Miracle of the Billetes.
Vices, and presumably non-Christian enemies, in the metaphorical charge against the Church.\textsuperscript{421}

Muslims are predominantly identified via costume and weapon in “Fortress of Faith” depictions. However, the reputation of their character as libidinous beasts resonates in a particular Vice as well. Lust (Luxuria/Luxure) is the most suitable vice to assign to this group. It is also a reasonable assumption for this study given the tendency to place Lust, Avarice, and Pride in ascending order at the top of the hierarchy of the Seven Deadly Sins.\textsuperscript{422}

The depiction of the well-established enemies in the company of the Vices further complicates the message of the tower attacked by its many enemies. Dressed in contemporary women’s fashions and carrying appropriate symbols, the Vices in the earliest French manuscript of Louis of Bruges even bear golden inscriptions that identify them as the Seven Deadly Sins. Although the Vices pose a laughable physical threat to the tower, their mere appearance evokes earlier images of the Vices paired with demons as in the \textit{Speculum humanae salvationis} manuscript from the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich. Both the virtuous and sinful women in the manuscript are well dressed, crowned, and ride horses. It is their respective associations with angels and demons, which connote their true nature. In the miniature devoted to \textit{Humilitas}, the fair Virtue

\textsuperscript{421} The placement of Pride at the top of the hierarchy of sin is derived from Gregory the Great’s \textit{Moralia in Job} 31:45, in which he identified pride as “the root of all evil.”

\textsuperscript{422} As, for example, in Simon Bougouin’s \textit{L’Homme Juste et l’Homme Mondain} in which the full hierarchy of the Vices moves from Sloth (Paresse) to Anger (Ire), Gluttony (Glutonie), Envy (Envie), Lust (Luxure), Avarice (Avarice), and Pride (Orgueil). Lester K. Little has argued that the hierarchy was widely adjusted between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries, placing Avarice at the top due to the growing commercial economy alongside the rise of the mendicant orders and the decline of the Benedictines. See Lester K. Little, “Pride Goes before Avarice: Social Change and the Vices in Latin Christendom,” \textit{The American Historical Review} 76 no. 1 (1971): 16-49.
approaches an angel on horseback. (Figure 211) In the miniatures depicting *Avaritia*, *Superbia*, and *Luxuria*, their steeds of goat, camel, and bear approach a partially armed demon, alluding to the perversion of the Vices’ characters. (Figures 212, 213, and 214)

The pairing of Vices and demons in the final miniatures of the “Fortress of Faith” manuscripts operates similarly as their joint attack on the tower cannot be dismissed. (Figures 8 and 13)

The regular, visual intermingling of the female personifications of sin with all the non-Christians discussed in the text suggests the “other” could be disguised as a good Christian but act in collaboration with established enemies. Suspicions about the actions and intentions of Christian neighbors reflect larger trends of doubt concerning orthodoxy, a phenomenon already discussed in this study. While there are many examples of similar transfers of doubt, the “Fortress of Faith’s” introduction of the Vices seems to admit the existence of Christian doubt and warn against the danger it poses toward the Church. However, it is important to note that works such as the “Fortress of Faith” remove Christian doubt from its true context and redefine it as the epitome of non-Christian thought.

The overlap of the Vices and more particular enemies of Christianity and the interchangeability of devils with fools, doctors, and clowns in medieval theatrical performance, as suggested by R.J.E. Tiddy, encourage a holistic reading of the “Fortress of Faith.” 423 Such an approach accurately prompts the theoretical conflation of heretics, Jews, Muslims, and demons as experienced by late medieval readers.

---

It is insufficient to address the amalgamation of Christian enemies in the “Fortress of Faith” without considering issues of hybridization and monstrosity, particularly as they relate to the demons. The tendency to understand undesirable human groups as subhuman, or even inhuman, is recurrent throughout the Middle Ages, and the text at hand is no exception. However, the “Fortress of Faith” illuminates the terrifying path between humanity and the monstrous in a very particular way. In the images from the text, the heretical, Jewish, and Muslim figures are anatomically human, but there are moments in Espina’s encyclopedia, which intimate an animalistic or demonic understanding of these religious groups. At first he refers to the “subtle deception” of heretics, but he continues calling them “monsters of heresy.” In his initial description of the Jews, Espina acknowledges their spiritual blindness, but he is unforgiving in his characterization of them as agents of “enormous cruelties and obstinate malice.” His extensive recitation of blood libel events focuses on the violence of the Jews to strip them of their human capacity for compassion. He even calls Jews the “sons and brothers of devils.” Perhaps most transparent is the sustained discussion of Muslims as bestial and sexually depraved beings. Espina describes their “abomination and the filth of their law” and classifies them as “monstrous” due to their “odorous soul[s] and abhorrent bod[ies].” Whether explicitly stated or not, the friar’s description of each human enemy aims at reclassifying them as inhuman, demonic, and monstrous.424

Following these attempts to dehumanize heretics, Jews, and Muslims, the disappearance of the human aspect of the enemies in representations of the demons is expected. In the 1475 woodcut, the two demons are strikingly different from the heretics,

424 These descriptions come from the Prohemium and folio 130 of Royal MS 17 F VI and VII, British Library, London.
Jews, and Muslims surrounding the tower. (Figure 3) They appear as beasts with horns, fangs, snouts, and talons, among other features. Yet they are even more remarkable in their inseparability. The bare-breasted, side-saddled demon riding atop the other uses both animal and gender based hybridity to convey deviancy. Then, in the 1487 woodcut, the quadruped demon reads as a stylized dog, while the demon rider’s body becomes the locus for more specific monstrosity. (Figure 73) It is still horned and hairy, but the breasts are replaced with a second face on the beast’s torso. It recalls the Blemmyai of the monstrous races, but this demon is dangerous, rather than exotic.

The demons of the French manuscripts demonstrate a similar preoccupation with gender and hybridity as a means of expressing monstrosity. In many ways the demons in these miniatures recall the apocalyptic demons and, specifically, Beatus manuscripts. Perhaps Beatus images, along with the monsters of corbels and capitals in medieval Spain, inspired the demons in the Burgo Fortalitium fidei.\textsuperscript{425} (Figures 215 and 216) However, another figure must be considered as a source for the effeminate demons of the Paris and London manuscripts. As a result of her geographic and temporal proximity to late medieval northern courts and her representation in both paint and print, Mélusine was known amongst authors and artists of the Forteresse de la foy.

Jean d’Arras composed the Roman de Mélusine in 1393, but it was first mentioned two centuries earlier by Gervase of Tilbury. The daughter of a mortal man and a fairy, Mélusine hoped to gain humanity and mortality through marriage to the

\textsuperscript{425} The medieval manuscript for which El Burgo de Osma has received the most attention is a beautifully executed Beatus manuscript, and it is known that Liébana’s commentary on the Apocalypse was originally produced in a manuscript for a bishop of Osma. Given Bishop Pedro de Montoya’s dedication to the aggrandizement of the cathedral library at El Burgo de Osma, it seems likely he was familiar with said manuscript and could have used it as inspiration for the decoration of his Fortalitium fidei.
knight, and mortal man, Remondin. He had fallen in love with her after a chance encounter in a wood, and their love seemed destined to last so long as he followed Mélusine’s instruction to never seek her company on Saturdays. Unbeknownst to him, Melusine’s fairy mother placed her body under an enchantment, which caused her to transform into a half-serpent on every Saturday.

At first Remondin and Mélusine had a model marriage. They built monasteries and castles, and they consolidated political power for themselves and their eight children. (Figure 217) Their implementation of chivalric values allowed them to establish a network of Christian kingdoms. One fateful Saturday, though, Remondin heard a rumor about his wife’s alleged secret sexual life, and in a jealous rage, he broke his promise to Mélusine and witnessed her in her bath. (Figure 218) Remondin’s revelation was not immediately problematic because it cleared her of any suspicion of promiscuity and because he kept his knowledge of his wife’s hybridity to himself. However, the murder of one of his sons by another weakened Remondin’s resolve. Fueled by grief, anger, and presumably confusion, Remondin accused Mélusine of being responsible for the act as a result of her inhumaness. Mélusine finally revealed the origin of her hybridity and the possibility of her redemption through marriage, but it was too late. Remondin’s knowledge of her nature ultimately sealed her fate and forced her departure to the supernatural world as a miserable beast. (Figures 219, 220, and 221)

The legend of Mélusine was quite popular in the late Middle Ages. She was known as the founding mother of the House of Lusignan, whose fortress was later taken
by Duke Jean de Berry. As a result, Mélusine sometimes appears in the skies of the calendar pages of his *Très Riches Heures* manuscript. (Figures 222 and 223) The *Roman de Mélusine* was also circulated in at least eight illustrated printed editions before 1500, making Mélusine a common figure for exploring female hybridity. Her matriarchal ancestry and her physical features identified her as a creature fused from woman, mermaid, and witch, and the depiction of her three disfigured sons in the *roman* provide a tangible, if understated, connection to the monstrous races. (Figures 224 and 225) The similarities between late fifteenth-century manuscript paintings of Mélusine and the demons of the *Fortresse de la foy* suggest a borrowing of visual formulae for representing monstrosity and sin. (Figures 226, 8, and 13)

4) Conclusion

Upon initial perusal, the most striking visual aspect of the “Fortress of Faith” is the sustained representation of the besieged castle in several of the French manuscripts. Chapter Four explores some specific elements of text and image used to portray the accusations of the “Fortress of Faith” as fact. The present chapter continues the exploration of self and “other” with an explicit focus on the visual conflation of all non-Christians within the text. At stake are the mechanisms conveying the message.

---


427 The woodcuts of Melusine in her bath and leaving the castle come from four different incunable editions of the text.

428 Here, “witch” is meant in the whimsical, fairy sense. Though in some ways related, the witches of the Heinrich Institor and James Sprenger’s 1486 *Malleus Maleficarum* and Dürer’s and Grien’s works of circa 1500 are characterized quite differently as naked, old women, riding goats, screeching, and practicing the witches’ Sabbath. See Dorinda Neave, “The Witch in Early 16th-Century German Art,” *Woman’s Art Journal* 9 no. 1 (1988): 3-9.
Two underlying themes fuel the text’s visual communication with the reader. The first is the use of form as content. In the Bruges miniatures the reader encounters repurposed visual formulae in which the fortress replaces the body of Christ. The repetition of the new formula throughout the French manuscripts presents an unforgettable iconography of violent actions against a sacred institution. The second theme is the association of good with beauty and evil with ugliness. Using the distinct volume frontispieces, the artist attempted to precisely delineate the separation between human and monster, good and evil, and Christian and non-Christian.
Conclusion: Discerning the “Other” and Erasing the Self

Alonso de Espina’s “Fortress of Faith” is a text worthy of study because it reveals the artistic, religious, and social values of its original and later audiences. First and foremost, it is a text, which exposes fifteenth-century modes of identity construction. Espina’s adaptation of the scriptural turris had far-reaching implications because it was both universally recognizable and individually meaningful. All readers could identify the friar’s call for Christian vigilance with the fortitude of the tower and the strength of Catholic faith.

For the art historian, the “Fortress of Faith” is most intriguing in the moments when the text retains its universal appeal while simultaneously adopting the specificity of particular groups of readers. The work’s fifteenth-century production in manuscript and print demonstrates its increased popularity among varied audiences. The authority of the castle symbolism along with the familiarity of polemical rhetoric and encyclopedic organization met with two very different visual cultures. The Latin editions of the Fortalitium fidei, two of which included a single small woodcut of the fortress surrounded by its enemies, suggested a general understanding of the alleged attack on Christianity. However, the specific qualities of each non-Christian could not be ascertained without reading the text itself. This requirement, the physical evidence of readership, and the ever-increasing portability of the book indicate a more consistently engaged audience for the text in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Despite the quality of their execution, French manuscripts of the “Fortress of Faith” do not indicate a similar breadth of reader engagement. Such is not to discount their visual sophistication but, rather, to identify a much more specific audience for the
small suite of books. In aristocratic circles, the image of the “Fortress of Faith” borrowed from the values and culture of the courts and assumed an iconic representation of Espina’s message. The illuminators of the *Forteresse de la foy* manuscripts experimented with symbolism, metaphor, allegory, and theatrical experience in their encouragement of courtly readers to recognize the vulnerability of the Christian world and accept their roles in buttressing it. Though the illuminated miniatures of the *Forteresse de la foy* were traditionally read as iconographic exempla, they should be treated as something much more significant. They move beyond iconography and static symbolism to activate readers as pious witnesses and valiant knights of Christianity.

The variety of tower imagery in the “Fortress of Faith” advocates for the recognition of the complexity of late medieval visual culture in terms of both media and content. For the purposes of charting the evolution of images of the “Fortress of Faith,” five discreet manifestations may be discerned. The frontispiece to the manuscript in El Burgo de Osma stands alone and reveals the most about its patron to the modern art historian. The manuscripts now in Valenciennes, Paris, London, and Brussels are a second group. They develop the iconic image of the besieged tower. From there the Vienna and Brooklyn images evolve and experiment as a third group. The woodcuts may be divided into the fourth and fifth groups from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries respectively. The identification of the artist workshop for several of the manuscripts should not award them greater importance for the art historian, just as the simplicity of line and color in the woodcuts should not be equated with a simplicity of content. Each type of book appropriately engaged its intended reader in absorbing communal memory and developing positive self-perception.
In order to meet these last goals, the author and artists of the “Fortress of Faith,”
toiled to forge a relationship between all non-Christian figures mentioned in the words
and images. In communicating a sharp distinction between the Christian self and the
non-Christian “other,” the creators of the text attempted to obliterate any self-doubt
among Christian audiences and rouse suspicions about the illicit actions of their non-
Christian enemies. One may argue the relative effectiveness of the various verbal and
visual arguments to this end, but for the modern reader, one thing is certain. It is
precisely this attempt to squelch Christian doubt, which reveals it to the world. The
conflation of all the “others” is almost too easily completed. It leaves one uneasy with
worry over the possibility of Christians also being lumped in with this bad crowd. As the
focus of the image-makers shifted from an iconography of symbols to an iconography of
actions, the danger of the erring Christian became all too plausible.

Through a consideration of the “Fortress of Faith’s” reception by multiple
audiences across Europe, this dissertation explores the transformations of Christian
perceptions, texts, and images as they crossed geographic, social, and media boundaries.
In particular, this study contributes to an on-going discussion of medieval Jewish-
Christian relations in visual studies. The foundations of medieval Jewish art history
examined the Church’s dissemination of a negative iconography of Jews. More recent
scholarship has moved in two directions. Iconographical surveys trace the historical
development of the Jew as “other,” while specific case studies suggest that the
traditionally accepted Jewish-Christian rivalry is better interpreted as an internal struggle
between the Christian self and the Christian ideal. The present study identifies the “Fortress of Faith” as a participant in this development of medieval Christian identity but also broadens the scope of understanding how “the Jew,” “the heretic,” “the Muslim,” and “the demon” were created. While many traditional anti-Jewish features are present in the images, Jews and other non-Christians are actually discussed through the image of a new symbol of Christianity. The fortress manifested itself in Christian manuscripts, books, memory, and ideologies across Europe and emerged as the central visual element in an international program of renewed animosity toward Jews and other non-Christians. The Jews were the model population for addressing increasing concerns about purging outsiders and protecting the Holy Land. They remain the model group for exploring the late medieval development of the Christian self via the non-Christian “other.”

Discussions of the “Fortress of Faith’s” popularity across Christian Europe and its visual construction of identity also contribute to modern debates over the distinction between anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism. While scholars have theoretically defined anti-Judaism in terms of religious difference and anti-Semitism as an issue of racial difference arising only in the nineteenth century, the literature reflects the complications involved in drawing a rigid line between the two terms in any period. The “Fortress of Faith’s” literary structure of accusing a series of religious “others” may suggest that it is strictly a product of anti-Judaism, but the demons and devils presented in the final volume of the text indicate otherwise. The literary and visual likening of the Jews to the demons draws
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on medieval Christian belief in a biological distinction, which labeled the Jews as a sub-human race linked with Satan in their efforts to ruin Christendom. Therefore, the “Fortress of Faith” mediates between anti-Jewish and anti-Semitic ideas for late medieval audiences across Europe.

Espina’s “Fortress of Faith” is a classic example of the universal struggle between the self and the “other” in medieval Christianity. At times shocking to modern readers, it offered nothing unexpected to its original audiences in terms of content. On the contrary, it appealed to their innermost fears about societal and religious neighbors, while consoling them about their own inner natures. While a wealth of scholarship exists identifying the phenomenon of fearing the self and projecting onto the “other,” humans have not adjusted their worldviews significantly. The intellectual recognition of prejudice and irrational xenophobia often fails to yield peaceful coexistence, and fifteenth-century paranoia penetrates far into the modern world. The “Jewish problem” at the heart of this study echoes in the most horrifying moments of European history and is simply reinvented to address new racial and religious fears in modern society. Recent attacks against African Americans, Muslim Americans, LGBTQ communities, and an endless list of others indicate the continued role of unfounded fear in acts of terrorism and hate. Historians in all disciplines must continue to study these events. Only through doing so might the world better understand and better prevent them.

Appendix I: Manuscripts of Alonso de Espina’s *Fortalitium fidei*

**Manuscripts**

**Latin**

*Fortalitium fidei* (c. 1460), El Burgo de Osma, Biblioteca de la Catedral, códice 154.

**French**

*Forteresse de la foy* (c. 1460-80), trans. by Pierre Richart dit l’Oiselet Berne, Bürger-Bibliothek, MS 84.

*Forteresse de la foy* (c. 1460-80), Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 244.

*Forteresse de la foy* (c. 1460-80), Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 515.

*Forteresse de la foy* (c. 1460-80), Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. français, 20067-69.

*Forteresse de la foy* (c. 1460-80), London, British Library, MS Royal 17 F VI, VII.

*Forteresse de la foy* (c. 1460-80), London, British Library, MS Royal 19 E IV.

*Forteresse de la foy* (c. 1460-80), Brussels, Bibliothèque royale, MS 9007.

*Forteresse de la foy* (c. 1460-90), Wien, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek, MSS 2535.

*Forteresse de la foy* (c. 1460-90), Wien, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek, MSS 2536.

*Forteresse de la foy* (presumed fragment c. 1460-90), Brooklyn, Brooklyn Museum, Accession 11.506.

*Forteresse de la foy* (presumed fragment c. 1460-90), Brooklyn, Brooklyn Museum, Accession 11.507.
Appendix II: Printed Editions of the *Fortalitium fidei*

**Latin**


_____. *Fortalitium fidei*. Basel: Bernhard Richel, 1475.


_____. *Fortalitium fidei contra fidei christianae hostes*. Lyon: Guillaume Balsarin, 1487.


**Vernacular**

_____. *Festung des Glaubens*. 1476.

_____. *Fortalizio delle fede contro gli Ebrei, li Saraceni, ed altri inimici della Cristiana Religione*. Carmagnole, 1522.
Appendix III: Catalog of Printed Copies of the *Fortalitium fidei* in Public Collections

Appendix III provides a listing of all known printed copies of the *Fortalitium fidei* currently residing in public library collections. In brief summary, the present author can account for fifty-nine copies of the 1471 edition, forty-two copies of the 1475 edition, seventy-three copies of the 1485 edition, twenty copies of the 1487 editions, seventy-six copies of the 1494 edition, twenty-seven copies of the 1511 edition, and nineteen copies of the 1525 edition. Remnant records of other copies exist but remain unconfirmed. If historians’ estimates of approximately two hundred copies in a single edition are correct, this list only accounts for approximately one quarter of the books produced. However, the sample is large enough to draw some significant conclusions. This appendix provides the holding institution, location, edition year, and shelf mark when available. All copies examined specifically for the purposes of this study are indicated in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Shelf Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prämonstratenser</td>
<td>Aigen-Schlägl</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Union Catalogue and Danish National Bibliography</td>
<td>Ballerup</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Inc.typ.Q.I.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadtbibliothek, University of Basel</td>
<td>Bamberg</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Inc 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussicher Kulturbesitz, Haus Potsdamer Strase</td>
<td>Basel</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>f IG4.S87 M35 1471a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussicher Kulturbesitz, Haus Potsdamer Strase</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>4&quot; Inc. 872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Cambridge, England</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>an: 4&quot; Inc. 2623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Erlangen-</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Inc. 1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>Erlangen</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Freiburg</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Glasgow</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Heidelberg</td>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilten</td>
<td>Innsbruck</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Innsbruck</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University Library</td>
<td>Ithaca, NY</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badische Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Karlsruhe</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Kiel</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorherren</td>
<td>Klosterneburg</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätstadtbibliothek</td>
<td>Köln</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsches Buch- und Schriftmuseum</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberösterreich Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Linz</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benediktiner</td>
<td>Melk</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadtbibliothek</td>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oxford - Balliol College Library</td>
<td>Oxford, England</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale de</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interuniversitaire de la Sorbonne</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>Princeton, NJ</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>5713.121f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the West</td>
<td>Rosemead, CA</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Library</td>
<td>San Marino, CA</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>89456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Höffbibliothek</td>
<td>Sigmaringen</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Sigm. 3.29 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire de Strasbourg</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Württembergische Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>inc.fol.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>inc f 00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Tübingen</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Gb 545.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schotten</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Österreich Nationalbibliothek</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Ink 3 B.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Österreich Nationalbibliothek</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Ink 29-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington University Law Library</td>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>BT1100 .a47 1471 vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzog August Bibliothek</td>
<td>Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>2(degree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Würzburg</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>t.f. LXI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Würzburg</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>t.f. LXII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zentralbibliothek Zurich</td>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>4939867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aargauer Kantonsbibliothek</td>
<td>Aarau</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>ZBSO Ran II 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish National Library</td>
<td>Ballerup</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Basel</td>
<td>Basel</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>FP I 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätslandesbibliothek</td>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Inc. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätslandesbibliothek</td>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Inc. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätslandesbibliothek</td>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Inc. 527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Cambridge, MA</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Houghton f Typ Inc 7522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadsarchief en Athenaeumbibliotheek</td>
<td>Deventer</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Otago</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Freiburg</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>3665, a 2 PATR LAT 2304/1 INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niedersächsische Staats und Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Ink 864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benediktiner</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Heidelberg</td>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Q 9669 Folio INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Name</td>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badishce Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Karlsruhe, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Dn 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorherren</td>
<td>Klosterneuburg, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>GBIV4115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsstadtbibliothek</td>
<td>Köln, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Brotherton Incunabula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
<td>Leeds, England</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>GRC I.C.37154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Leipzig, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Ed.vet.s.a.m.9-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>England, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>München, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Université de Neuchatel</td>
<td>Neuchatel, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>R00177344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Université de Neuchatel</td>
<td>Neuchatel, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>R007512477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierpont Morgan Library</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>ChL137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burke [UTS] Van Ess 3 #262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oxford - Bodleian</td>
<td>Oxford, England</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Auct. 1 Q inf. 2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale de France</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>FRBNF30014044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Rostock, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Salzburg, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Library</td>
<td>San Marino, CA</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>89455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benediktiner</td>
<td>St. Paul, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Württembergische Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Stuttgart, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Inc.fo.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Württembergische Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Stuttgart, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopold-Sophien-Bibliothek</td>
<td>Überlingen, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osterreich Nationalbibliothek</td>
<td>Vienna, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorherren</td>
<td>Vorau, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzog August Bibliothek</td>
<td>Wolfenbüttel, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzog August Bibliothek</td>
<td>Wolfenbüttel, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zentralbibliothek Zurich</td>
<td>Zurich, Baden</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benediktiner</td>
<td>Altenburg, Baden</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Union Catalogue and</td>
<td>Ballerup, Baden</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish National Bibliography</td>
<td>Stadt, Baden</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitat de Barcelona,</td>
<td>Barcelona, Baden</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Call Number/Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAI Universitat de Barcelona,</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>07 Inc 761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAI</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>07 Inc 762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Basel</td>
<td>Basel</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>FP I 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preussischer Kulturbesitz,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haus Potsdamer Strase</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>2&quot; Inc. 1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preussischer Kulturbesitz,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haus Potsdamer Strase</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>2&quot; Inc. 1709&lt;a&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitat Bern</td>
<td>Bern</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>ZB Bong I 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RARE BKS Q.400.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FOLIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>call # 07058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Public Library</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridwell Library at SMU</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erlangen-Nuremberg</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Inc. 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risbibliothek</td>
<td>Flaurling</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ink. 2(degree) K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3665, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Freiburg</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prämonstratenser</td>
<td>Geras</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franziskaner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zentralbibliothek</td>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek und</td>
<td>Greifswald</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>GeistlMin: 752.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geistl. Min.</td>
<td>Innsbruck</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Ink 00 00 06.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73 C 11 Ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badishche Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Karlsruhe</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Klagenfurt</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsstadtbibliothek</td>
<td>Köln</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>AD+BL555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diözesan- und Dombibliothek</td>
<td>Köln</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Inc.d. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krakow</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Research Libraries</td>
<td>Jagiellonska</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benediktiner</td>
<td>Kremsmünster</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>GRC IC.7333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional de España</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>INC/1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynooth University</td>
<td>Maynooth</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>RB 9 (RUSSELL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benediktiner</td>
<td>Melk</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeeuwse Bibliothek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleburg</td>
<td>Middleburg</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>2 Inc.c.a. 1545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>2 Inc.c.a. 1545 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>2 Inc.c.a. 1545 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>2 Inc.c.a. 1545 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>2 Inc.c.a. 1545 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Université de Neuchatel</td>
<td>Neuchatel</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>R004632183 KB+ 1485 (Alphonsus de Spina.[Fortalitium fidei])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Public Library</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>SHF 1939:2 Burke [UTS] Van Ess #245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Burke [UTS] Van Ess #245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>BX 2349 AL4f 1485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oxford - Bodleian</td>
<td>Oxford, England</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>AUCT. 1 Q 1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale de France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>FRBNF30014047 FOL- T- 1707 (Arsenal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale de France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franziskaner</td>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priestersem Bibliothek</td>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Library</td>
<td>San Marino, CA</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>89458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorherren</td>
<td>St. Florian</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diözese</td>
<td>St. Pölten</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Württemburgische Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Inc.fol.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Württemburgische Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Inc.fol.873(HB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibiotecha Comunale di Trento</td>
<td>Trento</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>5634166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Tübingen</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Gb 546.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrecht University</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Retzer Bestand, Ink 3345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominikaner</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Ink C 37200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadtlandesbibliothek</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Ink 7.C.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oesterreich Nationalbibliothek</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Ink 25.C.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oesterreich Nationalbibliothek</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Ink 4.C.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>Waltham, MA</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Rare ++ Incun 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUKAT, Union Catalog of Polish Libraries</td>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Opis 1 z 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare Folger Library</td>
<td>Washington,</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>INC A480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek</td>
<td>Weimar</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Inc Fragment 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessische Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Wiesbaden</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Würzburg</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>l.t.f. 515a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Würzburg</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>l.t.f. 515b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Würzburg</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>l.t.f. 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Würzburg</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>l.t.f. 356a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Würzburg</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>l.t.f. 462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zentralbibliothek Zurich</td>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>4500227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zentralbibliothek Zurich</td>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>4497437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Of Basel</td>
<td>Basel</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>ZB Bong I 503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universität Bern</td>
<td>Bern</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>ZB Bong I 503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Bloomington, IN</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>BT1100 .A45 1487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado College</td>
<td>Springs, CO</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>BF1520 .S65 1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University Library</td>
<td>Ithaca, NY</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>BT1100 .A45 1487+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>London,</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Municipale de Lyon</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>Rés Inc 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Municipale de Lyon</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>Rés Inc 487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>2 Inc.c.a. 1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>2 Inc.c.a. 1871 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Université de Neuchatel</td>
<td>Neuchatel</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>R003919109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Université de Neuchatel</td>
<td>Neuchatel</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>R003923111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>SHF 1933a:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interuniversitaire Sainte-Genevieve</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale de France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>FRBNF30014048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale de France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>FOL- T- 1708 (Arsenal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale de France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>FOL- T- 1709 (Arsenal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Library</td>
<td>San Marino, CA</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>89454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Charleston, Nathan and Marelne</strong></td>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>not yet assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addlestone Library</td>
<td>Benediktiner</td>
<td>Admont 1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erfgoedbibliotheek Henrik Conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td>Antwerp 1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Union Catalogue and Danish National Bibliography</td>
<td>Ballerup</td>
<td>1494 07 Inc 385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitat de Barcelona</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>1494 IG4.N8K6.1494a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>1494 07 Inc 385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Haus Potsdamer Strasse</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>1494 Inc. 3261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Haus Potsdamer Strasse</td>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>1494 Inc. 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätslandesbibliothek</td>
<td>Cambridge, England</td>
<td>1494 Inc.4.A.7.2[892]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridge, England</td>
<td>1494 Inc.4.A.7.2[893]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>1494 Rosenberger 24-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technische Universität und Landesbibliothek - Stadtmitte</td>
<td>Darmstadt</td>
<td>1494 Inc III 165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh, Scotland</td>
<td>1494 Inc.17 (New College Library)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>Eichstätt</td>
<td>1494 13/1 Ink AÖ 142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Eichstätt</td>
<td>1494 13/1 B X 1132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Erfurt</td>
<td>1494 Dep. Erf., I. 8(degree) 00234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Eugene, OR</td>
<td>1494 Burgess 005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Freiburg</td>
<td>1494 UB: Ink. K 3665, f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchenbibliothek</td>
<td>Friedland</td>
<td>1494 Ink. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forschungsbibliothek</td>
<td>Gotha</td>
<td>1494 Mon.typ.1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benediktiner</td>
<td>Göttweig</td>
<td>1494 4(degree)2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>1494 Ink 689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>1494 Ink. 134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler University</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>1494 BT230 .S75 1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Innsbruck</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Library of Israel</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>1494 95 F 187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsstadtbibliothek</td>
<td>Köln</td>
<td>1494 GBIV419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krakow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Research Libraries</td>
<td>Jagiellonska</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Scr.eccl.1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zisterzienser</td>
<td>Lilienfeld</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Ink 54=A.39b.N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>GRC IB.7464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>GRC IB.7465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutenberg-Museum</td>
<td>Mainz</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Mainz GutenbergM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>4 Inc.c.a. 1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>4 Inc.c.a. 1061 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>4 Inc.c.a. 1061 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>4 Inc.c.a. 1061 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>4 Inc.c.a. 1061 ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>4 Inc.c.a. 1061 cb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>4 Inc.lat. 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>Neuburg/Dona</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>03/Inc. 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Zi 2088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>SHF 1933a:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadtbibliothek</td>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Solg. 616.4(degree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadtbibliothek</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Inc. 102.4(degree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford University</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>WE.5.25 (Christ Church Main Library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford University</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Bod-inc., A-225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Inc A-543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>Regensburg</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>999 IM/4Inc.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Rostock</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Fg-1727(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad de Salamanca</td>
<td>Salamanca</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>BG/l. 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter</td>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia Seminary</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>INC 1494 .A456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diözese</td>
<td>St. Pölten</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Württembergische Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Inc.qt.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Württembergische Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Inc.qt.875(HB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diözese Rottenburg</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Wilhelmsstift: Gf 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Library of New South Wales</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>SC/INC/073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre d'Études Superieures de la Renaissance</td>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Accession Number</td>
<td>Identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Tübingen University</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Gb 545 a.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>Park, PA</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>BT230.S75 1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominikaner</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>W 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadtlandesbibliothek</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Ink A 34516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osterreich Nationalbibliothek</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Ink 9.H.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osterreich Nationalbibliothek</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Ink 28-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorherren</td>
<td>Vorau</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUKAT, Union Catalog of Polish Libraries</td>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Opis 2 z 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzog August Bibliothek</td>
<td>Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Wolfenbüttel HAB (2) [10], CCLXXXIX Bl. ; 4(degree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadtbibliothek</td>
<td>Worms</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław - Zaklad Narodowy im.</td>
<td>Ossolinskich</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Research Libraries</td>
<td>Würzburg</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>I.t.q. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Würzburg</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>I.t.q. 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zentralbibliothek Zurich</td>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>4751350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oxford - Bodleian</td>
<td>Oxford, England</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Douce 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aargauer Kantonsbibliothek</td>
<td>Aarau</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>ZBSO Rar 1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universiteit van Amsterdam, Centrale Bibliotheek</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>H 13 : 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staatsbibliothek Bamberg</td>
<td>Bamberg</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>22/Inc.typ.B.XVI.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridge, England</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>F.5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridge, England</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>Acton.d.sel.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>MA Cambridge, MA</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>SC.Ae747.471fg (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>MA Cambridge, MA</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>SC.Ae747.471fg (B) VAULT Greenlee 5100. A45 1511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry Library</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sächsische Landesbibliothek - Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Dresden</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>37.8.6012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St. Andrew</td>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>TypFL. B11RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St. Andrews</td>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>TypFL.B11RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State University</td>
<td>Las Cruces, NM</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>BT1100. A46 1511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Municipale de Lyon</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>Rés 380022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional de España</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>R/14510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional de España</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>R/14702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional de España</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>R/14709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional de España</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>R/15729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>P.lat. 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>RB425:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale de France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>FRBNF30014049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad de Salamanca</td>
<td>Salamanca</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>BG/20852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitat Rovira I Virgili</td>
<td>Tarragona</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrecht University</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUKAT, Union Catalog of Polish Libraries</td>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>Opis 3 z 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Research Libraries</td>
<td>Warszawa</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Plantin-Moretus</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>c:lvd:12862104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitat de Barcelona, CRAI</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>07 CM-432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitat de Barcelona, CRAI</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>07 CM-433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitat de Barcelona</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>07 CM-2656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Basel</td>
<td>Basel</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>Frey-Gryn E VIII 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridge, England</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>Acton.d.46.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>BT770.A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Coburg</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>Cas A 642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sächsische Landesbibliothek - Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Dresden</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>Theol.Jud.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>London,</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>GRC 4034.k.41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional de España</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional de España</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Université de Neuchatel</td>
<td>Neuchatel</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale de France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale de France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale de France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Rostock</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional de Mexico</td>
<td>Machester, England St.</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Manchester</td>
<td>Manchester, England</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Bonaventure University</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Manchester</td>
<td>Villeneuve d'Ascq</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Université Charles de Gaulle</td>
<td>Ottawa, ON</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofbibliothek</td>
<td>Aschaffenburg, Chestnut Hill,</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>16th c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV: Specimens of the *Fortalitium fidei* Editions

I. 1471, Strasbourg, Johann Mentelin (Figures 66 and 67)

   a. Sel. A. 198, Queens College Special Collections, Oxford, England

   The 1471 edition now housed at Queens College, Oxford demonstrates the frequent lack of historical attention to the details of the earliest edition. In the notes on the fly leaves, the work is inaccurately dated twice, once as Koberger’s 1494 edition and again as Richel’s 1475 edition. The Bodleian’s SOLO Catalogue even wrongly dates the copy to the 1475 edition. The inconsistencies in the historical record of this volume further advocate for its basic examination as an object of material culture.

   The large folio volume was rebound in calf during the seventeenth century. Both sides of the book covering are embossed with concentric rectangles with filigreed corners. When the book is closed, the leaves show red and gold/brown speckling along their edges, and there is evidence of a previous chain apparatus for closure.

   Red initials appear throughout this copy, but the pages remain unnumbered suggesting its infrequent use as a reference volume. As in other copies of this edition, Book Two includes a series of heading corrections inserted on small slips of paper. The red initials are quite simple, and there are no obvious marks of the rubricator. The tables are bound at the end of the book.

   Like many copies of the text, this copy likely belonged to a member of the clergy. The underlined passage, “*De armatura veroy pdicatoru i speciali,*” lends support to this assumption.\(^{432}\) Annotations in the *Fortalitium fidei* generally demonstrate reader interest in the discussion of the Jews in the third volume. However, such is not clearly the case in

\(^{432}\) “On the special armor of preachers”
this particular copy. Here, volume three has experienced more water damage, tears, folds, smudges, and rubbed out words. The only substantial annotations to the text are found in Book Five on folio 218r. The inscriptions are specifically concerned with the demons’ identification as fallen angels and their number.\footnote{Next to the printed lines, “Et si qras qt demons ceci derut respodet cy notat in summa veritatis theolice libro scdo,” is the inscription, “na° Quot angeli cecidnt,” and next to, “pno qt cecidit draco i traxit secu tciam pte stellaru celi apoc.xii.seqt cy erit suma legion oim angeloy:lix.milia et noue cete,” is the inscription, “Suma orm angloy.” All transcriptions are mine unless otherwise noted.}

b. Douce 279, Bodleian Library, Oxford, England\footnote{Bod-Inc I A-222.}

The tables are bound at the end of this copy, and the instruction rubric is omitted. It was rebound in calf during the eighteenth century, and the overall dimensions are 402 x 304 x 55 mm with leaves measuring 398 x 282 mm. The paper is generally very thick, and the leaves present a red edge when the book is in the closed position. Some initials, paragraph marks, headings, titles, initial strokes, and underlining are added in red, and multiple hands appear in the marginal notes.\footnote{Three or four different hands are noticeable throughout the book.} An inscription on one of the fly leaves identifies Richard François Philippe Brunck, an Alsatian imprisoned in Besançon during the French Revolution, as the owner preceding its acquisition by the Bodleian.\footnote{“Prof. Brunck’s Copy/very rare/vide Vogt. Simon. US/Excusit Argent/vide Panger.”}

Two of the readers’ hands demonstrate important engagement with the text, but the readers’ interests are not uniform. One hand is concerned with noting the origin of specific passages in scripture or the theological musings of important historical figures. Another hand notes some similar references but also seems to include other more instructive markers such as “replira,” “simile,” “allegoria,” “crudelitas,” and “humilitas.” Words like these could potentially serve as preaching reference points in
their ability to adequately and quickly respond to the dynamic needs of a religious audience.

The folia are hand numbered in red, and titles and opening passages are also inscribed in red. On folio 1v, the “I” of *incipit* and the “T” of *turris* fill the eight line space in their decorative red execution. Copies of this edition provide excellent examples of the variety found in early printed books. The inscription of the first few lines of the prohemium in this copy differs enough from that of Sel. A. 198 to remind the reader that rubrication was not standardized among copies of the text from a single edition.437

The notes of past readers are frequent in this copy with those of the two hands discussed above increasing dramatically in the fifth volume. Also notable is the absence of Hands 2 and 3 before the volume discussing the Jews. The book is annotated throughout with certain hands displaying greater interest in some sections than in others. The volume on the Muslims receives the least attention, but marginal notes in Hands 1 and 2 increase dramatically in the volume concerning the demons.

II. 1475, Basel, Bernhard Richel, before May 10, 1475 (Figures 3, 68, 82, 83, and 84)

a. ChL 1371, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, New York438

The Morgan copy is bound in its original pressed pigskin over wooden boards with two clasps. It is rubricated throughout and includes many painted red initials. Each volume begins with a red printed incipit and red and blue initials with non-figurative embellishments. The tabula is bound at the back of the book.

437 “Incipit phemiu sq laudes dine anotat i initut quela au tronu maiestatis dei et poniten schetis...”
438 Figure 84
The significant number of reader notations in the first thirty folia, the considerable repairs made to the outer, lower corners of the pages, and the apparent loss of original leaves indicate the books heavy use at some point in time. There are additional reader notations in the other volumes, but many in volumes two and three are no longer legible. The less repaired corners of the folia and limited number of reader notations by mid-way through volume three suggest the reader’s greater interest in the volumes concerning Christians, heretics, and Jews. Many of the shorter notations appear to mark the text for the returning reader. They indicate new sections, highlight specific points, and at times simply transcribe what is already printed. There are at least two identifiable reader hands. Several manicules are inserted, the best of them on folia 94v and 95v in Volume 3. Folio 83r includes a faintly drawn hand pointing to the printed words referencing the first Psalm in which it is said that God always protects the righteous.439

The coloring of the woodcut in this copy is limited to three colors: red, yellow-green, and blue. The tower is untouched excepting the yellow base and some traces of yellow and a red dot at the bottom right of the central turret. The sky is indicated with mere streaks of blue and traces of yellow, while the treetops and distant roofline are also yellow. The foreground is slightly yellowed, and the red paint appears sloppily applied, often bleeding outside of the lines. A ruddy-faced Jew near the left margin wears a red hat, blue robe, and yellow blindfold. Next to him are two other Jews, one in a blue-rimmed yellow hat and the other in a red robe, yellow blindfold, and multi-colored hat. The Saracen near the margin has yellow hair, a red face, and a red robe with a yellow

439 Espina, Fortalitium fidel, 1475. “Dicit eni I ps. Justi aut hereditabut tra et/habitabut i seculum seculi super eaz.” “The refrain to the first Psalm says the righteous shall inherit the earth and live forever.” See Psalms 1, “…for the Lord watches over the way of the righteous…” NRSV.
collar, while the one adjacent the tower has a white-rimmed blue hat, a red face, a red-trimmed yellow robe, and yellow-handled axe. Both demons are painted red, and their weapon is yellow. The man holding the tower wears a yellow hat and shirt and has a red face. One of the remaining figures has a red face, a yellow shirt, and blue pants, while the other has a red face, red-rimmed yellow hat, a blue-collared red shirt, blue pants, and a red shovel.

The red faces recall the trend of the ruddy-faced Judas in medieval and early modern painting, but the connection is tenuous since only three colors employed here. It does seem significant that the red was used for every face and the shovel. Its occasionally violent application draws greater attention to the demons and to the enemies’ faces.

b. Auct. 1Q inf. 2.13, Bodleian Library, Oxford, England

Rebound in calf in the eighteenth century, its overall dimensions are 390 x 297 x 55 mm with leaves measuring 385 x 274 mm. The prohemium follows the rubric. There are black headings and yellow highlighting around the capitals. The woodcut in this copy is colored with green, yellow, red, and black. (Figure 82)


This copy was rebound with a copy of Johann Sensenschmidt’s and Andreas Frisner’s 1476 *Biblia latina*. The current binding is a nineteenth-century plain calf specific to the Bodleian Library, and when closed the leaves present a dark green or black edge. The overall dimensions are 392 x 300 x 85 mm with leaves measuring 379 x 277 mm.
The name “Johannis” is inscribed on the blank page preceding the first of the bound texts, and an inserted piece of paper below the first page of print reads, “Ad Bibliothecam F.F. Min. Convent. Wirceburgi,” while an inscription between the “pro” and “logus” at the top of the first page indicates another library. The beginning of the printed texts credits Jerome as the translator of the Bible. The gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John follow the prologue. The printing is a simple scheme of black font with red initials to mark new sentences or passages, but special attention is given to a few early initials of John. The rest of the New Testament follows.

The *Fortalitium fidei* begins after 71 folia with the tables preceding the Prohemium. The woodcut is colored, and there is one large initial “T” on fol. 1r and a running title in black ink. Red capital strokes and some underlining are visible, and there are red initials and paragraph marks in some of the gatherings, but there are no painted initials or sentence markers. Although there are minimal marginal notes, the woodcut is worthy of careful consideration.

The coloring of the woodcut in this copy is more sophisticated than many of its contemporaries. (Figure 83) It possesses a greater variety of color and value as well as areas of greater distinction of the figures’ costumes. The sky is blue at the top and striated to white as it meets the top of the tower. The trees have muted brown trunks and

---

440 “*Bibliotheca Frabzum Min. Con. Herlipoli*”
441 “*Incipit epistola beati hieromini psbiteri ad damasu papam in quor evangelitas.*”
442 The Bible text ends in the left column of folio 67v. The right column of the same leaf begins with a blank space for an initial and, “Enerabili vir dno. Jacobo de ysenaco. Menardy solo nomie…” A concluding paragraph on folio 70r reads, “*Qui memor esse cupit libroy bibliotece Dilcat opus presens si retinere velit Maxima de minimus ex ptha accipe totum Inuemes quod amas si studiolus eris. Ecce iesu xpe claudio pietate libellum Sit bndictus de u homo y virgine nata Credentes verbis sacrís saluare paratus.*”
leaves of green near the bottom and white near the top. The building at the top right is washed in light pink and has a red roof. The rolling hills behind the tower grade from very light green at their bases to more verdant green in the middle and blue-green at the top. The lower hill upon which the tower stands uses the same gradient except that the peak is more yellow-green.

The tower is washed in pink and has a blue roof and light yellow flags and turret roofs. The heretics wear all grey and have rosy cheeks. The one closest to the front digs away at a brown pile of dirt with a yellow shovel. The Jews wear grey robes with white collars and grey tights. Their hats come to a pointed ball and are yellow with a close-fitting red band at the base. Their hands are almost entirely hidden in their sleeves. Their blindfolds are white, and their faces are rosy. The Muslims also have rosy cheeks and the most colorful costumes in this presentation of the woodcut. The man in the back wears a robe of red and yellow stripes with a brown collar, red tights, black shoes, and brown hair. The man in the front wears a robe of blue and yellow stripes with brown trim at the top and bottom, a white shirt, multicolored sword and spear, brown hair and beard, brown tights, black shoes, and a blue fold-over cap with a cream band. The four-legged demon is grey and white with red spots in the ears and mouth, while the one on his back is yellow and red with a brown horn and neutrally colored weapon.

III. 1485, Nuremburg, Anton Koberger (Figures 69, 70, and 71)

This discussion of specimens is intentionally brief. For the purposes of this study, Koberger’s 1485 edition of the *Fortalitium fidei* is predominantly important because it reveals the printer’s familiarity with the text for about a decade before his 1494 printing
Historians of the “Fortress of Faith” most frequently use this later edition as a primary reference. It will be discussed below with specific attention given to its reformatting for increased portability.

a. Auct. IQ 1.11, Bodleian Library, Oxford, England

The eighteenth-century binding in French red morocco includes some distinctive gold decoration. The overall dimensions are 396 x 290 x 32 mm with leaves measuring 394 x 263 mm. There is one very large initial and several slightly smaller ones in red or blue. The tables are printed on pages of varying thickness and are bound at the beginning of this copy. Red and blue initials are painted in the spaces left by the printer to indicate the consideratios, with the rest of the text printed in black. (Figure 71)

Marginal notations indicate reader interest in the volume concerning the Jews. A small marker is found on folio 57v to mark the words of the apostle, Paul. On folio 59r, a long squiggle highlights twenty-five lines of the right column. The passage begins, “Ad scdm dicendu y in hebreo sunt tria...” and ends “…scripte nili tm tres lez rebeca.xxiii,” making repeated reference to earlier polemicists against Jews and their arguments. A large portion of the tenth consideratio, which discusses the stubbornness of Jews even in

---

443 The 1485 edition could also help to establish a firmer connection between Anton Koberger and Bernhard Richel. Koberger copied Richel’s 1474 Biblia latina page for page when he printed the bible himself. Richel’s 1475 edition of the Fortalitium fidei is the one immediately preceding Koberger’s 1485 edition, which coincidentally leaves a blank space in place of a woodcut.

444 The 1471, 1475, 1485, and 1487 editions were all produced in folio size. The 1494 edition is classified as a quarto.

445 “Tabula fortalicij fidei.” “Incipit in qua pmo ponut cuislibz libri osideratones.cu...” The tables end with the same passage as the 1475 edition. “[D]ecimu mirabile ac...”
the wake of Christian miracles, is also marked on folios 90v to 91v. The first article of the eleventh consideratio is also marked.

IV. 1487, Lyon, Guillaume Balsarin (Figures 73, 74, 75, and 76)

a. Personal copy of the author

This copy of the edition has leaves measuring approximately 265 x 178 mm and appears to have been rebound some time during the eighteenth century. (Figure 94) Although the entire provenance is incomplete, the bookplate pasted into the top cover invites important speculation about how the text was used over time. The plate claims the book as an item in the “Bibliothèque du Doct. Broca.” (Figure 95) As yet, nothing has been certified, but if the book was once the property of Paul Broca, the so-called founder of French anthropology, one might draw a likely connection between Espina’s arguments and Broca’s research on the “races of mankind.”

The tabula in this copy is incomplete, and the initial spaces are left blank with the exception of guide letters never fully executed by a scribe or miniaturist. The paper leaves occasionally vary in thickness, and there is minor damage to some of the page margins, but the printed text remains pristine. The woodcut is uncolored. Other copies of this edition, such as the digitized version from Ghent, include the finished initials and

---

446 Fourth to ninth miracles or wonders.
447 “Judet pmittunt vivere inter xplainos.” “Permit the Jews to live among Christians.”
448 Frances Schiller, Biography of Paul Broca... Although Broca is best known for his work on language and the frontal lobe of the human brain, his research on the relationships between hominid species was also quite extensive. The book may also have belonged to one of his sons, both of whom became successful professors of medical science.
confirm the expected range of owners and readers. However, the 1487 edition is the least discussed in the scholarship and has the shortest list of known extant copies.449

The first annotation does not appear until the discussion of the third heresy: the denial of the remission of sin. A second notation appears in the second volume, which is concerned with the spiritual value of consecration. In the third volume a marginal note is found near the discussion of the Jews’ cruelty in taking Christians. In Volume Four a long note is inscribed next to the “Seventieth war between Saracens and Christians” in the year 945 CE. Another appears near the “Seventy-eighth war between Saracens and Christians” in 1027 CE. In the final volume, notes accompany passages on the magic arts of the demons and their war in the heavens, which preceded their demise.

V. 1494, Nuremburg, Anton Koberger (Figures 77, 78, 79, and 80)

a. BOD Douce 120

The Bodleian Library’s Douce 120 is a 1494 edition in a post-fifteenth century binding. The paper is generally very thin, and it is approximately 150 x 200 mm with some pages cut small enough to crop out the pagination originally beginning after the prohemium. In fact, the title page is not bound into the codex but pasted onto another bound page so that it becomes a combination of printed title page and handwritten inscription.450 (Figure 77) The tables are bound at the beginning of this copy. The consideratios are marked with larger red initials, some of which appear to have been

449 Rosa Vidal Doval’s recent book is an exception to this, as she works from the 1487 edition and even published an image of the woodcut on the cover.

450 The following words are handwritten at the top of the page: “Hereticorum bellum pax est Ecclesiae/Omnis plantatio quam non plantavit/ pater meus coelestis eradicator.” “War of the heretics and peace of the Church / Every tree that was not planted / My heavenly father eradicator.” The title is printed: “Fortalicium fidei contra iudaeos saracenos aliolqz chri/stiane fidei inimicos.” Two other inscriptions are partially legible on this leaf.
embellished with now tarnished metallic pigment. The tables for the third book begin
with a blue-green initial, and part of the tables are underlined in red on the third page. The “T” of turris in the prohemium is rendered in an abstract blue and white design on a
gold leaf ground. (Figure 78) The ground also appears to have some sort of punch-work design impressed into it.

Inserts pasted inside the front cover reveal two previous owners. The upper insert
includes an etching of an unmanned ship on the seas. It has two large sails and four
triple-striped flags. Two other ships are visible in the distance. A molding frames the
main ship, and the letters “I.G.M” appear at the top of the frame. A banner weaves
through the frame displaying the words, “MEDIO TUTISSIMUS IBI,” and the print is
signed “L. Fruijtiers Scul” at the bottom. The second insert bears the name Francis
Douce along with his coat of arms. From this point the book must have joined the
Bodleian Library collection along with many of his other books.

An inscription scrawled across the top of folio 1v mentions Guglielmus Totani
indicating the reader’s association of this 1494 copy with later editions of the text. Other
inscriptions suggest a reader with a good working knowledge of scripture as biblical
passages are frequently noted in the margins.

451 “Octavu impossibile cy ielus nazarenus sit deus cu fuerit in loco determinato. Sez in
utero virginis in nazaret in galylea ic. Sicut sunt alia corpora. Cxxix.” “The eighth is the
impossibility of the Nazarene being in a definite place. To wit, in the womb of the Virgin
in Nazareth in Galilee. Just as there are other bodies…” The pope is mentioned in the
margin here.
452 For example: folio 1v: “Tu tetendisti sup ea lignea i bales eius cosolidasti. Tu es
quem” is marked with “Job 38.” The last two lines of the left column on folio 1r are
marked with “Jepe: 40.”
Some passages bear red marks or initials in red or blue. Much of the prohemium is underlined in red, as is a considerable amount of the first and second volumes. Red underlining and inscriptions continue into the third volume, but it stops for about ten leaves after folio 157v and does not return with the same enthusiasm. A second reader’s hand appears in the fourth volume, and squiggly lines mark passages from the fourth and ninth consideratios in that volume. Less red underlining is found in the fifth volume than in the others. However, a manicule appears on folio 284r drawing attention to the tenth consideratio of the fifth volume.

b. BOD AA 61 Th.Seld.

This copy of the Fortalitium fidei is approximately 200 x 250 mm. It is bound with a brown leather cover. (Fique 79) Three framing lines and a rectangular frame with foliage designs in the corners are embossed on both covers. About one third of the distance down the right side of the cover, the leather is worn and there are two nail-sized holes where a clasp once existed. When closed the leaves pressed together bear a red speckling.

An incomplete tabula on thinner paper than that of the actual text is bound at the beginning of the book. (Figure 80) The folia are thicker where pagination begins, but the thickness of the paper is not uniform, and there is considerable water damage, oxidation, and/or acid damage throughout.

---

453 There are also a few illegible inscriptions on folios 14v, 36v, and 39v.
454 The squiggle on folio 197v begins with “De rebec sola...” and ends with “...intsedit et quo pomit.” About half of the left column on folio 228v is underlined in red, and the first three lines are further marked: “no habebat in cosuetudine alicui mulieri iclinare nisi solu ymagini vginis glose i suo noie.”
455 Figure 100
Several lines are underscored on folio 3r, but the reader seems to have been particularly concerned with the third consideration of the first volume.\(^{456}\) “Consideratio tercia” at the top of the page and “secundum examen” at the bottom of the left column are underlined. Additionally, a manicule mid-way down the right column points to, “Postqz phauerut cy non pficiebant in luis publicis mandates ordianerut vna subtile incooptaqz tela q vi. Debat satis ronabilil. Qn multi de luis maioribus receperut ficte baptismus.” The immediate focus on public mandate and the possibility of disingenuous baptism is striking.

In the volume concerning the heretics, a few passages from the third and fourth considerations are noted and more extensive attention is given to the sixth consideration. One manicule in this section points to, “De exudit illu de egypeto cui fortitudo sil est hinoce rontis i vntcornis qd e aial fortissimulz capit in sinu vginis adolescetule... fideles codes sanguine lauant et mudissimi efficiut...” Several lines later another manicule appears with an arrow pointing away from the words and toward the hand. The noted passage reads, “…hereticis y dictis insipientib in lxx. Interpretib: grant vbi dictu est i inuenier…”\(^{457}\) A few pages later on folio 62v and still within the sixth consideratio the words, “os in celu ponebat cu curie romane derrabebat qz instar sacrilegii est de facto summi pontifici disputare,” are underlined and “papa” is written into the margin. The word appears again in the margin of folio 76v where the following passage of the twelfth and final consideration is noted: “Decima quarta difficultas est si prelates sit

\(^{456}\) On folio 3r, “Inde e cy sandalia pontificis auro i gemis i diversis coloribus adornant.” (First consideratio)
\(^{457}\) Both of these passages occur on folio 58v. Figure 101.
hereticus...sic papa in heresy dephensus no est papa ppter qo ipso facto e depositus si
ergo...”

The reader’s mark is largely absent from the third volume until the twelfth
consideratio. On folio 183r, “anxys erit falsus cristianusi finger seviy ecclesiasticu,” is
underlined and marked with a marginal doodle. A number of brief passages marked
toward the end of the volume indicate a reader’s concern with subjugation of the Jews
and the possible eradication of Judaism.

VI. 1511 and 1525, Lyon, Stephano Gueynard (Figures 99, 100, 101, 102, 103,
104, 105, and 106)

a. BOD 4° F 7 Th.Seld. (Figure 106)

This specimen offers valuable information about possible owners of the
Fortalitium fidei via multiple aspects of its material quality. The text remains encased in
its original binding and is approximately 150 x 200 mm. Two metal clasps originally
installed on the back cover wrap around the pages to hook onto the front cover, though
only one clasp is currently functional. The spine is rounded, and the covers have beveled
inner edges. When the book is closed, the edges of the pages are a dark blue-green.

The binding is done in lightly colored leather embossed with intricate designs.
The central panel of the front cover is more deeply embossed and was originally deeply
colored, but only the red pigments remain. The outer band of embossed designs includes
personifications of the Virtues labeled FIDES and IUSTICIA on the front cover and SPES
on the back cover. The central panel on the back cover includes two figures

458 “The fourth difficulty is of heretical prelates...so the heretical pope is not a pope and
is, therefore deposed...” This and the other quotations marked in this section are
specifically concerned with the doctrinal hierarchy of the Church and also indicate
concerns of heresy infiltrating even the highest levels of Christian practice.
circumscribed in writing. One figure holds a book in the lap, and the other holds a staff with a chalice at the top and a wafer above it. Christ with the orb looks down over the scene.

A few reader inscriptions indicate the audience’s interest in the text. There is considerable underlining and a marginal note in the third consideration of the third volume on folia 109v-110r. The words, “Decium mirabile accidit in supradicto regno castelle...” are partially underlined on folio 222r as are the words “Quartus punctus est si iudei sint copelledi ad recipiedu baptismus: hic sunt duoviveda. Primu...” on folio 235v.459 The reader(s) seems interested in addressing the problems of Talmudic law and the diversity of Judaism, as well as in finding precedents and setting standards to avoid related ill effects.

b. BOD 8° F 12 Th.

The Duke Humphreys copy of the 1525 edition of the Fortalitium fidei is even smaller than the previously examined book, measuring approximately 125 x 175 mm. It is bound in dark brown leather, has a curved spine, and minimal linear embossing and gold leaf application. Small slots with bits of leather poking through both covers indicate now missing leather straps once used to clasp the volume shut. The book is well preserved but shows its use in the wrinkled spine and slightly scuffed covers. It is clear that this is not the original binding of the book as the pages have been trimmed enough to leave only the lower remnants of a handwritten inscription at the top of the first page.

459 The first passage is concerned with miracle occurring in Castile. The passage from 222 v reads: “The fourth point is that if the Jews are compelled to receive Baptism, their lives are divided in two...”
The tabula is bound at the front of this copy, and a blank leaf exists between it and the main text. There is only one inscription of note in the first volume. About halfway down the right column on folio 7r, the words, “vnde ad counth. xiii. dicit” are underlined and the word, “note” is written in the margin. The text remains unmarked until folio 240v on which the words, “qui abdalamiq machometu ex enima vxore q fuit filia hanop” and “in villa quada q dicit ntrarip” are marked through.460 On the next few leaves, a long passage within the second article of the first consideration is marked with a vertical line in the left margin, and a few other lines are additionally underlined.461 The noted passages recount some basic elements of Muhammad’s biography. More lines are noted in the right column.462

---

460 This passage concerns Muhammad’s daughter.
461 “El rabiani i affricani in magno cogitatru q nesciebat certitudinaliter ad qua credetiaru se attineret si ad credentia xpiayoy vel iudeoy seu ad secta arriano. Et cu esset machomet quatuor annoru dixit iude astronomus metiedo cy venerat duo angeli i extraxerat coi machometi i eo diviso p mediuq cy extraxerat ab eo vnu coaguluz sanguinis i deinde cy lauerat eu multu bene cu aqua clarissima i pulcherrima i post hoc cy podera uerat illud cu cordiba dece hoiuz q erant sue getis. I deinde cu mille cordiba alisi i cy semp invenerut cy coz machometi poderabat plus qz oia alia i cy vnus angela illoy dixit alteri si istud cor fuerit positu in podere cu olius cordiba oium hominu qui sunt in Arabia excedet in podere oia alia. Et ille iude dixit metiedo i cy hoc dixe rit fibi archagelus Gabriel i visione. Lu aut machomet esset octo annoy mortua matre. I auo eius.

Abdemuthaleph cepit eu i custo…” The underlining of these lines and those recorded in the preceding and following notes recount details of the life of Muhammad and suggest the reader’s interest in the Muslim war on Christianity presented by Espina.

462 Underlining begins in the second line: “sui i h Abutalip tradidit” “q instruxit eu i scietsjs naturaliba” “huic cy cu eet machomet. xxv ano” “[existe-]tiba alique tpe anni specialiter cu…” and is also present at: “nome erat iohanes” “illo malo monacho” “dictus monachus totu erat cotra” “fuit etia discipula Sergii monachi.q fuit heretic arriana. Hic Sergius in errore nestorii icides”
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