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ABSTRACT

Erin Grady: Moralizing Monsters: Heretics in the Bible Moralisée, Vienna 2554
(Under the direction of Dorothy Verkerk)

This thesis examines the early thirteenth-century manuscript Vienna 2554 in order to understand the place of heresy and hybridity in its pages and in its broader cultural context. The approach is founded on concepts of hybridity and monstrosity found in Classical and medieval writers. The thesis argues that the Bible moralisée’s representation of heretics as or alongside monsters reflects the religious and cultural place of unorthodox and heretical groups in thirteenth-century France. It argues that formal innovations and textual irregularities that characterize the manuscript make the book itself a type of hybrid. This thesis suggests that representation of heretics as monsters in their hybridization of doctrine, the formal and textual innovations present in the manuscript, and the recurring theme of the authority of the monarchy over heretics within its boundaries all work together to produce a royal reader emboldened to transgress boundaries in the exercise religious and political authority.
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INTRODUCTION

Monsters come in many forms, and the monstrous can be described in innumerable ways. The hybrid or composite, as described in Horace’s *Ars Poetica*, often falls into the realm of the monstrous, simultaneously unsettling and intriguing its beholder. Some monsters seem quite ordinary at first glance, only later coming to light as unconventional or contrary to nature or tradition. Often these monsters are multidimensional and contain further hybrids beneath the surface, offering a view of a world uncertain and filled with the strange and dangerous.

One of the earliest *Bibles moralisées*, Codex Vindobonensis 2554 (Vienna 2554), is precisely this kind of monster. A nearly unprecedented kind of book at its appearance in the first decades of the thirteenth century (1215-1230), Vienna 2554 is itself a new kind of composite; a monster that turns the page inside out and places the text at the margin. The *Bibles moralisées*, a group of seven illuminated manuscripts made in Paris during the first half of the thirteenth century, are known for their curious combination of text and image. These books, the two earliest of which are housed in the Austrian National Library in Vienna, are characterized by a format that brings together four Bible paraphrases and four associated commentaries on each page, each illustrated with its own miniature. As a part of this tradition, Vienna 2554 brings together sacred texts, allegorical illustrations, and exegetical commentaries all in an invented idiom that challenges and even subverts traditional ways of translating and transcribing biblical text. Vienna 2554 is nontraditional in almost every way, even to its use of French vernacular rather than ecclesiastical Latin.
Within the pages of this startlingly unconventional book are yet more anxiety-evoking monsters, including another example of the subtle hybrid: the heretic. The presence of heretics as a topic in commentary texts in Vienna 2554 is particularly notable within the pages of a book that itself breaks the rules of traditional transcription and theological interpretation. Destined for royal use, the manuscript isolates heretics, along with Jews and miscreants, as monsters and raises questions of authority, invention, and hybridity within the Catholic culture of France and its monarchy.

Vienna 2554 is one of the four earliest Bibles moralisées, or moralized Bibles. Created around 1215-1230 in Paris, Vienna 2554 is a manuscript that was possibly commissioned by or for Blanche of Castile and executed by members of a religious house in the vicinity. The precise origins of the manuscript remain unknown.¹ The manuscript pages measure 345 x 260 mm, and it is presumed that trimming is responsible for the narrow margins.² There is no evidence that there were ever marginal illustrations or annotations. The painted frame that contains each page's text and illustrations measures about 280 x 210 mm throughout.³ In its current state, the manuscript consists of 131 folios in nineteen gatherings of eight leaves. The leaves are bound in the incorrect order in several places and there are several missing leaves throughout. The manuscript contains passages from Genesis through IV Kings, with parts of the books arranged

¹John Lowden, *The Making of the Bibles Moralisées* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), 5. Robert Branner, *Manuscript Painting in Paris During the Reign of Saint Louis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.), 5-7. Lowden and Branner disagree as to the most likely commissioner of the manuscript. Lowden prefers the hypothesis that the French royal family commissioned the book, while Branner believes that it was likely someone of elite class but not royal. For the purposes of this paper, I will follow Lowden’s thinking on this point.


³Ibid., 12.
incorrectly.\textsuperscript{4} The text is written in Old French, and is thought to predate the earliest full translation of the Bible into French.\textsuperscript{5}

The layout of the book's pages is quite orderly and unified (figure 1). On each page, four biblical passages are paraphrased and each is provided with a short commentary yielding a total of eight small text blocks per page. Each of these text blocks is accompanied by an illustration. In all, there are 1,032 illustrated medallions in the manuscript. In Vienna 2554, the texts and illustrations are arranged in orderly columns and rows, all contained neatly within the limits of a painted frame. The texts and images are read in vertical pairs, left to right and top to bottom. The text spaces occupy the left and right extremities within the frame and the illustrations' roundels are arranged in the center and accented with little angel quatrefoils and patterned background. Like the other early moralized Bibles, Vienna 2554 is essentially a picture book. Visually, Vienna 2554 is similar to its nearest relative, Vienna 1179, in both layout and aesthetics. The Old French rather than Latin text is an important point of distinction from Vienna 1179, which is written in Latin. The other early moralized Bibles differ in their text and image layout, though they maintain the general text and commentary with illustrations format.\textsuperscript{6}

Even among the family of \textit{Bibles moralisées}, Vienna 2554 is an uncommon book in a number of ways. The layout of the pages is remarkably symmetrical and these pages feature details such as textile-like background patterns and repeated angels in quatrefoils. This symmetry

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid. 14.


distinguishes Vienna 2554 from its nearest relative, Vienna 1179, which is much less consistent in the length of texts and their adherence to the boundaries of the painted frame. According to Lowden's analysis, two thirds of the space within the frame on each page of Vienna 2554 is dedicated to the illustrations, and just one third, divided, belongs to the text. This format exemplifies a break with traditional page layouts and is just one way in which such conventions are subverted by the manuscript. While ostensibly remaining within appropriate boundaries, the contents of the frames run contrary to convention in their unorthodox rendering of biblical text and commentaries.

I will approach my discussion of Vienna 2554 through the lens of hybridity, arguing three main points. First, in its representation of heretics as hybrid creatures, or monsters, the Bible moralisée reinforces contemporary religious and political views of heretics, along with Jews and miscreants, as dangerous outsider groups. Second, the Bible moralisée, with its innovative manner of orienting text and illustration on each page, can itself be read as a kind of monster in its subversion of conventional methods of organizing text and images in Bible manuscripts. This is also reflected in the use of French rather than Latin and in the nonstandard content of the text. Third, as a part of the speculum principis genre, the book’s influence on its royal reader might be read as a means of monster-making. The education of a royal reader through unconventional texts conveyed by unconventional means is arguably a step toward the emergence of rulers willing to function independently of established authorities and conventions.

The first part of the paper will explore the idea of monstrosity as it has appeared in literature, philosophy, theology, and art from late Antiquity through the thirteenth century. A detailed analysis of secular and religious thought concerning hybridity and monstrosity will

---

elucidate the progression of thought concerning the problem of monsters. Here, Horace’s *Ars Poetica*, filtered through early and late medieval thought, will serve as a foundational concept for the further exploration of Vienna 2554 as an instance of the monstrous in both content and construction. This discussion will draw on classical, early medieval, and late medieval commentaries on the making of monsters.  

Having established the concept of hybridity as artifice prone to impropriety, the focus will shift to the link between heresy and hybridity. Here the problem of heresy as a hybridization of beliefs or a corruption of orthodox theology will be offered. An examination of groups perceived as heretical in France in the early thirteenth century, particularly the Albigensians and the Saracens, will lead into an extensive analysis of several of the images in Vienna 2554 that represent heretics. Heretics represented as monsters will be discussed from theological, iconographic, and political standpoints.

The discussion continues with an analysis of the formal hybridity of the Vienna 2554 manuscript, establishing the pervasive unconventionality of the book’s pages. Key aspects of the manuscript’s hybrid nature include the vernacular texts that do not accurately translate or paraphrase any widely accepted edition of the biblical text, commentaries that stray widely from conventional biblical glosses, and the organization of text and image on each page. Each of these characteristics will be discussed and brought into conversation with the idea of heretics as monsters discussed in the previous section.  

The paper will conclude with a discussion of the reception of the *Bible moralisée* by its most likely audience, the French royal family, and the implication of their using as thoroughly unconventional a book as Vienna 2554. I will explore the role of books in the religious and moral

---

8Horace, Aristotle, Isidore of Seville, Augustine, and Bernard of Clairvaux will form the core of writers on this subject.
formation of royalty. An examination of the relationship between the contemporary emphasis of the Church on the care of souls and the content of the text and images in the manuscript will establish a foundation for the assertion that the unconventionality of the book is in keeping with the changing self-understanding of the royal reader.
SECTION 1: TEXTUAL FOUNDATIONS FOR THE IDEA OF THE MONSTER

Hybridity and monstrosity are terms that have been employed in a wide range of contexts from the literature of Classical Greece and Rome to the present day. Over the course of twenty centuries or more, each of these terms has developed a strong set of connotations. The monster has come to be associated not only with artifice or hybridity, but also with the limits of propriety and acceptability not only in art and literature, but also in social, religious, and political contexts. In order to frame the exploration of monsters represented in the Bible moralisée of the thirteenth century, a survey of the presence of monsters in the literature leading to its production will establish a cultural context for the makers of the manuscript.

Horace, Quintus Horatius Flaccus, was a preeminent poet during his own lifetime in the first century BCE and has remained an influential Latin writer ever since.9 One of Horace’s most celebrated works is a poem often known as the Ars Poetica.10 In this poem, Horace sets forth a

---

9 Horace lived from 65-8 BCE, and his Ars Poetica continued to be well known through late antiquity and the Middle Ages. E.R. Curtius provides a literary genealogy for the works of Horace through the Middle Ages, showing that the poet was influential in the development of both sacred and secular poetry and poetic theory. The Ars Poetica as well as the Odes and Epodes of Horace were important to many prominent medieval poets. Ernst Robert Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1973); Horace, Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica, with an English Translation (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929).

10 Bernard Frischer, Shifting Paradigms: New Approaches to Horace’s Ars Poetica (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991) 5-20. The Epistola ad Pisones is the most common title other than Ars Poetica. Studies have been undertaken by Frischer and others that attempt to find the original dating and proper placement in the canon of Horace’s works, but there seems to be little substantial evidence as to its original context.
series of rules and proscriptions that ought to govern the writing of poetry. The first section of
the poem is often quoted in relationship to both the literary and the visual arts. Here Horace says,

If a painter chose to join a human head to the neck of a horse, and to spread feathers of
many a hue over limbs picked up now here now there, so that what at the top is a lovely
woman ends below in a black and ugly fish, could you, my friends, if favored with a
private view, refrain from laughing? …“Painters and poets,” you say, “have always had
an equal right in hazarding anything.” We know it: this license we poets claim and in our
turn we grant the like; but not so far that the savage should mate with the tame, or
serpents couple with birds, lambs with tigers.11

Horace introduces the problem of the composite as a product of artifice, decrying the impropriety
of such an exercise of poetic license.12 What Horace describes is not the monster that occurs in
nature, but the one that exists in the imagination of the poet or painter. His fish-tailed woman
(figure 2), along with other creative hybrids, appears again and again in Roman wall painting,
manuscript marginalia, and carved grotesqueries across many centuries.

According to Horace, both poets and painters possess the power to engender monstrous
creatures and bring them to birth in words or images, making them available for readers and
viewers to behold and respond. According to Horace, this license is a freedom that ought to be
used judiciously, lest the poet or painter become a laughingstock to his readers and viewers. The
creation and presentation of such hybrids as would be catalogued among the monstrous races of
the earth is an artistic choice that should not be overused, as these transgress the boundaries of

11Horace *Ars Poetica*, 1-13. “Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam iungere si velit et varias
inducere plumas undique collatis membris, ut turpiter atrum desinat in piscem mulier formosa
superne, spectatum admisis, risum teneatis, amici? Credite, Pisonis, isti tabulae fore librum
persimilem, cuius, velut aegri somnia, vanae fingentur species, ut nec pes nec caput uni reddatur
formae. "Pictoribus atque poetis quidlibet audendi semper fuit aequa potestas." Scimus, et hanc
veniam petimusque damusque vicissim, sed non ut placidis coeant immitia, non ut serpentes
auibus gemitentur, tigribus agni”.

12Horace’s letter is sometimes read as a subtle satire on the rules of poetry- as he offers many
departures from his own set of rules. It is also read sometimes as a commentary on the excesses
of the fourth style of Roman wall painting popular at the time.
poetic propriety. Here even the imagined monster is presented as an undesirable creature that ought not to be perpetuated without due consideration.\textsuperscript{13} Notwithstanding the warnings Horace offers, artifice would continue to yield monsters long after the writing of the \textit{Ars Poetica}.

Poetic creation, particularly when departing from the realm of the natural or the conventional, is an inventive pursuit. Horace’s \textit{Ars Poetica} is itself an example of tension between the natural and the artificial.\textsuperscript{14} The work is generally grouped with the Epistles, but does not conform to the epistolary conventions of its time. It lists many examples of poets’ and artists’ subversion of established norms while failing to conform to those norms itself. Reading the \textit{Ars Poetica} as a satire on the limitations imposed on poets and artists lends depth to the problem of texts that do something different from what they say. The \textit{Bible moralisée}, as will be seen later, is another such book.

Shortly after Horace’s lifetime, during the first century CE, Pliny the Elder produced his \textit{Natural History}. Rather than discussing monsters made by artifice, as Horace had done, Pliny treated the monsters found in nature.\textsuperscript{15} In introducing the monstrous races and describing their qualities, Pliny begins to establish the distance between these strange beings and his readers. In

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Ars Poetica}, 14-52. “…Sumite materiam vestris, qui scribitis, aequam viribus et versate diu quid ferre recusent, quid valeant umeri. Cui lecta potenter erit res, nec facundia deseret hunc, nec lucidus ordo…”
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{14} Here I use natural in the sense of traditional, or according to the conventions of literary genres. Artificial here means a product of artifice rather than false or deceptive. Horace’s poem does not properly fit with the Odes or with the Epistles as far as literary form is concerned. This is one reason why hybridity or the subversion of conventions is of particular interest regarding the \textit{Ars Poetica}.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{15} Pliny the Elder, \textit{Natural History}, trans. Philemon Holland (London: George Barclay, 1847), Book VII; Pliny discusses sea monsters, monstrous races of men, and other strange composite creatures that occur naturally but have many of the same qualities of hybridity as Horace’s imagined monsters.
\end{flushright}
terms both of distance and of difference, Pliny founds his description of the monstrous races on unfamiliarity. Rather like Horace’s poet, Pliny offers accounts of people whose heads are in the shape of dogs’, whose feet are backwards on their bodies, or who are half male and half female.\(^\text{16}\) Pliny describes monsters that he has never seen and writes authoritatively and vividly about their composition. Though naturally occurring, the monstrous races are described in such a way that they seem as artificial as Horace’s fish-tailed woman. They are shown to be monstrous because of their hybridity and because of their unfamiliarity to the Latin reader of Pliny’s day. Difference and distance, along with hybridity, are responsible for the assignment of these people to the monstrous races.

Christian writers also concerned themselves with the place of monsters in the economy of creation. In the *City of God*, Augustine of Hippo, writing during the fourth and early fifth centuries CE, discusses the existence and nature of monsters.\(^\text{17}\) Framed in a discussion of how phenomena that appear to be outside the normal course of creation can be understood as transformations effected by God, Augustine gives an explanation of the character of monsters, portents, and prodigies as works of God. He says,

> As therefore it was not impossible to God to create such natures as He pleased, so it is not impossible to Him to change these natures of His own creation into whatever He pleases, and thus spread abroad a multitude of those marvels which are called monsters, portents, prodigies, phenomena, and which if I were minded to cite and record, what end would there be to this work? They say that they are called monsters, because they demonstrate or signify something; portents, because they portend something; and so forth.\(^\text{18}\)

\(^\text{16}\)Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* Book VII, Chapter 2; These monstrous races would be taken up again by Isidore of Seville in the sixth century CE and would often appear on medieval *mappae mundi*.


\(^\text{18}\)Augustine, *City of God*, Book XXI, Chapter 8. Rather than list specific monsters, Augustine’s discussion remains in the abstract, generalizing about the kinds of phenomena catalogued by
He goes on to warn that people should not be deceived by the messages of such monsters and portents, because they are easily misinterpreted. The danger of pretending to fully understand the monster lies in the potential for assuming knowledge of the future. The monsters dwell at a dangerous limit between human and divine knowledge, a limit easily transgressed.

In the sixth century CE, the bishop Isidore of Seville produced the *Etymologiae*, an exploration of the natural world through the explanation of the words used to describe it. In book XI, *On Humans and Portents*, he offers a discussion of monsters and their place in the economy of creation. Isidore defines the monster as an omen, directly quoting Augustine in the *City of God*. He says that monsters “derive their name from admonition, because in giving a sign they indicate something, or because they instantly show what may appear.” Isidore’s preferred term for monsters is portents, and he describes an enormous array of portents that, though seemingly impossible, are actually occurrences of nature intended to warn humanity of some future event. Following the catalogue of Pliny’s *Natural History*, Isidore lists and describes a collection of monstrous races and where they can be found. Among these races are the cynocephali, or dog-headed men, known to the Greeks, the Cyclops of India, and the Blemmyans, whose eyes are set directly into their chests without a proper head, from Libya. He asserts that such portents are not precisely unnatural, but rather are outside of what is known of nature. Thus, Isidore brings earlier Classical writers like Pliny and Varro. These writers, he indicates, could not have properly understood the monsters and portents because of their predating Christianity.

---


20 *Etymologies* XI.iii.3 “Monstra vero a monitu dicta, quod aliquid significando demonstrent, sive quod statim monstreunt quid appareat.”

21 *Etymologies* XI. iii. 14, 16, 17. Isidore lists many of the same monstrous races as the writers he cites, and he labels some real and some imagined as causes for phenomena in the world.
Pliny’s monstrous races into the Christian concept of creation and links Augustine’s general principle of intentional creation or change with the idea of unfamiliarity. Rather than being aberrations, they are simply instructive and little known only because of their remote locations. Both hybridity and metamorphosis are cited as reasons for categorization as portents. The production of monsters is described here in several ways, including combination and mutation, and both of these kinds of monstrosity can be understood in literal or figurative senses. The extension of the idea of the monster to non-physical contexts such as theology or social standing might well have developed from these definitions of combinations and mutations present at the boundaries between the natural and the unnatural.

Even predating Horace, mention of hybridity and the monstrous appeared in the *Poetics* and *Physics* of Aristotle.²² In the context of natural history, Aristotle describes the hybrid as a mixture of separate species. In terms of the arts, Aristotle’s sense of harmony requires that the parts composing any work, poetic or visual, be proportional and orderly.²³ Along with Horace, Pliny, Augustine, and Isidore, this Aristotelian use of the monster as something outside the ordinary limits of nature became woven into the medieval imagination, appearing in scholastic commentaries, theological treatises, and sermons. Though images containing monsters were plentiful, they were not appreciated by all medieval writers.

By the eleventh century, monsters had become commonplace in the decoration of church and monastery buildings (figure 3). Monsters, hybrids, and other grotesqueries frame many Romanesque church portals, peer down from capitals, or lurk in the corners and crevices of church façades. Their presence was perceived alternately as imaginative and delightful or as

---


²³ *Poetics* 1.7, 14.
excessive and distracting. Bernard of Clairvaux, in his *Apologia to Abbot William*, condemns the inclusion of monsters and other grotesques in the decoration of churches. He declares them excessive in their quality of distraction and proscribes the fanciful freedom of stone carvers who would produce such things. Bernard, representative of the approach to monsters that would exclude them as harmful to the spiritual development of monks and other Christians, writes in an admonitory tone that seems not to allow the possibility of the positive place of monsters put forth by Augustine and Isidore.

What excuse can there be for these ridiculous monstrosities in the cloisters … Here is one head with many bodies, there is one body with many heads. Over there is a beast with a serpent for its tail, a fish with an animal's head, and a creature that is horse in front and goat behind, and a second beast with horns and the rear of a horse. All round there is such an amazing variety of shapes that one could easily prefer to take one's reading from the walls instead of from a book. One could spend the whole day gazing fascinated at these things, one by one, instead of meditating on the law of God. Good Lord, even if the foolishness of it all occasion no shame, at least one might balk at the expense.  

Even Bernard could not conceive of a proper purpose for the presence of monsters. Relegated to the margins of books and the capitals of columns, they were still too near the central space of contemplation. For Bernard, the monster is no longer the strange yet intentionally created portent that it was for Isidore and Augustine, but a threat to the contemplative stability of the monastic project. The monster represented not the inexplicable work of God, but the distraction and insidious temptation of the world outside the monastery.  

---


The significance of monsters and grotesques at the margins of sacred and secular spaces and in the interstices of books’ texts and images remains a contested topic. Even today, such monsters are still read with a multiplicity of meanings. The idea of hybrids as products of artistic and poetic freedom, as expressed by Horace, continued to function as a justification for the imaginative play of literary and visual creators through the Middle Ages into the early Renaissance. The location of these free spaces at the margins of buildings, texts, and social structures also continued, with the unfamiliar and the different being recognized as sources of potential danger. The hybridization of bodies became emblematic of the hybridization of thought, belief, and social convention. Evidence of all three forms of hybridization, of monstrosity, can be found within the pages of the Bible moralisée.


27 Camille, *Image on the Edge*.

28 Umberto Eco notes that direct quotation of the *Ars Poetica* appears in Cennino Cennini and other contemporary writers on the nature of art. The continuity of the idea that the artist has power to produce hybrids not possible in nature runs from the lifetime of Horace himself right through the Middle Ages and Renaissance. Umberto Eco, *Art and Beauty in the Middle Ages* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 101.

29 Hybridity is a concept that has been applied to many areas of study. This topic figures into literary studies, sociological surveys, and postcolonial theory, among many other areas. A full discussion of this material does not fall within the purview of this thesis, but is nevertheless of interest for further research. Notable books on the subject include Caroline Walker Bynum, *Metamorphosis and Identity* (New York: MIT Press, 2001), Ruth Melinkoff, *Averting Demons* (Los Angeles: Ruth Melinkoff Publications, 2004), and Partha Mitter, *Much Maligned Monsters: a History of European Reactions to Indian Art* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2013), among many others.
Hybridity and monstrosity are not concepts reserved for the description of physical irregularities or inventions of the artistic imagination. Hybridization of religious beliefs, particularly the combination of orthodox Christian doctrine with Gnostic or otherwise unorthodox tenets, was an issue that had plagued the Church from its first centuries through the Middle Ages. Heretical, corrupted or hybridized, belief systems were perceived as dangerous to the integrity of the Church and individual Christians and their proponents were cast as evil, devil-inspired, or injurious even during the earliest years of Christianity. The attitude of Patristic writers toward heresy and heretics was formative for medieval thought on this subject.

Theological responses to heresies with lineage reaching centuries into the Christian past were not specifically concerned with the visual representation of heresy and heretics, but their insights are recognizable in many of the illustrations in Vienna 2554. In exploring the antecedents of heresies still active during the Middle Ages, the writings of Irenaeus of Lyons and Augustine of Hippo offer insight into the Christological and Gnostic heresies still prevalent by the time that Vienna 2554 was produced. Dualism was a hallmark of most Christian heresies with adherents in France during the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries when the manuscript was written and illustrated.

Among the earliest Christian writers on heresy, Irenaeus of Lyons lived and wrote during the second century CE. His *Adversus Haereses* has been a classic of Christian apologetics since its production and deals with the strands of dualist heresy propagated by Valentinus and Marcion, both prevalent at his time. Irenaeus argues against the basic dualist tenet that there were two
discrete powers at work in the creation of the world, one good and one evil. To the heretics’ idea that the observable world in its imperfect state was not a result of intentional creation by one all-powerful God, but of the degeneration of a world created by spirits subordinate to God, Irenaeus argues for the necessity of a single God responsible for the genesis of the world and fully aware of the eventual entry of sin and corruption into it.\textsuperscript{30} As one of the earliest voices establishing the Church’s position on the nature of God and creation, Irenaeus helped found a tradition of asserting the danger associated with heresy. In Chapter XI, he says, “these individuals delight in making accusations, and because, like calumniators, they assail things that are above calumny, bringing against us many parables and difficulties…”\textsuperscript{31} Irenaeus asserts that he and other orthodox theologians are in a position of responsibility to bring reason and truth to the heretics who ought to listen and be converted.\textsuperscript{32}

Augustine of Hippo, almost two centuries after Irenaeus, wrote extensive apologetic treatises in opposition to the Christological heresy Manichaeism.\textsuperscript{33} Having once belonged to the Manichaean sect himself, Augustine was in a privileged position to answer its arguments against orthodox doctrine. Like many other early heresies, this one was dualist and asserted that good and evil were equal forces in the world, with material creation understood as fundamentally evil.

\textsuperscript{30}Irenaeus of Lyons, \textit{St. Irenaeus of Lyons, Against the Heresies} (New York, NY: Newman Press, 1992), II.iii-v. Irenaeus goes on to treat a wide range of heretical beliefs and practices. His treatise is one of the main primary sources that offer information on the doctrine of sects like Marcion’s and Valentinus’s.

\textsuperscript{31}Ibid., II.xi.2.

\textsuperscript{32}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{33}Augustine of Hippo, \textit{Contra Epistolam Manichaei Quam Vacant Fundamenti. The Early Church Fathers and Other Works}, (Edinburgh: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1867). This treatise was written in 397 CE. It is one of several works on the subject of the Manichaean heresy.
and the purely spiritual as good and true.\textsuperscript{34} Augustine argues that such dualism is inconsistent with the goodness and omnipotence attributed to God by orthodox doctrine. The Manichaean inconsistency of labeling the material world evil while still attributing a physical nature to God, albeit ethereal, is an aspect of the heresy strongly refuted by Augustine.\textsuperscript{35} Augustine’s arguments against this brand of dualism form some of the core criticisms of later dualist sects that would crop up in medieval Western Europe.

The Church’s response to the Bogomils, Waldensians, and Cathars through the Middle Ages was a combination of theological refutation, in the tradition of Irenaeus and Augustine, and political maneuvers intended to marginalize heretical groups. These responses are clearly represented in the texts and the images of Vienna 2554.

\textsuperscript{34}Ibid., Chapter 13.

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., Chapter 15.
SECTION 3: THE REPRESENTATION OF HERETICS IN THE BIBLE MORALISÉE

Heresy, in its broadest definition as non-orthodox belief, is referred to throughout the Bible moralisée. Though the illustrations for the Bible paraphrases are filled with innovations on classic iconography, the commentaries and their illustrations offer a particularly intriguing view of the contemporary cultural position of Jews, heretics, and the catchall group referred to as miscreants. Vienna 2554 features a remarkable quantity of references to Jews, heretics, and miscreants. References to these groups occur again and again throughout the manuscript, in both commentary texts and images. The treatment of Jews in the Bible moralisée has been extensively studied, but there is less literature dealing with the heretics and miscreants. The representation of heretics, in particular, merits further investigation in relationship to the theme of the monster. In a number of the commentary illustrations, heretics are presented alongside devils or demons of various kinds. These devil figures are often hybrid creatures, whether of human shape with a grotesque face and costumed as royalty, human-shaped figures with dragon tails and horns, or composite beasts. In most cases the demons appear to be allied with the heretics or urging them on in their errors.

During the period in which Vienna 2554 was created, the term heretic was applied to almost any group perceived to be at odds with orthodox Catholicism, from Christian dualist sects to Saracens. Practically, unorthodox beliefs and practices were seen as profound threats to the unity of the Church and the salvation of souls and so were both feared and condemned. The

36See Sara Lipton in Images of Intolerance and Dark Mirror.
37Luther Link, The Devil: a Mask Without a Face, (London: Reaktion, 1995), 90.
condemnation of heresy was not limited to the Church authorities, but was also taken up by political powers invested in strong alliance with the Church. The drive to cleanse kingdoms of heresy was thus motivated by both spiritual and temporal concerns, perhaps accounting for the presence of anti-heresy texts and images in books like the *Bible moralisée*. These illustrations could easily have served an educational function for nobility or royalty, bolstering their sense that the mission against the heretics, in league with the devil, was indeed ordained by God and supported by the Church.

The first notable instance of heretics portrayed in Vienna 2554 is on folio 18r, medallion C (figure 4). The Bible verse paraphrased in medallion C is Exodus 4:6, reading, "Here God commands Moses to put out his hand and he does so and it turns leprous." The illustration is quite literal, showing Moses' hand covered in bright spots. The associated commentary reads, "That God commanded Moses to put out his hand and it turned leprous signifies those who are out from the Holy Church and who are separated from it and from its company and who turn wicked and leprous like the hand that turned leprous." Though heresy is not named specifically here, the set of images and texts offers an opening idea of the problems perceived as attendant on

---

38 Ibid., 93.
40 There are several methods of foliation used by different scholars for Vienna 2554. Rather than following the complex systems used by Lowden and Hausserr, I use the system according to which Gerald Guest’s translations appear in the half-scale facsimile edition. This paper, following Guest, will use the penciled numbers that appear at the top of each recto. Gerald Guest, *Bible moralisée: Codex Vindobonensis 2554, Vienna, Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* (London: Harvey Miller, 1995).
41 Ibid., 72.
42 Ibid., 72.
heterodoxy. In the image, four figures, one wearing a heretic's round cap, are sent away by the Church personified as a woman crowned and cloaked in blue. The heretic figures are covered in red spots, indicating that they are banished due to their disfigurement. Leprosy is a visible illness, and one resulting in social isolation. Sufferers are pushed to the margins of society as heretics and miscreants are pushed to the extremities of the Church or entirely out of it. Separation from the Church, as in heresy, results in disfigurement or the deadly disease of sin. The ugliness of the disease is used as a metaphor for the ugliness of the soul sunk in false doctrine. The sores of leprosy stand as outward signs of the interior wounds inflicted by disharmony with the Church.\textsuperscript{43} What has been made monstrous, disfigured by refusal to obey the rules of orthodoxy, must either suffer the separation of fear and ostracism or humble itself and be made acceptable by conformity to the Church's doctrine.

In the next set of images, folio 18r Dd, the power of the Church is asserted as the means by which the sufferer will find miraculous healing and salvation (figure 5). The afflicted lepers, now without their round heretics' caps, come before the Church in supplication and are blessed and healed. This presents a curious paradigm, as the general attitude toward heretics and other enemies of the faith had previously been one centered on excommunication. As Luther Link observes, the late twelfth century saw a change in the self-perception of the Church and its engagement with heresy. Where once the purity of the faith had been preserved by the exclusion of those who would not conform, in this period the Church and state collaborated to bring back

\textsuperscript{43}The association of moral depravity with physical deformity or dark skin color has a long history. This particular version of hybridity could easily form the basis for a study of the colors of the devils presented in Vienna 2554. For analysis of the importance of color in earlier manuscripts, see Dorothy Hoogland Verkerk, "Black Servant, Black Demon: Color Ideology in the Ashburnham Pentateuch," \textit{Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies} 31, no. 1 (2001): 57-77.
the heterodox by conversion, coercion, or physical force.\textsuperscript{44} The presentation here of an image that suggests reconciliation as the preferred mode of dealing with heresy or other spiritual illness can be read as a hybridization of thought and practice. The idea of the Church as a welcoming figure for repentant heretics and sinners becomes disfigured by the reality of Church practice that was far less gentle than the image indicates.

In a number of the commentary illuminations throughout Vienna 2554, heretics are shown as allies or instruments of the devil. Transgression of established limits and mutation of accepted doctrine and practice are aspects of heresy that bring it into the realm of monstrosity. In folio 19r medallion a (figure 6), a representation of wicked people in alliance with a devilish monster provides a first glimpse of the idea of corruption of beliefs as monstrous.\textsuperscript{45} Here the heretics are conflated with Jews, discernible by their pointed hats.\textsuperscript{46} The text paraphrases Exodus 7:22, concerning the contest between Moses and the Pharaoh's magicians. The commentary reads, "That the magicians struck with their rods and it [the water] did not change from how Moses [made] it signifies the wicked men and the wicked people who attempt to change the word of God, but their struggle turns to nothing."\textsuperscript{47} The dangerous activity attributed to the wicked here is an attempt to change the word of God.\textsuperscript{48} The large, blue-gray, apish monster dressed as a king sits behind the heretics and grins as they attempt to spread their revised word to the departing

\textsuperscript{44}Link, \textit{The Devil}, 93.
\textsuperscript{45}Guest, \textit{Bible moralisée}, 73.
\textsuperscript{46}Sara Lipton, \textit{Images of Intolerance: the Representation of Jews and Judaism in the Bible Moralisée} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 85.
\textsuperscript{47}Guest, \textit{Bible moralisée}, 73.
\textsuperscript{48}Ibid., 73.
Christians. The visualization of the modified word as the work of the devil resonates with the idea of the hybrid as a monster. The devil forms a composite mock-Christ, dressed in red, crowned, and seated on a throne. Where the authority of the true word of God ought to be enthroned, there is a leering devil whose followers are only too ready to spread his corrupted message. This devil is linked visually with the pharaoh of the Bible paraphrase medallion above, suggesting that the corrupt ruler can also play the role of the devil if he fails to thwart the progress of heresy in his territory.

Another instance of heretics as corruptors of the word of God is found on folio 41r, medallion c (figure 7). In this illustration, a commentary on I Kings 26: 1-2 (I Samuel 26:1-2 in most modern Bibles), the heretics appear with their characteristic round caps, in conversation with two horned monsters.49 The text reads,

That David was on a rock signifies those who are in religion and in hermitages. The messengers who told Saul to go destroy David and he went signify the miscreants and the heretics who come before their wicked princes, who are before the devils, and have them destroy all religion and all of Holy Christianity and have them kill all the good friends of the Lord God.50

The devils here are of two colors, one brown and the other blue. Both have tall horns, animal ears, and cloven hoofs appended to otherwise humanoid bodies. The devils are oriented toward the monk sitting in a church edifice at the right, but they look back toward the heretics. The composition of the paraphrase and commentary medallions is similar. The rock against which David rests in the paraphrase illustration is translated to the stout structure of the Church, both literally for the religious who dwell in Church structures such as monasteries and figuratively as the foundation of the world and the house of God. The false messengers of the paraphrase

49Lipton, *Images of Intolerance*, 85.

50Guest, *Bible moralisée*, 117.
roundel take the same body position as the devils. The heretics are placed in the same position as Saul, perhaps indicating the wickedness of political leaders who allow their corrupt beliefs or moral laxity to destroy the fabric of what has been ordained by God: in one case the ascendancy of David and in the other the flourishing of monastic and mendicant orders.
SECTION 4: SARACENS ND ALBIGENSANS: SPECIFIC THREATS

The change of manuscript style and composition from the text dominant page to a page filled with images and short texts in Vienna 2554 complicates the idea of the corruption of the word by royalty. Having most likely been commissioned by or for a member of the royal household, the manuscript seems to be an instance of royalty placing itself in precarious positions with regard to Church orthodoxy. Heretics as corruptors of the word are especially notable in the context of a book that is filled with arguably corrupt paraphrases and permutations of biblical text. The Bible texts are not direct renderings of the Vulgate, and they sometimes deviate significantly from the literal sense of the passage. The same can be said of the commentary texts, with their tendency to underline the power and importance of the Church even more than the traditional spiritual interpretation of the biblical passages. The problem of mutation or hybridization of the word by heretics mirrors the hybridization of the illuminated Bible in the *Bible moralisée*. The manuscript itself functions as a monster even while its texts and images work to proclaim the danger of heretical monsters to the Church and state.

In two cases, commentary texts name specific groups of heretics, the Saracens and the Albigensians.⁵¹ These instances nicely round out the presentation of the heretic as monster, giving distinctive identity to two sects of great religious and political concern to the Church and the French monarchy at the time of the manuscript's production. The culture of Crusade was an important element in the religious and political life of this period, and both the Saracens and the

---

⁵¹Both the Saracens and the Albigensians will be discussed at greater length in a subsequent section.
Albigensians, albeit in different capacities, offered opportunities for the perpetuation of the idea and practice of crusades. As Lipton notes, while the Jews had generally been tolerated with hostility, heretics and their beliefs were understood as inimical to the well being of the Church and needed eradication.\textsuperscript{52} Each group, Jews and heretics, bears examination, particularly in connection with the theme of the monster.

The commentary images found on folio 36r a and b (figures 8-9) present a collection of devils in each miniature. The passage for pair Aa is a paraphrase of I Kings 5:2, also known as I Samuel 5:2. In the paraphrase, the scribe has attributed the theft of the Ark to the Saracens and made reference to their placing it in their mosque, exchanging the biblical Philistines for the more contemporary Saracens and temple for mosque. At the time of Vienna 2554’s production, the term Saracen was commonly applied to all followers of Islam, but could sometimes also encompass other non-Christian groups remote from the everyday experience of Western European people.\textsuperscript{53} Though the name could also be applied to Arab peoples collectively, a distinction between Arabs and Saracens was often made, a fact that makes the scribe's substitutions all the more intriguing.\textsuperscript{54} The paraphrase for pair Aa of roundels reads, “Here the Saracens come and take the Ark that they had conquered and put it in their mosque beside one of

\textsuperscript{52} Lipton, Images of Intolerance, 86.


\textsuperscript{54} The etymology of the term Saracen is not completely clear, according to the Oxford English Dictionary. The Old French word used in Vienna 2554, Sarazin, is thought to have come from a Latin term derived, in turn, from a Late Greek word. In the late Antique context, Saracen was used to refer to nomadic groups that caused problems around the borders of the Empire in the vicinity of Syria. By the time of the Crusades, the term was most commonly used as a pejorative for Muslims. This could indicate that the perceived threat of Islam to the integrity of the faith and of Christian holdings in the Holy Land were understood as parallel to the physical danger posed by early Saracens encroaching on Roman borders. Ibid., 158ff.
their gods named Dagon."\textsuperscript{55} The Saracens are depicted with an array of devils on folio 36r medallion a (figure 8). The commentary reads, "That the Saracens placed the holy Ark beside one of their idols named Dagon signifies the devils who put the Holy Church, which they have stolen, beside one of their masters named Beelzebub."\textsuperscript{56} The image offered in the commentary illustration reiterates a common misconception of Saracens as idolaters, with a brutish blue devil enshrined to the left of the personification of the Church.\textsuperscript{57} The Saracens themselves are not depicted at all, but their devil friends replace them in the composition. The devils are shown as strange composite creatures of mixed colors with protruding noses and donkey ears.\textsuperscript{58} Their feet are bird claws or cloven hooves. They are presented in the act of enshrining Holy Church in their temple, establishing a link between the theft of the Ark and the mishandling of the Church. This introduces the idea of the heart of the Church, Jerusalem, having been taken from Christians and populated by Saracens. This idea of theft will reappear in later images of Saracens.

Folio 36rb (figure 9) offers the next moment of the story, showing the tumbling down of the idol next to which the Church was enshrined by the devils in the commentary. The commentary on I Kings 5:3-4 (I Samuel 5:3-4) reads, "That the wicked god Dagon fell to the ground and lost the power of his members signifies that Holy Church knocks down the devil and confounds and seizes the power of his head and all his members and takes his power from him.

\textsuperscript{55} Guest, \textit{Bible moralisée}, 108.

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 108.

\textsuperscript{57} Strickland, \textit{Saracens, Demons, & Jews}, 165-172.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 173-174. Strickland discusses the importance of color not only in depictions of Saracens, but in Crusaders’ treatment of Muslims in the Holy Land, indicating that a perception of hybridity between Saracens and Ethiopians has sometimes been read into historical accounts.
and all his evil ones." 59 Not only are devils similar to the ones in 36ra again present, but here we also see human Saracens. The devils draw back from the shrine as the Beelzebub idol falls down atop a pile of prone Saracens. The power of the idol and the devils it represents has been destroyed by the Church, a paradigm in keeping with the Church's contemporary view that heresy in all its forms must be excised from the body of the Church. Here the commentary asserts that the Church has the power to accomplish such eradication effectively, reiterating the power of the institutional Church and, perhaps by association, the monarchy.

Continuing with the theme of Saracens, the texts and illustrations for folio 35vCc and Dd (figures 10-11) operate in a similar fashion, replacing Old Testament Philistines with Saracens. Like the passages paraphrased on folio 36, these texts and their commentaries belong to I Kings, or I Samuel, 4:3-4 and 10-11. The commentaries on the two passages ally the wicked prelates of the Church with the heretics and miscreants while equating the Saracens with devils. 60 In the first commentary, the wicked prelates and clerics use the Church against the Saracen devils, who, in the second commentary, seize the Church and take her away from these prelates and clerics. The texts focus on theft and misuse of the Church represented by the Ark. The illustrations for the paraphrases are quite close in composition to their commentary illustrations. The wicked members of the institutional faith are gathered at the left of pair Cc, the Ark or miniature of the Church is held aloft at the center, and the Saracens are gathered at the right of each medallion.

In the paraphrase illustrations the Saracens appear wearing the heretic's round cap, and with faces that look somewhat distorted, perhaps by the ugliness of heresy. The commentary medallion for pair Cc is particularly notable in its equating of Saracens with devils. Here the


60 Ibid., 108.
Saracens are themselves devils, shown as gray, blue, green, or red humanoids with cloven hooves and a variety of animal attributes to their faces. Their horns, round ears, hooked noses, and grimacing faces clearly indicate their hybridity. They are the enemies who cannot be vanquished by the efforts of the heretics and miscreants who try to bend the Church to their own purposes. In the commentary illustration for pair Dd, a similar group of devils seize the personification of the Church. These devils, though not directly equated with the Saracens, bear a great visual kinship with the Saracen devils of the previous medallion. Here the animal features are more pronounced, with donkey ears and animal heads as well as one visible tail. These devils have sprung into action, fiercely trampling and slaughtering the heretics and miscreants who were misusing the Church. The personified Church is seized by the devils, and holds her head in distress.

In an age of crusades sponsored by both Church and state, the equating of Saracens with Philistines in league with the devil to steal the Church is quite suggestive. That one of the major problems associated with the Saracens in the Christian imagination was their claim to the holy city of Jerusalem cannot be forgotten in the analysis of this group of images. If Vienna 2554 was indeed destined for the personal use of Blanche of Castile, then it would not be surprising to find a visual and textual indication of the justice of the cause for reconquering Jerusalem. The establishment of a Christian community in a Jerusalem reclaimed from the Saracen infidels could inspire the faithful to greater devotion, sacrifice, and certainty, even if it was an idea that the Crusades never fully realized. The depiction of heretics, particularly Saracens, as devils served not only to underline their wickedness but also to set them apart from good Christians. This

61Kumler, Translating Truth, 17ff.
insistence on the otherness of non-Christian people could easily contribute to the collective sense of the Saracen as an enemy to be defeated through crusade and conversion.

The second heretical group specifically named in Vienna 2554 is the Albigensians. The Albigensians, also known as Cathars, were members of a dualist sect that flourished in southern France through much of the twelfth century. The Albigensians were the focus of both Church and state led campaigns of suppression in the early thirteenth century. The Albigensians were much closer to home than the Saracens for the French Church and monarchy. They presented a different variety of danger to the integrity of the Church because their beliefs were perceived as a perversion of Christian doctrine.

The Albigensians professed a version of the heresy of Bogomil, a tenth-century Macedonian preacher who taught penitence and retreat from the world, which he cast as fundamentally evil. Bogomil's dualism can, in turn, be traced back to the dualistic Paulicians preceded by the Manichaean sects known in the days of Saint Augustine. The Albigensians' particular brand of dualism preached that there were two distinct forces at work in the world: the force of goodness and light, God, and the force of evil, all of the physical world and the devil. Because of the belief that all matter was evil, the Albigensians were not only austere in their lifestyle, avoiding marriage and abstaining from eating any type of meat or eggs, but they were also anti-sacramental. Since the Church's sacraments were deeply rooted in the matter that was the vehicle for the symbolism and their efficacy, the Albigensians categorically denied that these

---


63 Ibid., 1-15.

sacraments could be of God. Additionally, the social aspects of the Albigensians were suspect to the Church. In the practice of the heretics, women were accorded higher status than in the Church, members of the sect were allowed to read the Bible if they were able, and believers were assured salvation through a ritual at the time of death. The austerity of the Albigensians, especially when compared to the relative comfort and occasional opulence of the Catholic clergy, was attractive to the less wealthy inhabitants of the Albigeois. The heresy took root in southern France, persisting well into the era of the Albigensian Crusade and to the present day, though much reduced in size.

In folio 40v pair Dd (figure 12), the Albigensians are mentioned by name and are marked as heretics by their round caps. The paraphrase is for I Kings, or I Samuel, 25:12-13, and the commentary reads,

That the messengers recounted to David the outrage and folly of Nabal, and David armed himself and vowed to destroy him and his line signifies the good messengers of Jesus Christ who return from the Albigensians and recount to the princes and to good Christians the evil and miscreance of the Albigensians and all the friends of God take the cross and say that they will kill and destroy them all.

This commentary seems to refer directly to the Albigensian Crusade. In 1208 a papal legate, Peter of Castelnau, was assassinated by heretics in Albigensian territory. This set off the ire of Pope Innocent III, who offered heretic-held lands to any nobles willing to fight on his behalf. The resultant Crusade lasted from 1209 through 1229. The period during which Vienna 2554 was made situates it perfectly during the years of the Albigensian Crusade. In the commentary image, compositionally similar to its paraphrase image, the heretics do not appear at all. Instead,

65 Ibid., 5ff.
66 Ibid., 6.
67 Guest, Bible moralisée, 116.
the messengers who have returned from their encounter with the Albigensians offer their news to
the crowned monarch whose gesture indicates that he is ready to lead his allies into battle against
the enemies of orthodoxy. The king is presented as a contemporary David, who takes the
outrages and blasphemies of enemies as a personal as well as a religious affront.

The comparison seems to identify the persistent clinging of the Albigensians to their
practices as an offense to the monarch under whose reign they live. In this case, the monstrosity
is no longer physical, but spiritual. The creation of composite belief systems and their
promulgation placed the Albigensians squarely in league with the devil in their refusal to adhere
to Church tenets. Such heresy could not be tolerated. Thus, through the Crusade, Church and
state were cooperative in the effort to end the heretical hybridization of the faith. The image
offered on folio 40v d provides a clear signal of the state's alliance with the anti-heretical mission
of the Church, and underlines its insistence that such heretics would be made examples; monsters
that would teach and warn the faithful to remain so.
Formally, Vienna 2554 is an uncommon book in a number of ways. In terms of page layout, the manuscript is strange in its reversal of text and decoration. Rather than placing the text at the center of the page, here the text is pushed to the extremity of the pages and the decoration is given the middle of each page. Most Bible manuscripts made before the *Bibles moralisées* consisted of text arranged in blocks, whether a single column or multiple columns, ornamented with decorative initials or framed miniatures. Marginal notes and interlinear commentaries could often appear as well. The abundant decoration of manuscripts with imaginative marginalia became more widespread during the thirteenth century, but even then the text most often occupied the central space of the page. Vienna 2554 departs from the usual ways of organizing the text. The interspersing of commentaries between paraphrases is reminiscent of the interlinear gloss, but there is no continuity of text since its own frame separates each section. The overall effect is visually harmonious and stable, drawing attention away from the fact that this is a hybridized book, a monster containing much more than a simple transcription of sacred texts.

The primacy afforded the visual material over the written word in this manuscript represents a new way of reading and assimilating spiritual literature. As Harvey Stahl has noted, the relationship between images and texts is inventive, associative, and full of intricate

---

metaphor. He sees in the manuscript’s pairings of biblical scenes with typological moralizations a new way of interacting with both threads, biblical and exegetical, simultaneously. The reader is invited to engage with the visual material first, finding reflections in the content and composition across the biblical narrative and the exegetical material. In Vienna 2554, even the texts themselves refer the reader directly to the images. In many, if not most, cases the paraphrase text begins with “Here is…”.

Where the biblical text with marginal or interlinear annotations had long been the primary content of Bible manuscript pages, with historiated or decorated initials, distinct illustrative miniatures, or decorative flourishes appearing periodically, Vienna 2554 and its close relatives shift the reader’s attention to the images.

The richness of the color, the abundance of gold leaf, and the avoidance of empty space within the outermost frame of each page all serve the visual splendor of each page of Vienna 2554. The images, embedded in a textile-like background between roundels, invite the reader into the world of the biblical text or into the world of the moralization. They allow the reader to enter into an image-rich world that is not particularly dependent on the text. Instead, the text depends on the images, making the marginal areas of the frames the place of circumscription and the center of the page the place of imaginative and inventive play.

---


70 Guest, *Bible moralisée*, 54-144. “Ici…”

71 Camille, *Image on the Edge*, 48-55. The texts are limited to spaces defined before they were written, yielding relative freedom for the illuminators. Thus, the central space full of images might be regarded as a space of play or invention. The images themselves support the idea of the images as a zone in which the illuminators had great freedom. Iconographic innovations abound in this book. From the representation of heretics as devils to the unusual uses of books as mangers, tables, carts, and more, Vienna 2554 provides innumerable instances of unusual methods of illustration and communication of theological and artistic content.
The texts of Vienna 2554 present further instances of the hybrid or composite. The texts are largely nonstandard. This raises questions as to what exemplars might have influenced the commentaries and under whose authority the texts were produced. Guest discusses the idea of a single exemplar, or “Ur-Bible,” as a possibility, but asserts that if there was such an exemplar it was regarded more as a set of suggestions than as a rule by the scribes. The influence of writings by scholars present at the University of Paris at the time is discernible in enough of the texts to make it clear that the texts were probably not simply transcribed, but composed in Paris as the manuscript was made.

The relationship between the texts and the images is nonstandard as well, with images that often seem unrelated to the text beside them. While this is likely a partial result of the illustrations' having been completed before the text was inscribed, the hybridization of the relationship is, in effect, the same. A distance emerges between text and image, inviting the play of imagination and inventive thinking on the part of the reader.

According to writers of the Patristic era, the Bible could be read in four distinct though related ways: literally, allegorically, tropologically, and anagogically. The literal reading is just that, a simple reading of the facts of the narrative. An allegorical reading moves past the literal and looks for what is prefigured or fulfilled by the passage under consideration. Tropology

---

72 Ibid., 11, 19-21. Guest identifies Hausscherr’s idea of a single exemplar as problematic, noting the wide variations among the texts of the four earliest Bibles moralisées, particularly Vienna 2554 and Vienna 1179. He does not reject the single exemplar out of hand, though. Instead, he favors the possibility of partial reliance on exemplars and a certain degree of creative and compositional freedom on the part of many authors working under the supervision of a single cleric.
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incorporates the moral or practical interpretation of the passage for the good of the reader.

Anagogy, considered the highest of the senses, attempts to move beyond all three of the lower senses and achieve a spiritual experience through the passage of text read.  

By the Middle Ages, the employment of this fourfold reading of scriptural texts was common. The work of several well-known commentators contributed the bulk of biblical interpretation as recorded in medieval compilations and scholastic theologies. Among these were Ante-Nicene writers like Gregory of Nazianzus, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory the Great. Commentaries, also referred to as glosses, by these Church Fathers and many others were customarily gathered into volumes known as Glossae ordinariae. These books consisted of the Vulgate text annotated with the commentaries of Patristic, early medieval, and contemporary theologians. At the time of Vienna 2554’s completion, the most recent Glossa ordinaria was the twelfth-century edition attributed to Walafrid Strabo.

On matters of doctrine, the Sentences of Peter Lombard offered the most comprehensive systematic theology until the arrival of Thomas Aquinas in the second half of the thirteenth century. Thomas and his Franciscan counterpart, Bonaventure, both refer regularly to the standard interpretations of scriptural texts and build their additions onto the established foundation reflected in the Glossa ordinaria and the Sentences. Though the commentaries of

---


76 Strabus Fulgensis et al., Bibliorum sacrorum cum glossa ordinaria (Venice, 1603). An early seventeenth century print edition of the Strabo Glossa ordinaria is used for this paper. Doctrinal and Patristic concordances that follow a format similar to the Glossa ordinaria include Denzinger’s Enchiridion Symbolorum and Migne’s Patrologia series. The attribution to Strabo is no longer considered valid.

77 Thomas studied at Paris and Cologne, and began his teaching career at Paris in 1256.
Vienna 2554 were composed two or three decades before Thomas and Bonaventure were producing their commentaries, similar techniques were in use at the University of Paris before their arrival there. The influence of writers including Augustine of Hippo, Isidore of Seville, Stephen Langton, and Peter the Chanter have been uncovered in the texts of Vienna 2554, but they are not so foundational to the content of the commentaries as to make them classic or even fully orthodox interpretations.  

The text of Vienna 2554 offers more than one departure from classic biblical translation and exegesis. Vienna 2554’s biblical paraphrases are not, in most cases, direct translations of Vienna 1179. Unlike the Latin text of Vienna 1179, which is discernibly related to the Vulgate, Vienna 2554 presents inventive versions that differ from the Vulgate and from the paraphrases of Vienna 1179. The paraphrases distill, sometimes more accurately than others, biblical passages into a French vernacular that had not previously been used for the rendering of scriptural text. Where there would usually be references to exegetical authorities, curiously composed commentaries appear that are frequently different from commonly accepted interpretations. No standard attributions to Church Fathers or other authorities appear in these commentaries, placing them at a threshold between the standard and the deviant. For the purposes of this study, one commentary example dealing with each of the three main types of heretic will be offered. Concerning the generalized heretic or the corruptor of the Word, the text for folio 19rAa (figure 6) will serve as an example. This text paraphrases Exodus 7:22. The Vulgate text reads, “Similarly did the wicked ones of Egypt [the magicians], by means of their incantations, and the

---

78 Guest, *Bible moralisée*, 22.

79 Lowden, Haussgherr, et al on the relationship between 1179 and 2554… Guest shows direct comparison between the books on several texts, but indicates that this comparability is not the rule.
heart of the Pharaoh was hardened and neither would he hear them [Moses and Aaron], as the Lord had said.” Vienna 2554 renders this, “Here Pharaoh’s magicians strike again with their rod, but the water does not change from how Moses made it.” The passage refers to the plagues leading to the Israelites’ liberation from slavery in Egypt, particularly the plague that turned the water of the Nile into blood. The classic commentaries, as listed in the Glossa ordinaria, focus on the selectivity of the changes to the water, not on the problem of doctrinal change. For this passage, Nicholas of Lyra is the primary commentator. The Glossa Ordinaria commentary of Nicholas of Lyra reads, “The Hebrews said, ‘Why were all of the waters of Egypt not turned to blood, but only the water of the river?’” He continues to discuss why water gathered from springs had been spared. The second commentator on this passage discusses the hardness of Pharaoh’s heart, reiterating the stubborn opposition to the message of the plagues that features in most early expositions of this text. The change of water to blood in the river can be read as analogous to the heart of the Pharaoh being the only one unmoved by the message of God through Moses.

Vienna 2554 takes an entirely different tone, zeroing in on the problem of changing biblical texts instead of the problem of the Pharaoh’s refusal to relent. The paraphrase says, "That the magicians struck with their rods and it [the water] did not change from how Moses [made] it signifies the wicked men and the wicked people who attempt to change the word of

---


81 Guest, Bible moralisée, 73.

82 Glossa ordinaria, Vol. 1, column 549. Dicunt Hebraei, quod non omnes aquae Aegypti fuerunt converse in sanguinem, sed sola aqua fiuminis...” The translations for Glossa Ordinaria texts throughout this paper are my own.
God, but their struggle turns to nothing. The futility of attempts to change the content of scripture is a curious point for the commentary text to highlight. While not controverting the general content of the original passage, the paraphrase is also not particularly close to the Vulgate text. Since the text rendered in French is about the same length as it is in the Vulgate, the omission of the hardening of the Pharaoh’s heart is notable. This focus on the magicians is consistent with the theme of the commentary text. The paraphrase is significantly different from the original text, complicating the statement that the commentary makes against changing the word of God. The relationship between the paraphrase and commentary texts and their images (figure 6) reflects neither a direct illustration of the written words nor an interpretation based on the *Glossa ordinaria*. The paraphrase image shows the king, standing for the Pharaoh, enthroned and watching the magicians strike the water. The commentary image casts the Pharaoh as an apish monster dressed in royal robes and a crown. He occupies a throne in the same position as in the paraphrase image above. In place of the magicians stand two Jews, identifiable by their pointed hats, holding unfurled scrolls that draw attention to the importance of the word in this reading of the passage and its paraphrase. The presentation of the monster Pharaoh in league with the Jews rather than in opposition to them is consistent with other commentaries in Vienna 2554, yet the manuscript’s insistence that the Jews are corruptors of the word is a departure from the mainstream commentaries of the time.

Concerning the Saracens, a pair of adjacent commentaries will serve as an example text. Paired with the images on folio 35v Cc and Dd (figures 10-11), the commentary texts explain I

---

83 Guest, *Bible moralisée*, 73.
Kings 4: 3-4, 10-11.\textsuperscript{84} The Vulgate passage is much longer than the French paraphrase included in Vienna 2554. The paraphrases read. “Here the two priests, Hophni and Phinehas, come and take the ark, and they go with all their people against the Saracens who had come to attack them and they attack them...Here the Saracens come and defeat the two priests Hophni and Phinehas and conquer the ark by force and take it from them and carry it off.”\textsuperscript{85} This is fairly distant from the Vulgate text, which has the Israelites question why God has struck them and take refuge under the Ark of the Covenant before ultimately being overtaken by the Philistines who steal the Ark and kill the unfaithful priests, Hophni and Phinehas. In any paraphrase, some details will necessarily be omitted, but the removal of the specific context of the battle from the passage changes its character. The first four chapters of I Kings are both paraphrased and interpreted within the span of a single folio, recto and verso. The paraphrases focus on the priestly aspect of the stories, with the first folio recounting the dedication of Samuel and the second, with which this study is concerned, detailing the failures of the priests Hophni and Phinehas. Though they are certainly incomplete, the paraphrase texts do not offer any additions. The most significant departures from standard texts occur in the commentaries on folio 35v.

The most noticeable difference between the commentaries in Vienna 2554 and the commonly used commentaries current in the early thirteenth century is the replacement of the biblical Philistines with the Saracens. The Philistines, enemies to the Israelites and powerful

\textsuperscript{84}I Samuel 4:3-4, 10-11 in modern editions. “Et reversus est populus ad castra: dixeruntque majores natu de Israel: Quare percussit nos Dominus hodie coram Philisthiim? Afferamus ad nos de Silo arcam foederis Domini, et veniat in medium nostrum, ut salvet nos de manu inimicorum nostrorum. Misit ergo populus in Silo, et tulerunt inde arcam foederis Domini exercituum sedentis super cherubim: erantque duo filii Heli cum arca foederis Dei, Ophni et Phinees... Pugnaverunt ergo Philisthiim, et caesus est Israel, et fugit unusquisque in tabernaculum suum: et facta est plaga magna nimis: et ceciderunt de Israel triginta millia peditum. Et arca Dei capta est: duo quoque filii Heli mortui sunt, Ophni et Phinees.”

\textsuperscript{85}Guest, \textit{Bible moralisée}, 108.
adversaries in battle, are not even mentioned in the paraphrases, but are conflated with the Saracens as enemies of the Church in the commentaries. The substitution establishes a parallel between two groups perceived as out of harmony with God. Rather than focusing on the doctrinal errors of the Saracens, though, the commentaries of Vienna 2554 place the responsibility of protecting the Church from the Saracens on its priests and prelates. As Hophni and Phinehas were unable to protect the Israelites and the Ark because of their wickedness, the bad prelates of the Church are unable to protect the institution and its integrity from the Saracens. The commentary texts read,

That the two wicked priests, Hophni and Phineas, carried the Ark and went against the Saracens signifies the wicked prelates and the wicked clerics, who are miscreants and heretics, who carry the Holy Church against the Saracens, that is against the devils...That the II priests of the law were defeated and the Saracens took the Ark by force and carried it off signifies the devils, who defeat the wicked clerics, miscreants, and heretics and trample them, and they seize the Holy Church and take her from them, and the Holy Church is greatly angered and distressed. 86

The commentaries on the same range of texts in the Glossa Ordinaria offer interpretations that focus on the Israelites and their confidence in God. Rupert of Deutz, for example, discusses the presumption of the Israelites in their removal of the Ark from its sanctuary at Shiloh. He says, “Presumption of foolish vanity, which then deceived the foolish and ignorant of God's righteousness, the same as when they are subjected to siege by the Romans, they rioted and shouted confident that God would never allow himself to be deprived of that temple and that beautiful golden sanctuary.” 87 Rupert’s commentary continues with a discussion

86 Guest, Bible moralisée, 108.

87 Glossa Ordinaria Vol. 2, “Presumptio stulta et vana, quae tunc deceit improvidos et iustitiae Dei ignaros, ipsa eadem deceit illos, quando clause obsidente exercitu Romano, tumultuaabantur et vociferabantur confidentes quod nequaquam toleraret Deus se privari illo temple, illo pulchro et aureo sanctuario.”
of the problem of placing trust not in God, but in the physical objects associated with his worship. A second commentator also discusses the fact that it is not the tablets or the Ark itself that provides strength and protection, but the fullness of knowledge of Christ reflected in both testaments of the Bible. None of the Glossa Ordinaria commentaries incorporate outside threats to the integrity of the Church as the Vienna 2554 commentaries do.

In the texts and commentaries of folio 35v Cc and Dd, hybridity appears in terms of changes to the biblical text and mutations in their interpretation. The change of Philistines to Saracens is a substantial metamorphosis, and the images (figures 10-11) reflect the shift in their replacement of human enemies (presumably Philistines) with devilish Saracens bear this concept out. The Saracens in the two commentary images are fierce, and their hybridity consists of bodies that combine human and animal characteristics with an array of unnatural colors. The Philistines of biblical history are transformed into the widely-feared Saracens who were likely remote from the experience of most Parisians and therefore ripe for inventive depiction. One threat specific to the region of biblical history, the Philistines, is replaced with the contemporary threat to the Holy Land of the thirteenth century, the Saracens. The fear of outsiders’ power to change, steal, or corrupt the faith is made manifest both in the texts’ admonitions against false prelates and heretical Saracens and in the images’ visualization of the Saracens as monsters.

The final text is the one associated with the commentary on the Albigensians. Paired with the passage I Kings 25:12-13, this exegetical text is an example of timely biblical

---

88 Glossa Ordinaria Vol. 2, “Tabula enim erat super arcam, qui protegebant Cherubin alis; ubi apparebat dominus per angelum et loquebatur. Cherubin plenitude scientiae, quae in Christo et in duobus testamentis invenitur.”
interpretation. As described above, this text and commentary, found on folio 40v pair Dd (figure 12), concerns itself with the heretical group causing trouble for both Church and state in the Languedoc region of southern France. The Bible paraphrase recounts the blasphemous response of Nabal to King David’s messengers and David’s vow to kill Nabal and his house. The Vulgate passage is not particularly different from the paraphrase text, with the exception of its noticeably more bellicose tone. For this example, the commentary is more unconventional than the paraphrase. The monster here is not a physical one, but an ideological one. The commentary text reads,

That the messengers recounted to David the outrage and folly of Nabal, and David armed himself and vowed to destroy him and his line signifies the good messengers of Jesus Christ who return from the Albigensians and recount to the princes and to good Christians the evil and miscreance of the Albigensians and all the friends of God take the cross and say that they will kill and destroy them all.

This text casts the Albigensians in the role of Nabal, scorning the messengers sent by the king and eliciting reactions from both Church and state officials. Here, the call for action to be

---


90 “So the servants of David went back their way, and returning came and told him all the words that he said. Then David said to his young men: Let every man gird on his sword. And they girded on every man his sword. And David also girded on his sword: and there followed David about four hundred men, and two hundred remained with the baggage.”

91 Guest, Bible moralisée, 116.

92 Embassies were sent to the Albigensians on several occasions, by both religious and secular authorities. Preaching missions of Cistercians and the founding members of the Dominicans were involved in these projects with little substantial success. Efforts were also made to displace Simon de Montfort, a local noble with extensive lands, who was an adherent of the sect. Even the Albigensian Crusade begun in 1209 could not completely eradicate the heretical group.
taken against the evil of the heretics is not limited to the king, but is still associated with the
authority of secular princes.

In the *Glossa Ordinaria* commentary, the interpretations are concerned with Nabal more
than with David or his violent response. Nabal is described as empty and vituperative, and
David’s readiness to retaliate violently is understood as the result of provocation.\(^3\) Josephus
characterizes Nabal as a hard man, in pursuit of malignancy and unwilling to hear the message
sent by David.\(^4\) These commentaries keep Nabal in the role of the villain, while also supporting
the right of David to respond violently. Their emphasis on justification for violent action against
Nabal runs parallel to Vienna 2554’s support for the princes and the Christians to take up arms
against the Albigensians. While the spirit of the traditional commentaries persists in Vienna
2554’s interpretation of this passage, its departure comes in the inclusion of the timely religious
and political issue of the Albigensian heresy. This text makes monsters not by hybridizing the
words of the Bible passage or by assigning specific heretical practices, but by labeling a
particular outside group for organized persecution. This is reflected in the images, where no
heretics are actually pictured. Instead, the images show the moment of encounter between the
king and his returning messengers, a moment when righteous anger is kindled and arms are taken
up against the enemies of the king and of God.


SECTION 6: CHURCH AND STATE IN VIENNA 2554

Given the paucity of information regarding the commission and production of the book, it is difficult to construct a complete picture of the nature of the impact it might have had. The accessibility offered by the use of French rather than Latin opens the question of readership. One thing that can be asserted with certainty is that the role of the king or comparable ruler is a thread woven through many of the commentary texts in Vienna 2554. The vernacular text, its content, and the images associated with many of the commentaries all contribute to the hypothesis that this manuscript was meant for the moral and political formation of a French monarch.

Dated between 1215 and 1230, the manuscript was most likely produced at the end of the reign of Phillip II, during the reign of Louis VIII, or at the beginning of the reign of Louis IX. If it was produced during the latter kings’ reigns, then it is likely that Blanche of Castile, wife of Louis VIII and mother of Louis IX, was in some way associated with the book’s use, if not its commission.\footnote{Guest, \textit{Bible moralisée}, 18-27.} According to scholarship from 1970 to the present, Vienna 2554 could well have been intended for the use of Blanche of Castile.\footnote{Robert Branner and John Lowden disagree on this point. Branner holds that a prominent member of the court commissioned Vienna 2554, \textit{Manuscript Painting in Paris}, 2-5. Lowden prefers the theory that it was a royal commission, \textit{The Making of the Bibles Moralisées}, 50-52.} With the death of her husband in 1226, Blanche became her twelve-year-old son’s regent and, effectively, the ruler of France. This
would have placed a vernacular iteration of biblical text without explicit Church authority or approval in the hands of a politically powerful laywoman.\textsuperscript{97}

It has been asserted that the \textit{Bibles moralisées} could well belong to the genre of the \textit{speculum principis}, a kind of vernacular text oriented to the formation of rulers in the proper conduct of their kingdoms, both politically and spiritually.\textsuperscript{98} The genre, if indeed applicable, would be hospitable to such a hybrid as Vienna 2554, with its combination of the spiritual and temporal. The manuscript, a peculiar hybrid of texts, images, commentaries, and inversions, presents the risk of making another monster— the dangerously educated layperson. Though the Church reform movement concerned with the care of souls through the education of clergy and in turn of laypeople was fully sanctioned by the Church, it is not clear that the institution maintained full control of the production of catechetical and homiletic manuals.

In 1215, the Canons of the Fourth Lateran Council were promulgated, and they included institutional statements on a range of subjects including the pastoral care of souls and the approach that ought to be taken toward heresy.\textsuperscript{99} Regarding pastoral care, the Council legislated that the theological education of the clergy ought to be guaranteed through the establishment of schools in every diocese. The text of the decree clearly links the education of clergy with the broader goal of the care of souls:

\begin{quote}
Lowden, \textit{The Making of the Bibles Moralisées}, 52, reviews and rejects earlier literature that asserts a relationship of necessity between the use of vernacular text and a female intended reader. His entertainment of the possibility of Blanche of Castile as patron is founded not on the language, but on the length of her presence at the French court and the large quantity of books she is known to have commissioned.

Guest, \textit{Bible moralisée}, 21.

\end{quote}
… not only in every cathedral church but also in other churches where means are sufficient, a competent master be appointed by the prelate with his chapter, or elected by the greater and more discerning part of the chapter, who shall instruct *gratis* and to the best of his ability the clerics of those and other churches in the art of grammar and in other branches of knowledge. In addition to a master, let the metropolitan church have also a theologian, who shall instruct the priests and others in the Sacred Scriptures and in those things especially that pertain to the *cura animarum*.100

The emphasis on the spiritual education of clergy extended to their role in the religious formation of the laity they served. Around the time of the Council, a new literature of preaching manuals, devotional texts, and catechetical treatises took root.101 The growing emphasis on the communication of religious knowledge through preaching and instruction is reflected in the content and quantity of spiritual literature produced during the first half of the thirteenth century. The doctrinal and biblical exegesis that was produced during this period was aimed at bringing the lay faithful to a fuller understanding of the fundamental tenets of Catholic orthodoxy. The bulk of this spiritual literature was written in Latin, for a clerical audience expected to translate and transmit its content. The vernacular text of Vienna 2554 needs no such translator, possibly making it more accessible to a lay reader than a Latin text might be.

Though a royal reader would likely have had little trouble reading a Latin Bible, the use of French brings the text into a closer relationship with the language of everyday life. If the cultural climate from which the manuscript emerged was one of increased interest in the care of souls, then the use of language that brings the interpretation of scripture into conversation with the life experience of its reader is not surprising. The combination of the language of practical life with commentary content geared to the spiritual and political development of the royal reader supports the assignment of Vienna 2554 to the *speculum principis* genre described above.

100 Fourth Lateran Council, Canon 11.

Woven throughout the commentaries are discernible references to contemporary writers and contemporary moral issues including politics. Guest raises the question of why certain books of the Bible-the Psalms, Gospels, and Epistles-were probably not included in the original group of books comprising Vienna 2554. He theorizes that these books might have been omitted due to their relative theological complexity, which could have led to interpretive difficulties and the danger of doctrinal error. The translation into the vernacular produced the fear of doctrinal, specifically heretical, error. As the reading and interpretation of scripture had traditionally been reserved for the clergy, the idea of translations being accessible to readers outside the Church hierarchy was novel and also risky. Allowing vernacular translations into the hands of a lay reader, even a royal one, could potentially undermine the authority of the Church.

The importance of strong rulers in support of the Church is a theme that appears in many commentary texts and the images they illustrate. The picture of kingship, both literary and visual, offered by Vienna 2554 is often consistent with certain ideals of the reform movement instituted by the Fourth Lateran Council, though the parallel presented between the biblical kings and the Capetian kings of the manuscript’s present day is not always direct. The association of the kings of the Bible with the kings of France not only lends credibility to claims of authority

---


103 Ibid., 25.

104 James Michael Heinlen, “The Ideology of Reform in the French Moralized Bible” (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1991), 196ff. Heinlen identifies 203 instances of kings represented in Vienna 2554, about one fifth of the images altogether. Even more than the content of the text, according to Heinlen, the prevalence of kings in the images argues for the assignment of the manuscript to the *speculum principis* genre.

105 Ibid., 198-200. Heinlen notes that direct prefigurations of contemporary kings by biblical ones are not especially common in this book, as negative exemplars are more numerous than positive ones.
sanctioned by God, but also provides a means of justification for their actions on behalf of the preservation and protection of the faith. Heinlen asserts the importance of the relationship between the monarch and the Church, noting that the good king in Vienna 2554 is someone who listens to the advice of righteous prelates, participates in the sacraments, and upholds the purity of the faith.¹⁰⁶

Threats to authority, whether threats of heresy to the doctrinal authority of the Church or threats of insurrection against the rightful authority of the crown in the enforcement of religious practice and doctrinal purity, are consistently presented as the responsibility of the ruler. The power and right of the ruler to establish and maintain a kingdom free of heresy, in fact, is reiterated a number of times. The ruler is encouraged to take matters of heresy, encompassing the problems associated with Jews, heretics, and miscreants, into his own hands on behalf of the Church. The emboldening of the ruler to act in a manner consistent with, but not necessarily directed by, the Church is analogous to the less than standard arrangement and contents of Vienna 2554.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., 206-207.
CONCLUSION

The early *Bibles moralisées*, especially Vienna 2554, are codices that illustrate early thirteenth-century religious and political thought. Through an examination of the formal and textual hybridity of one of the two earliest *Bibles moralisées*, Vienna 2554, it becomes clear that the illuminated book is far less conventional than it might first seem. Though the text and images all stay tidily contained within their frames on the page, the content that they convey is rarely traditional and often points to instances of hybridity and monstrosity perceived as a part of the world at the time of the book’s production between 1215 and 1230.

The continual use of a page layout that privileges the image over the text, even in the order of its production, contributes to the hybrid character of the book and its pages. By moving the text to the extremity of the page frame and exaggerating the proportion of images to text, the illustration becomes the focal point of the manuscript and the power of the text as a primary communicator of content is challenged. The alteration of standard page formats can be read as a hybridization in the sense of metamorphosis or mutation. In the early *Bibles moralisées*, but particularly in Vienna 2554, traditional means of page organization are turned inside out, making a beautiful monster pleasing to behold yet filled with dangerous knowledge in an accessible vernacular.

Throughout the discussion, classical and early Christian concepts of hybridity have shown the continuity of the development of ideas about monsters and their place in the world. While these ideas helped establish monsters as a part of the natural world or the product of artistic invention for writers and artists of the Middle Ages, they also served as a basis for establishing problems associated with otherness in physical, geographic, or theological terms.
Hybridization as mutation, combination, or corruption by means of theological or artistic artifice became increasingly important as a strand in medieval thought and visual representation.

In the series of images discussed above, the representation of heretics as hybrids, or monsters, works simultaneously to show the danger of the hybridization of religious belief and to visualize the profound differences perceived between orthodox Christians and heretical sects. Through these images and their associated texts and commentaries, the threat posed by the otherness of heretics, including Saracens and Albigensians, becomes perceptible. Responses to heresy on the part of the Church and the secular authorities are justified in the interplay between texts and images. The inculcation of fear concerning heresy and heretics and the cultivation of the idea that swift and strong responses to these problems are justified are two significant results of Vienna 2554’s presentation of heresy.

The participation of Vienna 2554 in the *speculum principis* genre situates it in a position of power consistent not only with the educational goals of the *cura animarum*, but also with the increasing power and stability of the French monarchy at the time. As a book intended to be formative for its royal readers, Vienna 2554 is capable not only of retaining its own status as a monster, hybridizing text and image in form and content, but also of making a monster of its reader, perpetuating the power of the monarchy in a manner not explicitly subordinate to the authority of the Church.
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### Heretics in Vienna 2554

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio and Place</th>
<th>Bible Passage</th>
<th>Theme (if any)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18r c</td>
<td>Ex. 4:6</td>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r a</td>
<td>Ex. 7:22</td>
<td>Changing the Word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20v d</td>
<td>Ex. 12:23, 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23r c</td>
<td>Ex. 17:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23r d</td>
<td>Ex. 18:13-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25v a</td>
<td>Ex. 32:4-6</td>
<td>Idolatry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26r c</td>
<td>Ex. 32:26-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26r d</td>
<td>Ex. 32:28</td>
<td>Excommunication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29v c</td>
<td>Lev. 11:10-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30r d</td>
<td>Lev. 24:10-14</td>
<td>Mock the Sacraments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30v a</td>
<td>Lev. 24:16</td>
<td>Mock God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62v b</td>
<td>Judges 15:4-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65r a</td>
<td>Judges 19:22-23</td>
<td>Destroy the Sacraments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65r c</td>
<td>Judges 19:25</td>
<td>Stealing Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65r d</td>
<td>Judges 19:25-28</td>
<td>Trample Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63r d</td>
<td>Ruth 1:6, 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35v c</td>
<td>I Kings 4:3-4</td>
<td>Misuse of the Church</td>
<td>Saracens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35v d</td>
<td>I Kings 4:10-11</td>
<td>Theft of the Church</td>
<td>Saracens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36r a</td>
<td>I Kings 5:2</td>
<td>Theft of the Church, Idolatry</td>
<td>Saracens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36r c</td>
<td>I Kings 5:6</td>
<td>Saracens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36r d</td>
<td>I Kings 6:5</td>
<td>Saracens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36v b</td>
<td>I Kings 6:13, 19</td>
<td>Saracens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37r b</td>
<td>I Kings 15:7-9</td>
<td>False teaching</td>
<td>Saracens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38r c</td>
<td>I Kings 17:1-9</td>
<td>Saracens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39v d</td>
<td>I Kings 24:4-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40v d</td>
<td>I Kings 25:12-12-13</td>
<td>Albigensians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41r c</td>
<td>I Kings 26:1-2</td>
<td>Destroy religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42r a</td>
<td>I Kings 30:1-2, 5</td>
<td>Theft of the Church</td>
<td>Saracens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43v a</td>
<td>II Kings 2:8-9</td>
<td>Idolatry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43v d</td>
<td>II Kings 5:6-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50r a</td>
<td>III Kings 3:23-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53r c</td>
<td>III Kings 18: 20-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53v b</td>
<td>III Kings 18:40</td>
<td>Idolatry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56v a</td>
<td>IV Kings 1:11-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numerical foliation is out of order because the folios were rebound incorrectly.\(^{107}\) All of the biblical passage references come from Guest’s translations.\(^{108}\)

\(^{107}\)Guest, *Bible moralisée*, 5-8.
Miscreants in Vienna 2554

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio and Place</th>
<th>Bible Passage</th>
<th>Theme (if any)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6r a</td>
<td>Gn. 25:24-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r b</td>
<td>Gn. 25: 27-28</td>
<td>Abandon the Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r d</td>
<td>Gn. 27:30-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8r b</td>
<td>Gn. 38:6-10</td>
<td>Error against God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v a</td>
<td>Gn. 41:53-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17v b</td>
<td>Ex. 3:1-2</td>
<td>Rejection of doctrine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18r a</td>
<td>Ex. 4:3</td>
<td>Attachment to Old Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20v b</td>
<td>Ex. 12:43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20v d</td>
<td>Ex. 12:23, 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21v v</td>
<td>Ex. 14:24-28</td>
<td>Enemies of Christ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23r a</td>
<td>Ex. 17:8</td>
<td>Vice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23r c</td>
<td>Ex. 17:13</td>
<td>Vice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25v d</td>
<td>Ex. 31:18, 32:1-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25v a</td>
<td>Ex. 32:4-6</td>
<td>Idolatry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26r c</td>
<td>Ex. 32:26-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26r d</td>
<td>Ex. 32:28</td>
<td>Excommunication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29r c</td>
<td>Lev. 13:1, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29v c</td>
<td>Lev. 21:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30r d</td>
<td>Lev. 24:10-14</td>
<td>Mock the Sacraments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30v a</td>
<td>Lev. 24:16</td>
<td>Mock God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31v b</td>
<td>Num. 12:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31v c</td>
<td>Num. 12:10-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v c</td>
<td>Dt. 28: 15-68</td>
<td>Excommunication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34r b</td>
<td>Joshua 6:15-16, 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58v c</td>
<td>Judges 6:25-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60r b</td>
<td>Judges 9: 1-4, 6</td>
<td>Idolatry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62v b</td>
<td>Judges 15:4-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62v d</td>
<td>Judges 15:14-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65r a</td>
<td>Judges 19:22-23</td>
<td>Destroy the Sacraments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65r c</td>
<td>Judges 19:25</td>
<td>Stealing Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65r d</td>
<td>Judges 19:25-28</td>
<td>Trample Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63v c</td>
<td>Judges 20:47</td>
<td>Abandoning God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35v a</td>
<td>I Kings 2:22</td>
<td>Wicked doctrine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35v c</td>
<td>I Kings 4:3-4</td>
<td>Misuse of the Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35v d</td>
<td>I Kings 4:10-11</td>
<td>Theft of the Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38r a</td>
<td>I Kings 16:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38r c</td>
<td>I Kings 17:1-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39v d</td>
<td>I Kings 24:4-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40v a</td>
<td>I Kings 25:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40v c</td>
<td>I Kings 25:9-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[108\]Ibid., 54-144.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio and Place</th>
<th>Bible Passage</th>
<th>Theme (if any)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40v d</td>
<td>1 Kings 25:12-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41r c</td>
<td>1 Kings 25:1-2</td>
<td>Destroy religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42r a</td>
<td>1 Kings 30:1-2, 5</td>
<td>Theft of the Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42v d</td>
<td>1 Kings 30:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43r a</td>
<td>1 Kings 31:4, II Kings 1:6-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43v d</td>
<td>II Kings 5:6-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47r b</td>
<td>II Kings 15:2-6, 12</td>
<td>Deceive the faithful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49v b</td>
<td>III Kings 2:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50r a</td>
<td>III Kings 3:23-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51v d</td>
<td>III Kings 13:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52r b</td>
<td>III Kings 13:11, 14-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53r c</td>
<td>III Kings 18:20-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53r d</td>
<td>III Kings 18:26-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53v b</td>
<td>III Kings 18:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57v b</td>
<td>IV Kings 2:24</td>
<td>Mock Christ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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