



8-1998

*Delectatio et Utilitas in Hrotsvit of Gandersheim's Resuscitatio
Drusianae et Calimachi*

Mary Maxine Browne
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses



Part of the Medieval Studies Commons

Recommended Citation

Browne, Mary Maxine, "*Delectatio et Utilitas in Hrotsvit of Gandersheim's Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*" (1998). *Masters Theses*. 4209.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/4209

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



*DELECTATIO ET UTILITAS IN HROTSVIT OF GANDERSHEIM'S
RESUSCITATIO DRUSIANAE ET CALIMACHI*

by

Mary Maxine Browne

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts
The Medieval Institute

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 1998

Copyright by
Mary Maxine Browne
1998

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Upon the completion of a project such as this, many people must be thanked for the time and effort they contributed to its completion. In my case, I feel especially grateful to those who stuck by me throughout the difficult period during and after my mother's death when I began my program of study at the Medieval Institute. My most sincere thanks and appreciation go to Dr. Otto Grundler, without whose steadfast encouragement I could not have succeeded. To him, as well as Dr. Clifford Davidson and Dr. Joyce Kubiski as my committee members, I offer heartfelt thanks. Also, to those who provided specialized consultation on my thesis, Dr. E. Rozanne Elder for direction on hagiographic texts, Dr. Michael Driscoll for guidance on medieval liturgy, and Dr. David Bevington on dialogue in Shakespeare, special thanks. For his time and attention to the Greek legend and its translation, thanks to Paul Streuffert. A sincere thanks also goes to my friend Helen Wencke for her assistance with French texts. I remain most grateful to Dr. Sandro Sticca for the inspiration of his scholarship in Hrotsvit studies.

Thanks are also due to the many other professors and friends at Western Michigan University who were so generous with their support and encouragement, especially Dr. Larry Syndergaard and Tim Graham, Karen Jazeyeri at Cistercian Studies, and to Ardis Syndergaard and the staff at the Medieval Institute. I am very grateful to Bonnie Jacobson, and especially Alashar Waltz, for their help with the final

Acknowledgments—continued

process of editing and production.

Finally, without the support and encouragement of my friends Pat Hanavan and Carol Meyer-Niedzwieki throughout the course of my studies, I would not have been able to “grin and bear it” as many times as I did. To Rubie McWilliam and Prema Strecker, I also extend much appreciation for their constancy of support. And, to the Mills, the Leonardelli’s and Pamela Rups, thanks for helping me out at the end when I needed it most.

Mary Maxine Browne

*DELECTATIO ET UTILITAS IN HROTSVIT OF GANDERSHEIM'S
RESUSCITATIO DRUSIANAE ET CALIMACHI*

Mary Maxine Browne, M.A.

Western Michigan University, 1998

Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (935-1002 A.D.) wrote her play, *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, as the other five plays which Hrotsvit composed, as an adaptation of a hagiography from the apocryphal *Acta Johannis*. Written in the spirit of the tenth-century didactic esthetic *delectatio et utilitas*, Hrotsvit adapted the narrative of the legend to the Terentian comedic form, that she might instruct her monastic audience according to the *delectatio et utilitas* esthetic.

This discussion focuses on the sources and backgrounds of Hrotsvit's play, followed by Hrotsvit's adaptive treatment of the characters in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* with a scene by scene comparative study of each character in the legend and the play, showing how Hrotsvit shifted the characterizations in the hagiography to suit her Terentian objectives in conjunction with *delectatio et utilitas*.

Through this study it is evident that Hrotsvit not only made significant changes to the characterizations in the hagiography, but also to its content and structure so that the legend of Drusiana and Calimachus might be shaped by the *delectatio et utilitas* esthetic that animates *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
PREMISE OF THESIS	1
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	3
Hrotsvit's Tenth-Century Gandersheim.....	5
Hrotsvit	10
The Tenth-Century Esthetic of <i>Delectatio et Utilitas</i>	14
The <i>Acta Johannis</i> Legend of Drusiana and Calimachus.....	21
Hrotsvit's Play: <i>Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi</i>	23
Literature	26
The Scope of the Present Study	29
II. ST. JOHN	31
III. CALIMACHUS	52
IV. DRUSIANA	77
V. ANDRONICUS	84
VI. FORTUNATUS.....	89
VII. GOD	94
Hrotsvit as Teacher and Playwright.....	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY	104

PREMISE OF THESIS

Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (c.935-1002 A.D) wrote her play, *Resuscitatio Drusiana et Calimachi* as an adaptation of a hagiography which she found in the apocryphal *Acta Johannis*. In the spirit of the tenth century religious esthetic, *delectatio et utilitas*, or “enjoyment and usefulness,” Hrotsvit interwove the didactic message—the *utilitas*, or usefulness, of the Drusiana and Calimachus legend, with the *delectatio*, or enjoyment, of Terentian comedic style. Her purpose was to provide morally sound, yet enjoyably comedic reading for her tenth-century monastic audience.

Hrotsvit achieved *delectatio et utilitas* in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* in several ways; this discussion will focus on how Hrotsvit created it through her adaptive treatment of the legend’s characters. This will be done with a scene by scene comparative study of each character as portrayed by the legend and the play, and the resulting observations then will be summarized.

The introduction will present the greater contexts of Hrotsvit’s audience, Hrotsvit as hagiographer within these contexts, particularly the *delectatio et utilitas* esthetic. A brief discussion of Hrotsvit’s sources for her creation of *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* will also be included. The comparative analysis of Hrotsvit’s character adaptations will form the body of the text, beginning with St. John, Calimachus, and Drusiana, followed by Andronicus, and Fortunatus. The

conclusion will examine how Hrotsvit's treatment of the character of God demonstrates the *exempla* of the legend and the play.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Hrotsvit of Gandersheim (c.935-1002 A.D.)¹ adapted her dramatization of the Drusianae et Calimachus² legend from an early saint's life originally written in Greek and later translated into Latin. The present thesis will compare Hrotsvit's play with the Latin version of the hagiography, a copy of which Hrotsvit most likely encountered at the royal Saxon abbey at Gandersheim where she lived and worked as a Benedictine canoness. The earlier Greek version,³ of which the Latin seems to be a close copy, will also be included in the analysis. The thesis will focus on Hrotsvit's characterizations; that is, how she adapted the characters of the saint's legend, especially as it was treated by the tenth-century didactic esthetic of *delectatio et*

¹ Bert Nagel, *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1965), p. 39. The last record of Hrotsvit's lifespan is 973, but an old Hildesheim chronicle says that she wrote a biography of all three of the Ottos I-III. This means that she lived at least to 1002, her lifetime corresponding with that of her abbess, Gerberga II. Scholars generally agree on the years 934-1002 for Hrotsvit's life.

² Anne Lyon Haight, ed., *Hrotswitha of Gandersheim: Her Life, Times, and Works, and a Comprehensive Bibliography* (New York: The Hrotswitha Club, 1965), p. 3, 42. One complete tenth-eleventh century manuscript of Hrotsvit's work in Latin is held by the Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14485 contains *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, along with all of Hrotsvit's poems, plays, chronicles, and the biography of Otto I. This manuscript, a small leather-bound book, was discovered by the German humanist, Conrad Celtes, in 1495 in the library at the Emmeram monastery, Regensburg. It apparently had been forgotten there for several hundred years. Other partial manuscripts from later centuries have been discovered, but the plays as they are read today are taken from the more authoritative early manuscript.

³ Max Bonnet's edition of the early Greek text (published by Richard Adelbert Lipsius, *Acta Apocrypha Apostolorum* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1919)), in conjunction with the Modern English translation by J.K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 328-335, has been used in this study. See also Helena Homeyer,

utilitas.⁴ In addition, the comedies of Terence⁵ need to be considered, for Hrotsvit says herself that she imitated his style and structure in the creation of her plays.⁶

The legend of Drusiana and Calimachus is one of the miracle stories in the second-century *Acta Johannis* that records the apostolic life and work of St. John in Ephesus and the surrounding region of Syria and Asia Minor. The original *Acta Johannis* text, written in Greek and often attributed to the Egyptian Leucius (Charinus),⁷ was most likely translated into Latin during the fourth century, as Eusebius makes reference to it at that time.⁸ The Latin version of the *Acta Johannis* used in this thesis, translated by pseudo-Abdias as *Virtutes Johannis*, was published in 1703 by J.H. Fabricius from a sixth or seventh-century Latin manuscript that has since been lost.⁹

Hrotsvithae Opera (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1970), p. 278 (see Printed Editions below).

⁴ Joachim Suchomski, *Delectatio und Utilitas* (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1975). All translations of German are my own.

⁵ The editions of Terence's plays used for this study are P. Terenti Afri, *Comoediae*, ed. Sextus Prete (Heidelberg, 1954), and *The Complete Comedies of Terence: Modern Verse Translations*, ed. Palmer Bovie (Rutgers, 1974). Also consulted, Leslie Webber Jones and J.R. Morey, *The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence Prior to the Thirteenth Century* (Princeton, 1930). Publius Terenti Afer (195-160 B.C.) adapted New Greek Comedy for the Roman stage. He wrote six very successful comedies. Terence's plays retained their popularity throughout Roman times; when the theatres were closed in the sixth century, Terence's plays continued to be avidly read, copied, and most likely informally performed. Some fifty medieval unillustrated manuscripts, and thirteen illustrated sets of Terence's six comedies have survived to modern times.

⁶ Hrotsvit explains her authorial intents in her introduction to her dramas, quoted below.

⁷ Elliott, p. 306.

⁸ Elliott, pp. 303, 306. Edgar Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha* I-II, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, English translation ed. R.McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), p. 190.

⁹ Fabricius published the *Virtutes Johannis* in his greater work *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti* in Hamburg in 1701. The *Virtutes Johannis* are one of the ten "books" included in this work. Fabricius' title page for the *Virtutes Johannis* opens with: *Acta Apostolorum, Apocrypha, sive Historia Certaminis Apostolici, adscripta Abdiae, Primo, ut ferunt, Babyloniae episcopo, et distributi in libros decem*. Elliott speculates that this volume was originally compiled in France in the sixth-seventh century (p. 525). Of the Latin versions of the legend, Fabricius' version of the pseudo-Abdias text corresponds to Hrotsvit's play most closely.

Hrotsvit's Tenth-Century Gandersheim

Hrotsvit (c. 935-1002) can hardly be understood apart from the Benedictine convent at Gandersheim, which she most likely entered as a child of noble parentage. Gandersheim, founded by the Saxon Liudolf I (d. 866 A.D.) and his wife Oda after Louis the German had appointed Liudolf to rule Saxony,¹⁰ was from its inception the royal abbey of the Ottonian kings. The inspiration to create Gandersheim came in a vision of St. John the Baptist, not to Liudolf, but to Liudolf's mother-in-law, Aeda. She in turn imparted the saint's command to establish a monastery for women that would be renowned for its greatness. Liudolf and Oda, then bequeathed rich forest-land on the Gande River for the monastery, their plan having been blessed by Pope Sergius who presented them with relics of SS. Sylvester and Innocence for the convent. The "nighttime appearance of holy light in the darkness of the woods"¹¹ revealed to them where they should build the church, which was dedicated on All Saints' Day, 881, as Hrotsvit reports in her *Primordia Gandeshemensis*.¹²

Thomas F.X. Noble and Thomas Head, *Soldiers for Christ* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), p.158. Interestingly, Huneberc of Heidenheim, in her eighth-century hagiography of St. Willibald (700-786), makes reference to the grave of (an) Abdias outside the town of Sebaste (formerly called Samaria), "At the present time the bodies of Saint John the Baptist, Abdias, and Eliseus the prophet rest there." Some knowledge of a well-known "Abdias" must have existed in the eighth century, and it may be safe to speculate that the sixth-seventh century manuscript as Elliott describes could be the source of that knowledge, if it carried the name "Abdias" as represented by Fabricius.

¹⁰ Louis the German ruled the eastern realms of the former Carolingian empire created by the treaty at Verdun in 843. Gandersheim is located about twenty kilometers south of Hildesheim, on the banks of the Gande River in eastern Saxony.

¹¹ Sr. Mary Bernardine Bergman, *Hrotsvithae Liber Tertius*, Dissertation (St. Louis University, 1942), pp. 94-97.

¹² Paul von Winterfeld, *Hrotsvitha Opera*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica 34 (München, 1978), pp. 229-246.

The continued direction of Gandersheim by royal abbesses early in its life, plus its aristocratic visitors, made Gandersheim a monastic center of considerable importance during the tenth century when Hrotsvit composed her writings there. The first abbess, Hathumoda, was the daughter of Liudolf and Oda. They educated her at Herford, which had close associations with the great library and scriptoria at Corbie and its daughter house, Corvey. Two of her brothers were monks, Thankmar at Corbie and Agius at Corvey.¹³ Gerberga and Christine, two of Hathumoda's sisters, also became abbesses at Gandersheim. Their brother, Otto the Illustrious, inherited the throne upon Liudolf's death, while their sister Liutgard married Louis the German and became queen of France. Their royal mother, Oda, having taken the veil at Gandersheim upon Liudolf's death, outlived them all, dying at the age of 107 at the abbey she founded. By the time Hrotsvit was at the convent, the generous gifts of monies and land from King Otto, King Louis, and many other royal patrons that followed, had richly endowed Gandersheim. Indeed, Gandersheim may be considered a "family" institute for many of the tenth- and eleventh-century crowned heads of Europe, and a reflection of the Ottonian cultural revival in tenth-century Germany.¹⁴

The political hierarchy favored Gandersheim legally as well. Not only were its lands free of government control; Louis the German had granted the monastery toll

¹³ Francis J. Tschan, *Saint Bernward of Hildesheim: His Life and Times I-III* (Notre Dame, 1942), pp. 157-160. Corvey is within fifty miles of Gandersheim.

¹⁴ Haight, see geneological table. All dates from this record. Otto I married the daughter of England's king, Eduward (929), and after her death, married the widow of Italian king, Lothar (915); Otto II married Byzantine crown princess Theophano in 972.

James Snyder, *Medieval Art: Painting, Sculpture, Architecture 4th-14th Century* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1989), pp. 234-237.

rights of merchants traveling on the Gande. Over the years these privileges increased.

With the reign of Otto III, Gandersheim was given market and minting rights:

Gandersheim was one of the “free abbeys,” that is to say its Abbess held it direct from the King. Her rights of overlordship extended for many miles; she had her own law courts and sent her men-at-arms into the field. In fact, she enjoyed the usual privileges and undertook the usual responsibilities of a feudal baron, and as such had the right to seat in the Imperial Diet. Coins are extant, struck by the Abbesses of Gandersheim, whose portraits they bear.¹⁵

Thus from a secular point of view, Gandersheim was a community run by women, for women, that gradually grew into a considerable mercantile entity within the area’s economic system. By the millenium, Gandersheim had become more than a strict and pious monastery; it was a rich and thriving little town.¹⁶

From the clerical point of view, Gandersheim might seem to have been less than “free.” Hathumoda insisted on a very strict observance of Benedictine rule, even though Gandersheim was a “Kanonissenstift,” or center for canonesses who lived under the auspices of the abbess and her nuns. They were often brought there as children to be educated. Canonesses took vows of chastity, but not a vow of poverty, leaving their possessions of land and wealth under the auspices of relatives, whom they were also allowed to visit. Scholars agree that Hrotsvit was most likely a canoness, of noble heritage, for only the daughters of nobility were accepted at Gandersheim.¹⁷ The novitiate sisters lived a more austere life than the canonesses, and

¹⁵ Christopher St. John, *The Plays of Roswitha* (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1966), p. viii. See also Peter Dronke, *Women Writers of the Middle Ages: A Critical Study of Texts from Perpetua to Marguerite Porete* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 55-58.

¹⁶ Tschan, p.159.

¹⁷ Heinrich Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century: Mentalities and Social Orders*, trans. Patrick J. Geary (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), pp. 227-230. See also Sr. Mary Pia Heinrich,

were not permitted to have servants, wear other than simple woolen garments, or partake of a rich diet. They ate communally, and were not allowed to partake before sisters of lower social rank. They were not permitted to leave the convent to visit friends and family. Perhaps not as strict as some abbesses, Hathumoda nevertheless demanded that the Benedictine rule be observed in its basic requirements by its noble followers, and mother Oda strictly reinforced her demands.

And, although nuns were not priests and therefore did not answer to a secular male law, the male law of the Pope held sway very strongly in Gandersheim, along with the canonical law of bishopric and diocese. As far as is known, the nuns of Gandersheim did not attempt to take over these roles. Mass was said by priests or bishops, as well as all liturgical ceremonies and ordinations.

Daily life, however, was controlled by the abbesses, observance of the Benedictine lifestyle left very much in the hands of these women. After the death of Oda, in the face of the aristocratic tastes and habits of the nuns and canonesses, the abbesses tended gradually to relax the austerity of their demands concerning dress and diet. Nevertheless, they continued to fulfill their vows, eat communal meals, share sleeping quarters, and observe the canonical hours and feast days of the church. Gandersheim was known for its faithful adherence to the monastic life.

Christine was the last member of the Saxon royal family to be abbess of

Gandersheim; Otto I's (d. 973) niece, Gerberga II (940?-1001), took over the convent's leadership in 959. Gerberga II was abbess, teacher and friend to Hrotsvit throughout their lives.

It is difficult to assess exactly how relaxed the observance of the rule became during Hrotsvit's life at Gandersheim. The independent and high-spirited mood of the Gandersheim community must have been very powerful, for the abbesses were capable of standing up to their male superiors with vehement force. During the so-called Gandersheim dispute between Abbess Sophia and Bishop Bernward of Hildesheim, the nuns at Gandersheim demonstrated their strong-mindedness very openly.¹⁸

These events occurred near the end of Hrotsvit's lifetime, but she does not mention them in any of her writings. In fact, Hrotsvit's writings do not intimate any of the harsh political turbulence her era suffered; even her account of the insurgency of Henry I against his brother Otto II reads with a very pacifistic tone. Henry wrought havoc on the Saxon royal house, and only with great effort was Otto III's throne preserved. Added to these internal struggles, the Slavs, the Danes and the Hungarians were a continual threat to the Saxon kingdom throughout the tenth century, but the Ottonian kings were able to withstand their onslaughts at Saxony's eastern borders.

¹⁸ Tschan, pp. 157-199; Fichtenau, pp. 173, 228-229. When the dispute with the archbishop of Mainz over the control of Gandersheim developed in the year 1000, Abbess Sophia met Bernward's retinue on more than one occasion with armed guards. Bernward often commented on their lack of discipline, which the nuns took as an affront. At one point, while serving mass, Bernward admonished the Gandersheim nuns for their unruly behavior. They threw their offertories at his feet with angry epithets, much embarrassing the townspeople, and, of course, Bernward. These events seem mostly incited by Sophia's ongoing difficulties with Bernward, not by the nuns themselves, but the event points to a willingness to challenge the authority of the bishop with a confidence uncommon to medieval monastic.

Gandersheim seems to have survived without any hostile attacks, from within or without its settlement's walls. Separated by distance and lifestyle from their feuding countrymen, apparently the Gandersheim nuns on the whole lived a sheltered, more or less peaceful existence for several hundred years. The monastery and its hamlet continued to thrive as the abbey of the royal Saxon house until the mid-fifteenth century, when the storms of war and destruction did not pass by Gandersheim. Historians speculate that Gandersheim must have been fully destroyed during the papal wars,¹⁹ leaving only the vivid memory and clerical accounts of its history behind. Luckily a copy of Hrotsvit's little book of legends and plays had found its way to the apparently safer confines of the Emmeram monastery's library.

Hrotsvit

Within this setting of tenth-century monastic obedience, scholastic study, vast wealth, active commerce, and distant tribal wars, Hrotsvit, the "loud voice of Gandersheim,"²⁰ composed her eight saints' legends, six plays, the biography of Otto I, and the history of the founding of Gandersheim. Hrotsvit's life at Gandersheim leaves more questions than answers, however, when one studies her writings that were virtually unknown until Celtes discovered her book in 1495. Fortunately, Hrotsvit wrote prefaces to her works that shed some light on her upbringing, her goals in her

¹⁹ Walter Berschin, "Passio und Theatre: Zur dramatische Struktur einiger Vorlagen Hrotsvits von Gandersheim," *The Theatre in the Middle Ages*, ed. Herman Braet, John Nowé, Gilbert Turnoy, *Mediaevalia Lovaniensia* I, XII (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985), p. 2, note 7.

²⁰ Dronke, *Women Writers*, p. 70. The meaning of "Hrotsvit" in Old Saxon is "loud voice."

writing, and her milieu. From these, Hrotsvit scholars generally agree that Hrotsvit was a canoness, having entered Gandersheim as a young child, although her exact date of birth and her parentage are unknown. She presumably was of a noble family and grew up under the tutelage of Gandersheim's learned nuns. During Hrotsvit's times about twenty-four canonesses lived at Gandersheim.²¹

In her prefaces Hrotsvit relates that she received her first instruction from Abbess Rikkardis, and then from Otto II's niece, Abbess Gerberga II,²² whom Hrotsvit describes:

Though younger in years than I, as might be expected of the niece of an Emperor, far older in learning, and she had the kindness to make me familiar with the works of some of those authors in whose writings she had been instructed by learned men.²³

Thus Hrotsvit says that through Gerberga she studied the biblical, classical and Carolingian writers, whose influence Hrotsvit's works also show. It is clear that she studied the Fathers of the Church, such as Augustine and Jerome; Christian philosophers of late antiquity such as Boethius; the classical poets Horace, Virgil and Ovid; classical playwrights Plautus and Terence; and the writings of many hagiographers, ancient and contemporary.²⁴

²¹ Schäfer, p. 130.

²² Ludwig Wolf, ed., *Die Gandersheimer Reimchronik des Priesters Eberhard* (Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1927), p. 69. Gerberga II was abbess for fifty-two years, thus she and Hrotsvit studied and worked together at Gandersheim for an entire generation. For more on Gerberga in Hrotsvit's life see Dronke, *Women Writers*, pp. 56-60, Tschan, p. 161.

²³ St. John, p. xxxii. See printed editions of Hrotsvit's works, below. Translations of Hrotsvit's prefaces are taken from various English versions of Hrotsvit's writings, each noted. Translations of brief sentences and phrases from *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* without notation are my own.

²⁴ St. John, p. viii; Katharina Wilson, *The Plays of Hrotsvit of Gandersheim* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1989), p. xv-xxvii.

Hrotsvit says also that she wrote in secret until she gained confidence in her skill. When she finally showed Gerberga her work, Gerberga encouraged her and when Gandersheim had achieved a certain level of accomplishment Gerberga presented those accomplishments to their greater society. Hrotsvit received praise from her associates, to which she responded. Hrotsvit also refers to “the learned patrons of this book,” thus indicating that her work may have been supported by scholars outside Gandersheim as they became familiar with her work.²⁵

Hrotsvit had an invaluable resource at her disposal for the creation of her works: Goetting describes the Gandersheim library as Gandersheim’s “reiche früh- und hochmittelalterliche Bibliothek.”²⁶ Because Ottonian kings were great patrons of literature and art,²⁷ in its holdings Hrotsvit must have had access to almost any and every book copied in her day. Furthermore, Gandersheim’s intimate connections with Corvey and Corbie would have provided Gandersheim’s librarians with a direct source of the most finely executed illuminated manuscripts of the age, as well as copies of ancient texts from classical and late antique times.²⁸

Within the Gandersheim library Hrotsvit most likely found the hagiographies for her plays, and the source text for *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*. She was

²⁵ St. John, p. xxviii.

²⁶ Berschin, p. 2. It is fair to speculate that some of these volumes may have been in Greek, and whether Hrotsvit could read, if not speak Greek herself, for there was considerable exchange between Byzantia and the Ottonian Court. This remains in the realm of speculation, but Heinrich includes Greek as a subject of study in the medieval schools run by canonesses: “That the study of Greek formed a part of the curriculum of studies under specially favorable circumstances seems probable, though it can be definitely proved only in a very few instances,” p. 136.

²⁷ Snyder, p. 242. For example, *The Gospel Book of Otto III*.

young when she began her work, and lacking in self-confidence. As she describes herself in her preface to her poetical works:

Unknown to all around me, I have toiled in secret, often destroying what seemed to me to be ill written, and rewriting it. I have tried to the best of my ability to improvise on phrases collected from sacred writings in the precincts of our convent Gandersheim.²⁹

Berschin confirms that the ancient collection of hagiographies of the apostles, the *Passionale Apostolorum* that contained the *Acta Johannis*, was not an uncommon book and most libraries during the Middle Ages owned a copy. Given Gandersheim's status, one can safely assume that Hrotsvit had access to this book.³⁰

Hrotsvit makes an interesting statement regarding the apocryphal nature of the texts she found and used in her work:

To the objection that may be raised that I have borrowed parts of this work from authorities which some condemn as apocryphal, I would answer that I have erred through ignorance, not through presumption. When I started, timidly enough, on the work of composition I did not know that the authenticity of my material had been questioned. On discovering this to be the case I decided not to discard it, because it often happens that what is reputed false turns out to be true.³¹

This raises several important issues concerning *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*.

First, Hrotsvit did not seem to choose her texts solely for their spiritual content.

Evidently she was too young, and not well enough informed, to know the scope of the theology she was reading in the texts she discovered.

²⁸ Sr. Mary Margaret Butler, R.S.M., *Hrotsvitha: The Theatricality of Her Plays* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1960), pp. 8-9.

²⁹ St. John, p. xxxii.

³⁰ Berschin, p. 2-4.

³¹ St. John, p. xxxii

Secondly, in keeping with the independent attitudes for which the women of Gandersheim were known, she does not cower in the sight of this rebuke of her choices, but stands up for herself. She reveals that at this point in time she has a better understanding of clerical judgments against religious writings, saying that throughout the ages texts shift in status from non-acceptable to acceptable. This statement to her superiors shows not only that she does have an understanding of theology and history, but also that she has the confidence, wit and audacity with which to express her mind.

The Tenth-Century Esthetic of *Delectatio et Utilitas*

If Hrotsvit was not in search of liturgically correct texts, what was it she was looking for in the “precincts of Gandersheim”? In her preface to her dramas, Hrotsvit points to the answer to this question. She most likely was looking for texts that would lend themselves to the imitation of Terence’s style, texts with “laudable” Christian virgins as heroines who could replace Terence’s “sensual women.”³²

Many Catholics can be found who prefer the vanity of pagan books to the utility of holy Scripture, because of the pagan’s greater eloquence and grace of style – nor can I clear myself wholly of having such a preference. There are others again who cling to the sacred page and who, though they spurn other

³² See Bovie. All six of Terence’s plays concern, in one way or another, the conflicts between the Roman father (*senex/paterfamilias*), and his late adolescent son (*adolescens*), over women of ill-repute. The son invariably falls in love with a courtesan (*meretrix*), the father will not allow his son to marry. The father and/or the son’s slave(s) (*servus*), with the help of the courtesan’s pimp (*leno*), further confuse matters in their attempts to remedy the situation. The courtesan turns out to be the lost daughter of a rich Roman family, thus allowing the marriage after all.

Judith Tarr, “Terentian Elements in Hrotsvit,” *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Rara Avis in Saxonia?* Medieval and Renaissance Monograph Series VII (Ann Arbor, Michigan: MARC, 1987). Tarr discusses the similarities between Terence and Hrotsvit’s characters.

works by pagan authors, still rather often tend to read the fictive creations of Terence; and while they take delight in the melliflence of the style, they become tainted by coming to know an impious subject-matter.

So I, the 'Mighty Voice of Gandersheim', have not demurred at imitating Terence in composing, while others cultivate him in their reading – so that, in the same genre of composition in which the shameless unchaste actions of sensual women were portrayed, the laudable chastity of holy maidens might be celebrated, in as much as my little imaginative gift has power to do so.³³

The stories that celebrated the “the laudable chastity of holy maidens,” yet allowed Hrotsvit the freedom to adapt their stories into the Terentian comedic form, were the large corpus of legends of saints’ lives, or hagiographies, and these are the texts Hrotsvit sought out and drew upon for her Terentian substitutes. As Sticca has pointed out:

As a Benedictine nun Hrotsvitha was aware of this hagiographical tradition. Her very dramatization of legends taken from hagiographical accounts was dictated primarily by a consideration of the hagiographical *exemplum* within the tenth-century ascetic and monastic milieu, which saw in martyrdom and hermitic life the two perfect realizations of the Christian ideal.³⁴

In fact, the Bollandists list Hrotsvit’s dramatized versions of saints’ lives in the index to the *Acta Sanctorum*, making Hrotsvit, officially, a hagiographer.³⁵ Ultimately, Hrotsvit’s commitment to the Christian *exemplum* makes her a hagiographer above all else, for it is in the hagiographical intent of the *exemplum* of the chaste Christian woman that her author’s heart lies. Thus Hrotsvit’s work

³³ Dronke, *Women Writers*, p. 69.

³⁴ Sandro Sticca, “Sin and Salvation: The Dramatic Context of Hrotsvitha’s Women,” *The Roles and Images of Women in the Middle Age and the Renaissance*, ed. D.R. Radcliff-Umstead (Pittsburg, 1975), p. 8.

³⁵ Société Bollandiana, eds., *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina Antiquae et Mediae Aetatis* I-II (Brussels: Societe Bollandistes, 1898-1911).

Hippolyte DeleHaye, *Legends of the Saints* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1962), p. 49.

DeleHaye defines hagiographies as “parables or stories designed to bring about some religious truth

involves the combination of Christian content with pagan form in order to create a spiritually edifying Christian lesson that can be as humorously entertaining as Terence's comedies.

Hrotsvit's differentiation of "melliflence of style" from the "tainted subject-matter" in writing her plays has been studied by several scholars. Among them Suchomski states, "Hrotsvit finds the basic attitudes of the Terence plays unacceptable, but openly deems them in their artistic medium as legitimate."³⁶ Thus the creative process Hrotsvit uses in the *schöpfung* of her plays is one of adaptation. She does not invent her stories. She adapts existing legends into plays. Her artistry lies in her ability to span the distance between the sturdy and methodic narrative presentation of the hagiographic legend and the delicate and vivacious dialogue form of the Terentian comedy. Cornelia Coulter states:

. . . [T]he connections with Terence remain few in number, and the one outstanding similarity is that in both authors a story is developed by means of *dialogue* . . . To her, as to other readers of the Middle Ages, Terence's lines appeared to be prose, but prose of a peculiar elegance; . . . It took real inspiration to see that the saints' legends which she and everyone else up to this time had handled in narrative form could be given as well, or better, in dialogue . . . She shows a rare gift for seizing on the great moments of a story and presenting them strikingly.³⁷

As "original" as Hrotsvit's approach to drama may seem for the tenth century, in its purpose, Hrotsvit's approach to her work is not out of step with the esthetics of

or moral principle. The author tells a story in order to drive home a lesson more effectively. . . ."

³⁶ Suchomski, pp. 84-85.

³⁷ Cornelia Coulter, "The 'Terentian' Comedies of a Tenth-Century Nun," *The Classical Journal* XXIV (1928-29): 528-529.

her times. The concept of blending the hagiographic *exemplum*,³⁸ or lesson, with a comedic style of presentation was in fact in vogue in the tenth century, and referred to as *delectatio et utilitas*,³⁹ meaning “enjoyment” or “delight” in conjunction with “usefulness” or “service.” In practice, *delectatio et utilitas* required that the Christian lesson, or *exemplum* be presented with a laugh, or at least a smile, for, more than likely, listeners would retain the lesson better if they enjoyed hearing it. On a broader level, this esthetic recommended that comedy as such be read as a relief from the sobriety of philosophical and theological tracts.

The *delectatio et utilitas* esthetic developed out of the conflicting views of Christian and Classical culture on the “Godliness” of laughter. Aristotle, and the classicists in general, maintained that laughter was the special domain of human beings on earth.⁴⁰ Human beings are living creatures along with all of the other living organisms on the earth, but the human capacity for reason, or *ratio*, lifts human beings out of this general class. Reason, however, also belongs to the realm of God and the angels, thus it could not be considered a strictly human property. Laughter, on the other hand, is the sole “property” of human beings, for neither the general class of living organisms, nor God and the angels, laugh. This philosophical appreciation of

³⁸ John C. Traupman, *The New College Latin and English Dictionary* (New York: Bantam, 1966), p. 167, defines *exemplum* as: “sample, example, typical instance; precedent; pattern, make, character; model, pattern (*of conduct*); object lesson; warning; copy; transcript; portrait.”

³⁹ Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 536, 1946. The definition of *delectatio* is: “delighting, delight, pleasure, amusement”; *utilitas* is: “use, usefulness, utility, serviceableness, service, expediency, benefit, profit, advantage.”

Snyder, pp. 218-219; Jones and Morey, II. The *delectatio et utilitas* esthetic permeated not only written forms of didactic teaching, but artistic ones as well, such as the Utrecht Psalter and the miniatures of the plays of Terence.

laughter in the life of human beings supported the Greek and Roman taste for comedy, and the works of the great comic playwrights: Aristophanes and Menander of Athens, Plautus and Terence of Rome. Terence's six plays were the most popular comedies in Rome for their terse Latin and wise humor.

In contrast, Christian theologians were confronted with the problem that in the Bible, Christ never laughs. Scholars were very aware that there was not a single incident in the Gospels or the Acts of the Apostles in which Jesus laughed, or smiled. Yet Christians moved by the Holy Spirit were filled with joy. Thus developed the terms *gaudium spirituale*, which allowed for a slight smile in moments of spiritual bliss, in contrast with the less desirable earthly laugh of *laetitia secularis*.⁴¹ Loud boisterous laughter was not acceptable in most religious houses, as evidenced by God's ever-sterner countenances as Christianity advanced from Roman times.

Yet constricting laughter did not, in many ways, seem practical, even to the most devout and studied of Christian theologians who were well-aware that their pagan predecessors, despite their delusion by pagan religion, knew how to live well and enjoy life. As a result, various early medieval theologians began to develop approaches to life that sought a balance between pagan uproariousness and Christian *Ernst*, a melding of the wisdom of Classical times with the teachings of Christ.⁴²

⁴⁰ Suchomski, pp. 10, 30.

⁴¹ *ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

⁴² Claude W. Barlow, trans., *Iberian Fathers: Martin of Braga (Vita Honestae) Paschasius of Dumium, Leander of Seville I Fathers of the Church* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1969). *Vita Honestae*, pp. 12, 87-97. Greek bishop, Martin of Braga, wrote the *Vita Honestae* for King Miro, king of the Sueves in northwestern Spain in 570. It was one of the principal treatises that moved medieval thought in this direction. This treatise was apparently widely read as, "there are

The practical fact was that life devoid of enjoyment was a life incapable of serving Christ, for a person who was so dour of mood could not make an adequate contribution to the community, and the primary Christian ethic of service and kindness to others was violated. Tenth-century scholar Liutprand von Cremona states: “Even philosophers run the danger of deadening their spirits with constant reflective thought if they don’t delight and invigorate themselves with comedy or heroic poetry.”⁴³ Thus, enjoyment and relaxation was, in the end, also practical and useful. Scholars also found that the two elements served each other very well when an *exemplum*, a spiritual lesson within a parable or a homily, could be presented in an enjoyable way rather than couched in dry, moralizing directives on the Christian life. This transformed enjoyment into the servant of the highest good, rather than aligning it with the basest evil. The combination of enjoyment with Christian education, then, gave rise in the tenth century to the Christian didactic esthetic of *delectatio et utilitas*.

Suchomski points out that Hrotsvit herself says the reason she includes the shameful in her plays is in order to highlight the honorable. By making evil look ridiculous, she communicates her message that the good is to be emulated.⁴⁴ Her

more than 650 manuscripts in existence.” It “compris[es] those Stoic elements with which Christianity was completely in harmony.” Although it does not speak directly to the nature of laughter, it shows that “pagan” philosophy can be treated so that it is not in conflict with Christianity. The *Vita Honestae* was very popular, and served in the softening of Christian attitudes towards pagan philosophy, including ideas that promoted enjoyment.

⁴³ Catholic University of America, *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (NCE) VIII (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 942. Liutprand Bishop of Cremona (c. 920-c.972) was a contemporary of Hrotsvit’s. Otto I put him in charge of the envoy that travelled to Constantinople to “obtain a bride for his son and heir, Otto II.” Again this shows how interwoven the religious and political spheres of Gandersheim were, for Hrotsvit was close friends with Otto II’s sister, Gerberga.

Suchomski, pp. 82-89.

⁴⁴ *ibid*, p. 84.

ultimate goal is to make people laugh so that through relaxation of the spirit, new insight can take place. Rather than accepting a Tertullian approach to the medium of the theatrical as dangerous to the soul, Hrotsvit apparently follows the tenets of Guillaume des Conches; in his *Summa Philosophiae*, des Conches sees the theatrical as a curative force against *infirmetas*, one of the three *Übel des Menschen*, or evils of human beings (the other two evils being *ignorantia* and *concupiscentia*), for theatre serves relaxation, one of the cures of *infirmetas* or weakness, inconstancy.⁴⁵

Hrotsvit chose the biographies of those whose transformations from sinners to saints would demonstrate spiritual lessons for her royal and monastic audiences, and entertain them at the same time.⁴⁶ In as much as she states that her purpose is to turn people away from “pagan authors” and toward the “laudable” stories of Christian saints, her plays also embody the religious esthetic of her era that sought to integrate the wisdom of the Classical philosophers with the heroic virtues of Christian teachings. She sought out legends that would lend themselves to the Terentian comedic form, and at the same time celebrate the heroism of Christian women.

In *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, Hrotsvit discovered a story that placed a Christian woman’s commitment to her chastity central to the story of her life,

⁴⁵ *ibid.*, p. 82.

⁴⁶ Noble and Head, pp. xxiv, xxxii. Hrotsvit chose only ancient hagiographies for her plays. This choice could derive from her sensitivity for the families of saints closer to her own times. Noble and Head relate: “The traditions of hagiography and the practices of the cult of saints reaffirmed connections among holiness, charisma, and noble blood that were deeply rooted in both Roman and German societies . . . Sprung from aristocratic stock, these saints occupied positions of power within the church and society at large.” Not unlike Shakespeare who set many of his plays in foreign countries, Hrotsvit wrote her plays from legends of saints who were certain not to include family members who may have been in her audience.

a commitment around which all of the other action in the narrative revolves. The male characters are easily shifted into stock Terentian characters who stand out in bold relief against the anti-Terentian female character of Drusiana. The legend gives Hrotsvit a singular opportunity to shape hagiographic narrative according to the *delectatio et utilitas* esthetic. Understanding this approach to her adaptation lends a new insight into the composition and meaning of *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, an insight which this thesis hopes to facilitate.

The *Acta Johannis* Legend of Drusiana and Calimachus⁴⁷

The legend of Drusiana and Calimachus concerns three death, resurrection, and conversion miracles performed by St. John.⁴⁸ The central character of this legend is a young pagan man, Calimachus, to whom God appears, forgiving him despite the manic sexual passion Calimachus has for the married Christian woman, Drusiana, even after she has died. In the end Drusiana is resurrected, and Calimachus becomes a Christian.

The *Acta Johannis* originated in the late first to early second century A.D.

⁴⁷ Published editions of the *Acta Johannis* and The Legend of Drusiana and Calimachus: Greek: *Acta Johannis* - Richard Adelbert Lipsius, ed., *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* I-III (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1919); C. Tischendorf, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* I-III (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959). Latin: *Virtutes Johannis* - F. Nausea, *Anonymi Philalethi Eusebiani in vitas, miracula passionisque apostolorum rhapsodiae* (Cologne, 1531); J.A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti* (Hamburg, 1703); Eric Junod and Jean-Daniel Kaestli, eds., "Acta Johannis," *Corpus Christianorum Series Apocryphorum* I-III (Turnhout: Brepols, 1983). English: The Acts of John, J. K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993); Edgar Hennecke *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, English translation ed. R. Mcl. Wilson (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964).

⁴⁸ Junod and Kaestli, pp. 541-563, discuss the backgrounds and content of the "Drusiana novel."

a commitment around which all of the other action in the narrative revolves. The male characters are easily shifted into stock Terentian characters who stand out in bold relief against the anti-Terentian female character of Drusiana. The legend gives Hrotsvit a singular opportunity to shape hagiographic narrative according to the *delectatio et utilitas* esthetic. Understanding this approach to her adaptation lends a new insight into the composition and meaning of *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, an insight which this thesis hopes to facilitate.

The *Acta Johannis* Legend of Drusiana and Calimachus⁴⁷

The legend of Drusiana and Calimachus concerns three death, resurrection, and conversion miracles performed by St. John.⁴⁸ The central character of this legend is a young pagan man, Calimachus, to whom God appears, forgiving him despite the manic sexual passion Calimachus has for the married Christian woman, Drusiana, even after she has died. In the end Drusiana is resurrected, and Calimachus becomes a Christian.

The *Acta Johannis* originated in the late first to early second century A.D.

⁴⁷ Published editions of the *Acta Johannis* and The Legend of Drusiana and Calimachus: Greek: *Acta Johannis* - Richard Adelbert Lipsius, ed., *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* I-III (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1919); C. Tischendorf, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* I-III (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959). Latin: *Virtutes Johannis* - F. Nausea, *Anonymi Philalethi Eusebiani in vitas, miracula passionisque apostolorum rhapsodiae* (Cologne, 1531); J.A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti* (Hamburg, 1703); Eric Junod and Jean-Daniel Kaestli, eds., "Acta Johannis," *Corpus Christianorum Series Apocryphorum* I-III (Turnhout: Brepols, 1983). English: The Acts of John, J. K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993); Edgar Hennecke *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, English translation ed. R. Mcl. Wilson (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964).

⁴⁸ Junod and Kaestli, pp. 541-563, discuss the backgrounds and content of the "Drusiana novel."

during the lifetime of St. John the blessed disciple in Ephesus.⁴⁹ The apocryphal *Acta Johannis* was first declared heretical by Eusebius in the fourth century due to its partially Manichean contents such as the Hymn of Christ. It was again banned by the Council of Nicea in 787 A.D. when the iconoclasts, who used the second chapter of the *Acta* as evidence in support of iconoclasm, fell out of favor,⁵⁰ driving the *Acta Johannis* further “underground.” Nevertheless, relatively many manuscripts of the *Acta Johannis* have survived, indicating a reasonable amount of clerical interest in it during the Middle Ages, despite its heretical designation.⁵¹

The legend of Drusiana and Calimachus was not commonly known during the Middle Ages, first because of the *Acta Johannis*’ heretical status, but also because Jacobus de Voragine’s *Golden Legend* omits the legend of Drusiana and Calimachus in his highly edited and condensed version of the December 27th *Life of St. John the Evangelist*.⁵² Yet Erhard Dorn’s work on the “sinning saints” indicates that vivid

⁴⁹ Tschan, pp. 37-38. See also Henri deLubach, *Medieval Exegesis I-* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998); R.E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), and *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind* (New York: Paulist Press, 1984). Michael Driscoll, liturgist (personal conversation, Notre Dame, July 15, 1998). Since it is unlikely that St. John the Apostle lived into the latter half of the first century, a distinction is made between St. John the Apostle and the St. John the blessed disciple, the latter thought to be a disciple of St. John the Apostle who continued the Apostle’s work in Ephesus. During the Middle Ages, however, the two were considered to be the same person. Interestingly, medieval exegesis also saw St. John the Apostle and St. John the Baptist as representing different aspects of the same person. Thus Hrotsvit’s use of a text from the *Acta Johannis* might be seen as related to Oda’s vision of St. John the Baptist and the founding of Gandersheim. The eleventh-century evangelary of St. Bernward of Hildesheim includes an image of St. John the Baptist with the illustrations of St. John the Evangelist.

⁵⁰ Hennecke, pp. 190-194. Elliott, pp. 301-307, 313-314. Chapters 26-29 relate that St. John severely objected to a painting of himself made by one of his disciple to worship him.

⁵¹ Elliott, pp. 302, 309-310. These manuscripts are only two-thirds complete. Partial versions in Greek and seven other languages are extant.

⁵² Ripperger and Ryan, *The Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1941), pp. 58-64. This version of St. John’s *Life* renders Drusiana’s story: “And as he entered the city, he met a procession which accompanied the mortal remains of a woman named

medieval hagiographic records of criminal persons—prostitutes, incest perpetrators and murderers—blessed by the grace of God and redeemed through miracles of the saints and the Holy Spirit, held a significant position in the total corpus of medieval hagiographic lore. As Dorn points out, their stories related the archetypal conversion pattern of “sin, confession, forgiveness.” Calimachus clearly belongs to this genre of “sinning saints,”⁵³ and popular oral tradition may have made this legend more commonly known than otherwise expected.

Hrotsvit's Play: *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*

Exactly how widely known Hrotsvit's plays were in her era is difficult to say, as little attestation of them by her contemporaries exists. As they seem to have been written and copied as a group, *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*⁵⁴ would not have been any more or less known than her other plays.

Drusiana, who of old had been his most devoted friend, and more than anyone else had looked forward to his return. The kinsmen and the orphans and widows of Ephesus said to Saint John: 'Here we are about to bury Drusiana, who in accordance with thy monitions, ever nourished us with the divine word, and yearned more than any other for thy return, saying: 'Ah, if I might see the Apostle of God once more before I die!' And now thou art come back and she was not able to see thee.' Then the apostle ordered them to set down the coffin and open it; and he said: 'Drusiana, my Master Jesus Christ raises thee to life! Arise, go into thy house, and prepare my repast!' And at once she arose and went off to her house, thinking that she had awakened from sleep, and not from death." Calimachus is not mentioned in Ripperger and Ryan's version at any point.

⁵³ Erhard Dorn, "Der Sündige Heilige in der Legende des Mittelalters," *Medium Aevum-Philologische Studien* 10 (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1967), pp. 9, 52-86, 121-128. Discussion of the Calimachus legend, pp. 71-72. Important to note, the legend of Drusiana and Calimachus is not heretical in the eyes of church doctrine, in spite of its sexually macabre content.

⁵⁴ Published editions of Hrotsvit's works and *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*: publication of *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* has been generally limited to editions of Hrotsvit's collected works including all six of Hrotsvit's plays. Many editions of Hrotsvit's *oeuvre* have been published since 1501. This thesis has relied most on the Paul von Winterfeld edition (edited closely from the original manuscript), "Hrotsvithae Opera," *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* 34 (München, 1978), and Helena Homeyer's editions, both Latin and German, *Hrotsvithae Opera* (Paderborn, 1970),

Though Hrotsvit first wrote only privately, eventually Gandersheim Abbess Gerberga II showed her work to the Archbishop William of Mainz, and to visitors of Gandersheim. In the second preface to her dramas, titled *Epistola Eiusdem Ad Quosdam Sapientes Huius Libri Fautores* (Letter to Certain Learned Patrons of this Book), Hrotsvit thanks the scholars: “. . . who have been nurtured in the most profound philosophical studies, and have attained knowledge in perfection, should have deigned to approve the humble work of an obscure woman!”⁵⁵ Although Hrotsvit’s opening follows the tradition of humbling oneself to one’s correspondents, one still can conclude that scholarly men had praised her work. Hrotsvit also was very good friends with Otto II, thus her writings were most likely known by her monastic community in Gandersheim, and also by the Ottonian court.⁵⁶ Since she openly explains her purpose in imitating Terence’s style in the introduction to her plays, her audience could be broadly defined as people in her immediate and surrounding environment who enjoyed reading Terence.

Hrotsvitha Werke (Paderborn, 1973). Other modern editions include: J.P. Migne, “Hrotsvithae Opera,” *Patrologiae cursus completus Tonius CXXXVII*, Series Latina, *Tomus I* (Paris, 1853); Karl Strecker, “Hrotsvithae Opera,” *Bibliotheca Teubneriana* (Leipzig, 1906); Bert Nagel, *Samtliche Dichtungen* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche, 1965). No English translation of Hrotsvit’s collected works has been done, but several English translations of Hrotsvit’s plays, and therefore *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, exist. For this project I have used all of the translations listed below: Christopher St. John, *The Plays of Roswitha* (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1966); Larissa Bonfante, *The Plays of Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim* (New York, 1979); Katharina Wilson, *The Plays of Hrotsvit of Gandersheim* (New York, 1989). No Latin editions of *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* on its own are in print. There are, however, several translated editions of the play: C. Magnin “Abraham,” “Calimachus,” and “Dulcitius,” in *Theatre Europeen: Theatre anterieur a la Renaissance* (Paris, 1835); Else Schulhoff, *Die Erwachung des Calimachus: Ein Schauspiel* (Berlin, 1921); R.S. Lambert *Calimachus* (Wembley Hill, Middlesex, 1922); Helena Homeyer, *Die Wiedererweckung der Drusiana und des Calimachus* (Hamburg, 1931).

⁵⁵ St. John, p. xxviii.

⁵⁶ Dronke, *Women Writers*, pp. 57-59.

However difficult to ascertain, the existence of partial versions of the original book indicates some wider readership of Hrotsvit's plays during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries.⁵⁷ Otherwise there is little record of tenth- or eleventh-century scholars commenting on Hrotsvit's work, and subsequent centuries of scholarly study make no mention of her. Six hundred years after Hrotsvit's lifetime, Conrad Celtes discovered her book at the Emmeram Monastery library at Regensburg in 1495. He announced his discovery widely, calling Hrotsvit a "German Sappho."⁵⁸ Thus among German humanists, at least, she became very well known at the turn of the fifteenth century. Albrecht Dürer and Wolf Traut contributed woodcuts that included illustrations of the plays in Conrad Celtes' publication of Hrotsvit's works (*Opera*, Nuremberg: 1501),⁵⁹ in order to celebrate the discovery of Hrotsvit's work and receive it into the canon of German literature.

Celtes did not publish the manuscript in its exact form, however. He changed the order of the plays, and left out Hrotsvit's poem, *St. John*.⁶⁰ He also abbreviated the titles of the plays to the names of their primary male characters; these

⁵⁷ Haight, pp. 43-45; Meta Haarsen, "Manuscripts," *Hrotswitha of Gandersheim: Her Life, Times and Works and a Comprehensive Bibliography*, Anne Lyon Haight, ed. (New York: The Hrotswitha Club, 1965). The five other plays are: (1) *Conversio Gallicani Principis Militiae (Gallicanus)*, (2) *Passio Sanctarum Virginum Agapis, Chioniae et Hirenae (Dulcitius)*, (3) *Lapsus et Conversio Mariae Neptis Habrahae Heremicolae (Abraham)*, (4) *Conversio Thaidis Meretricis (Pafnutius)*, and (5) *Passio Sanctarum Virginum Fidei, Spei et Karitatis (Sapientia)*. Other partial manuscripts include *Gallicanus*, *Dulcitius*, *Calimachus*, and *Abraham* Cologne *Historische Archiv*, W1011, late XII c.; *Maria* and *Sapientia* Klagenfurt, Austria, Studienbibliothek Ms 44, late XII or early XIII c.; *Gallicanus* Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 2552, early XIII c.

⁵⁸ Haight, p. 3.

⁵⁹ Haight, pp. 57, 63. Marjorie Dana Barlow, "Printed Editions," *Hrotswitha of Gandersheim: Her Life, Times and Works and a Comprehensive Bibliography*, Anne Lyon Haight, ed. (New York: The Hrotswitha Club, 1965). The original book that Celtes found did not include the *Primordia Gandesheimensis*. This was discovered in the late seventeenth century.

abbreviations are still in use today. This thesis, however, does not replace Hrotsvit's original title, *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, with Celtes' abbreviated title, *Calimachus*. The original title has been retained throughout for purposes of authenticity and accurate representation of Hrotsvit's work.⁶¹

Literature

A great deal of scholarship on the many works of Hrotsvit of Gandersheim exists; however, no extensive studies of *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* have been done. All critical editions of Hrotsvit's collected works do include brief introductions to each play, including *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, which is summarized with some commentary in each edition. Homeyer includes the basic information regarding Hrotsvit's hagiographical sources and she includes the brief analysis of Hrotsvit's adaptation from the legend of Drusiana and Calimachus.⁶²

During the first half of this century there was a brief surge of interest in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* as several scholars saw links between the *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* and *Romeo and Juliet*,⁶³ but since both

⁶⁰ Haight, pp. 3, 57.

⁶¹ Berschin, p. 3. Berschin remarks that Conrad Celtes' titles even tend to mislead modern readers so that they do not realize that Hrotsvit used saints' legends for her plays. Hrotsvit's titles are the same as the saints' *Lives* she used for her plays.

⁶² Homeyer *Opera*, pp. 279-282

⁶³ Austin J. App, "Roswitha Puts Love into Drama," *The Magnificat* 70 (1942): 226-231, 281-85. Henry B. Binsse, "The Birth of Christian Drama," *Catholic World* 103 (1916): 135. App and Binsse note the similarities between Drusiana and Calimachus' conversation and *Romeo and Juliet*'s conversations.

Sr. Eugenia Maginnis, *The Four Dramas of Roswitha, a Nun of the Tenth Century*, masters thesis (University of Minnesota, 1917). David Bevington, email conversation (University of Chicago, March 9, 1998). Sr. Maginnis notes a similarity between Benvolio's early conversation with Romeo

Shakespeare and Hrotsvit modeled their plays after Terence (in Shakespeare's case, his comedies and romances), similarities between Shakespeare and Hrotsvit should not be unexpected. The particular points in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* that have been compared to Romeo and Juliet will be noted as they arise in the discussion of the play below.

Generally, studies of Hrotsvit's plays do not focus on them as adaptations of the hagiographies she used to write them. Sandro Sticca has written several significant and informative articles on the monastic, liturgical and exegetical backgrounds of Hrotsvit's plays, but he has not produced a study of this kind on *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*.⁶⁴ Walter Berschin's article (mentioned earlier), looks carefully at Hrotsvit source texts, but does not make any connections between these texts and how Hrotsvit developed her plays. Homeyer⁶⁵ and Black⁶⁶ have written on the liturgical language in Hrotsvit's plays, but these studies do not address the

about Juliet and Calimachus' conversation with his friends about Drusiana. Bevington points out that two "young men talking about one of them being in love" is "sufficiently general not to be very remarkable." "It's there in Chaucer's *Troilus and Creseida*, for example." There are many such conversations between two male friends in Shakespeare's plays, as Orlando telling about Rosalind in *As You Like It*, and similar scenes in *Love's Labor's Lost*, and *Taming of the Shrew*. "It's a tale-type, . . . come the Renaissance it becomes a commonplace."

⁶⁴ Sandro Sticca, "Hrotsvit's Abraham and the Exegetical Tradition," *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Lovaniensis* (1973): pp. 359-385; "Hrotsvit's Dulcitius and Christian Symbolism," *Mediaeval Studies* 32 (1970): 108-127; "Sacred Drama and Comic Realism in the plays of Hrotsvit of Gandersheim," *Center for Early and Renaissance Studies VI* (1979); "Sacred Drama and Tragic Realism Hrotsvit's Paphnutius," *Mediaevalia Lovaniensia I XIII* (1985); "The Hagiographical and Monastic Context of Hrotsvit's Plays," *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Rara Avis in Saxonia?* Medieval and Renaissance Monograph Series, ed. Katharina Wilson VII (Ann Arbor, Michigan: MARC, 1987), pp. 1-34.

⁶⁵ Homeyer, *Werke*, pp. 325-333. Homeyer's German translation of Hrotsvit's works contains an appendix that identifies the tenth-century liturgical vocabulary in Hrotsvit's plays.

⁶⁶ Jonathon Black, "The Use of Liturgical Texts in Hrotsvit's Works," *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim, Rara Avis in Saxonia?* Medieval and Renaissance Monograph Series, ed. Katharina Wilson VII (Ann Arbor, Michigan: MARC, 1987), pp. 165-181.

liturgical language or narrative content of the plays with their corresponding hagiographies. Homeyer has also written on *imitatio* and *aemulatio* in Hrotsvit's writings,⁶⁷ especially in relationship to Terence, but again the hagiographical source texts have not been considered in this discussion.

Several studies have been done of Hrotsvit's plays for their similarities to Terence's comedies. As earlier cited, Cornelia Coulter treats *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* briefly in her article, "The 'Terentian' Comedies of a Tenth Century Nun,"⁶⁸ which points out similarities between *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* and Terence's *Eunuchus*. She does not apply her conclusions to the hagiographic texts in specific detail. Carol Newlands' article, "Hrotsvitha's Debt to Terence,"⁶⁹ compares Hrotsvit's male and female characters in *Lapsus et Conversio Mariae Neptis Habrahae Heremicolae (Abraham)* and *Conversio Thaidis Meretricis (Pafnutius)* with Terence's male and female characters. She includes some comparative analysis with the hagiographical representation of the characters as well, but the adaptation from the hagiography is not the focus of her study, and it does not concern *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*.

Peter Dronke's article on Hrotsvit in *Medieval Women Writers* does make some observations about elements in the plays that Hrotsvit has added to the actual legend and thus is speaking to Hrotsvit's adaptation process, but he does not treat the

⁶⁷ Homeyer, "Imitatio und Aemulatio im Werk der Hrotsvitha von Gandersheim," *Studi Medievali* 10 (1968): 966-979.

⁶⁸ Coulter, pp. 523-524, 527-529.

⁶⁹ Carol E. Newlands, "Hrotsvitha's Debt to Terence," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 116 (1986): 369-391.

adaptation directly. Sr. Mary Marguerite Butler examines the adaptability of Hrotsvit's dramatic works to the stage,⁷⁰ showing their performability, but not in relation to Hrotsvit's hagiographic sources.

The Scope of the Present Study

This investigation will consist of line-by-line and/or act-by-act examinations of the characters throughout *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* in order to observe as closely as possible how Hrotsvit has adapted the characters of the original legend to her play. As Sticca points out, in tenth-century literary esthetics guided writers "to use comic and entertaining elements to achieve *utilitas* and *moralitas*."⁷¹ I hope to show how Hrotsvit's character adaptations related to her audience's fascination with *delectatio et utilitas*.

This study does not concern itself with determining the precise source texts Hrotsvit used for her legends, although this is a very important area much in need of study. Nor does it seek to explore in depth the religious, political and cultural backgrounds pertinent to the play. These will be included where possible, as audience plays an important role in this study; characterizations become comedic based on the contexts that the audience brings to the plays. The questions around Hrotsvit's intent that her plays be performed or merely read is not under consideration here, although this issue is important in the process of adapting a character for an audience, be they

⁷⁰ Butler, Sr. Mary.

⁷¹ Sticca, "Sacred Drama. . .", p. 129.

readers or viewers.⁷² A natural result of this study will be observations of the comedic value of live performance to given situations in the play, but these will not be considered as such. The term “audience” will be used throughout this thesis to refer to audience in its broadest sense, as readers of text and/or as viewers of live presentations.

The characterizations of St. John, Calimachus, Drusiana, Andronicus and Fortunatus, and the characterization of God as demonstrative of the greater lessons in the text are the focus of this thesis. Hrotsvit’s adaptations of St. John and Calimachus are examined in detail. Subsequent chapters treating Drusiana, Andronicus, and Fortunatus are less detailed to avoid repetition since overlaps occur when discussing characters in shared scenes. The conclusion treats Hrotsvit’s characterization of God in the play, and the ultimate effects of her approach to *delectatio et utilitas*.

This close reading hopes to lay the groundwork for further and broader contextual studies. As no such approach to the character adaptations in Hrotsvit has been previously attempted, I offer this as a preliminary step in preparation for future work of this nature.⁷³

⁷² Butler, Sr. Mary, Chapter V, and pp. 112-113. Butler discusses the theatricality of Hrotsvit’s play in depth. She also describes the *didascalia* in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*.

⁷³ The bibliography is extensive. In my research for this thesis, I sought out texts which I thought would shed light on the cultural backgrounds of Hrotsvit’s life that might influence her choices in the adaptation of her plays.

CHAPTER II

ST. JOHN

The *Acta Johannis*, written to verify the sanctity of St. John, begins this final section of the blessed disciple's hagiography with the scene of his arrival back at Ephesus. He is greeted with great reverence and affection by his followers who touch his feet, and draw his hands to their faces (63, IV).⁷⁴ This shows St. John as the center of the legend, and demonstrates how deeply St. John's followers loved him. Moreover, St. John does not hold a pious distance from his disciples, but as the legend relates, freely embraces them and encourages their sense of reverence and community: "great love and endless joy prevailed among the brethren."

In contrast, Hrotsvit's play begins with a brief summary of the plot mentioning St. John as the hero who saves Drusiana and Calimachus, but does not open Act I with St. John. Instead, Hrotsvit begins her play with a markedly Terentian conversation between Calimachus and his friends; St. John does not physically appear in the opening scene, and does not actually take the stage until Act V. This clearly shows that from the play's onset, St. John is an important player, but nonetheless just a player, in a story which will mainly be concerned with the lives of Drusiana and

⁷⁴ Arabic numerals refer to chapters in Bonnet's Greek edition of *Acta Johannis*, in English translation by Elliott, pp. 328-338. Roman numerals refer to chapters in Fabricius' Latin *Virtutes Johannis*, pp. 542-557.

Calimachus.

Thus the first adaptive decision Hrotsvit makes is not only to decentralize St. John from his sacred role in the original hagiography, but by fully applying the Terentian conversation form in the telling of this story, to completely change the mood of “great love and endless joy” to one of enjoyment and *delectatio*. Hrotsvit does this in order to achieve a complete focus on the Drusiana and Calimachus episode. This decision is necessary not only to establish the primacy of Drusiana and Calimachus in her play; Hrotsvit also needs to free herself from the deep and heavy mood of sanctity that permeates the entire text of the *Acta Johannis* so that she can tell the story of Drusiana and Calimachus in the lighter *delectatio et utilitas* style.

Although this deeply holy mood is filled with “great love and endless joy,” this “joy” is pious and sacred, not appropriate or suitable for the *delectatio* of her play. The Greek version of the hagiography uses the word *agape*, translated by Elliott as “great love and endless joy,” the meaning of *agape* being the fulfillment of spiritual love not only between human beings, but also between God and humanity. Therefore, a mood of intense spirituality is fostered directly by the hagiography, a mood which does not lend itself to the farcical aspects of *delectatio et utilitas*.

Hrotsvit’s decentralization of St. John from the core of her hagiographic stance can be read as an act of reverent respect on her part for the sanctity of St. John. For, despite the fact that she is celebrating very holy events in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, she is being very careful how she places a figure of St. John’s stature within the Terentian form. However, since St. John is the spiritual

teacher of Drusiana, and the redeemer of Calimachus, Hrotsvit retains his significant heroic function, but focuses upon his heroism in the facilitation of the sanctity and redemption of others, rather than upon testimony that St. John is a holy man. He remains the final authority, the facilitator of *agape*--the “golden background”⁷⁵--of God’s teaching and love that provides the stage for the mere mortals of the story to fulfill their spiritual destiny.

After St. John’s arrival in Ephesus, the hagiography shifts from the brethren and St. John to introduce Calimachus and his struggle (63, IV); St. John is not directly mentioned in this chapter of the hagiography.⁷⁶ Hrotsvit chooses to begin her play at this point. She introduces St. John within the context of Calimachus’ pursuit of Drusiana, rather than Drusiana and Calimachus as part of St. John’s life. She accomplishes this by indirect reference, including St. John in Calimachus’ friends’ description of Drusiana as one who “follows the teachings of St. John the apostle.”

Introducing St. John in this way also provides the information that Calimachus is in a certain antagonistic relationship with St. John. Calimachus’ friends explain that because Drusiana follows St. John, St. John is part of the list of reasons Calimachus cannot “have” the married Christian woman. By St. John’s becoming an obstacle to Calimachus’ satisfaction, Hrotsvit aligns Drusiana, Andronicus, St. John, and God with “the good,” and by implication aligns Calimachus with Satan, the servants of hell,

⁷⁵ Snyder, plates 2, 4, 9. The golden background of early Christian art symbolized the glory of the holy spirit and the splendor of the holy spirit.

⁷⁶ This demonstrates how the preceding chapters of the hagiography have served to contextualize the events in the Drusiana and Calimachus episode.

and “the bad.”

Hrotsvit does this in an extremely subtle way, in order to preserve the wonderful conversational mood of her first act. The hagiography draws the lines between good and evil in the story very bluntly, inciting fear in the audience with the words “one, a servant of Satan, coveted Drusiana.” Here Elliott has given the translation of “coveted” for the Greek *eros*, which appears in the sentence following the hagiography’s use of *agape* in regard to the brethren and St. John. The presence of Satan is far too strong for the delicate fabric of Hrotsvit’s *delectatio*. She carefully transforms this section of the hagiography into the *delectatio* of an animatedly Terentian exchange rather than the *timor mortis* of a soul-edifying encounter, yet communicating to the audience that a potentially serious conflict of interests is at hand between Calimachus and St. John, and if St. John is on heaven’s side of the conflict, Calimachus must be on the side of hell.

St. John does not appear in Hrotsvit’s Act III, which strengthens Drusiana and Calimachus’ centrality to the narrative, for this is “their” scene, fully constructed by Hrotsvit from a single line in the hagiography: “[Calimachus] was even so impudent as to send word to her.” By adding this full act, and by leaving St. John out of it, Hrotsvit significantly expands the legend of Drusiana and Calimachus. The audience is left, however, to wonder where St. John is keeping himself while Drusiana is being tormented by this maniacal man. His absence can also be read as neglect, and indirectly Hrotsvit begins to show St. John as slightly “caught up in the golden spiritual clouds” and not fully in touch with the gravity of earthly concerns.

In Act IV, Hrotsvit makes a small but significant change from the hagiographic rendition of the story. The hagiography states that “Drusiana departed this life in the presence of St. John”(64, IV). Hrotsvit, however, places Andronicus at Drusiana’s death-bed, with no sign of St. John. With this change, Hrotsvit again distances St. John from Drusiana’s crisis, and subtly points out for a second time that St. John is “somewhere else” and not where Drusiana needs him. His absence removes him from Drusiana’s confidence, unlike the hagiography in which St. John hears her prayers to God concerning Calimachus before she dies, and is therefore fully informed as to what has driven her to the extreme of praying for death to save her.

Interestingly this shift adds to the melodramatic rather than the tragic aspect of Drusiana’s prayer to die, and serves the *delectatio* of the play. For St. John is Drusiana’s confessor, and his absence from her death-bed delegitimizes her death, especially for Hrotsvit’s monastic audience. For Hrotsvit’s audience, the absence of her confessor makes Drusiana’s death seem unreal, exactly the effect Hrotsvit is seeking, in her shift away from hagiographic *Ernst*. The audience is brought to the smiles of surprise and disbelief rather than the heaviness of sorrow and grief upon Drusiana’s passing.

Furthermore, Andronicus’ presence at Drusiana’s death demands that he go find St. John, which further strengthens the sense that St. John, the “real” authority, is indeed somewhere else, and must be searched for and found in order to legitimize Drusiana’s passing. Thus, in keeping with her characterization of St. John as the “backdrop” to the action, it is to him that Andronicus turns for help with the crisis of

Drusiana's death in Act V.

Apparent at this point is that Hrotsvit incorporates the expectations of her audience into her characterization of St. John as a saint in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*. Hrotsvit counts on her audience's familiarity with the holy figure of St. John, knowing that her audience expects St. John to be perfectly and lovingly attentive to his disciples, all-knowing of every event taking place, and expressing a warm and powerful relationship to God and the Holy Spirit. Where a complete adherence to this characterization would flatten the levity of the play, deviating from it and portraying St. John as slightly less than truly sensitive and all-knowing allows even his holy figure to take on a comical quality that serves the *delectatio et utilitas* style Hrotsvit seeks to achieve without overtly insulting her audience's saintly St. John.

In *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* St. John becomes the slightly self-involved, too pious, and over-bearing bishop that may well have been a stereotyped figure by Hrotsvit's times, and given Hrotsvit's propensity for bringing high men off their pedestals in combination with the mood of independence at Gandersheim, Hrotsvit may be using St. John as a vehicle for poking critique at the male clergy of her day.⁷⁷

Hrotsvit finally brings St. John fully into the action of the play in Act V when Andronicus finds him to tell him of Drusiana's passing. This sequencing of events follows the hagiography; after Drusiana dies, Andronicus and St. John have a

⁷⁷ Fichtenau, p. 227-230. Given the "checkered" standing of the Hildesheim bishops at Gandersheim, such provocation might not be unexpected.

conversation wherein St. John consoles Andronicus. The Greek hagiography gives St. John's conversation with Andronicus a truly compassionate quality, for St. John knows that Andronicus is grief-stricken over the loss of Drusiana (65, V). He consoles Andronicus not by telling him to stop weeping, but calms him by saying Drusiana has left "this unjust life for a better hope." The hagiography also describes Andronicus as carrying a "hidden sadness" that he does not reveal to St. John. St. John in turn shows deference to his privacy and does not inquire as to the cause of Drusiana's death until after she is interred, and when he learns the whole story he "is more sorrowful than Andronicus"(65,V).

Throughout this segment of the hagiography, St. John is warm and compassionate, and sensitive to Andronicus. St. John addresses Andronicus here and in several other places with fatherly affection as "my son." The Latin version is less intimate, but still uses "my son." Hrotsvit's play is more like the Latin version in tone, but Hrotsvit eliminates the "my son" address almost completely from St. John's lines, giving him an edgy and patronizing, rather than receptive and fatherly, character. Hrotsvit has St. John ask Andronicus straight out, "why is he crying." This comes across as impatient and slightly rude; through brief questions and answers St. John discovers the cause of Andronicus' tears, and then instead of offering him consolation, tells him outright that his weeping "disagrees" with their "believing" that Drusiana is now "resting in heaven." Unlike the hagiography's kind, sensitive disciple, Hrotsvit's St. John bluntly asks Andronicus to tell him the cause of Drusiana's death, and Andronicus is forced to say that he'd rather discuss it when he is no longer mourning.

Then, rather than offering an apology or any sympathy for Andronicus, St. John abruptly suggests, as if he is nervous and trying to avoid Andronicus' emotional state, that they "go ahead and celebrate the service of the dead." Clearly, Hrotsvit creates a St. John who lacks tact, the very essence of saintliness, and by removing this quality from him, he becomes quite humorous. His final line in the scene stating that "It is proper that her body be honorably entombed" works as a sanctimonious, impersonal comment that could be said for almost anyone, and shows that he cares more about propriety than he cares about Drusiana or Andronicus. By giving him this concern for the "liturgically correct," however, Hrotsvit does reinforce his authority as bishop and earthly representative of heaven's law and practice, a foreshadowing of what will become very defined in Act IX.

At this point Hrotsvit significantly adapts the hagiography. While she uses Andronicus' delay in relating to St. John the exact circumstances of Drusiana's death she edits this hagiographical episode in order to telescope the time frame of events in her play. The hagiography continues with Andronicus revealing the cause of Drusiana's death (66, V), followed by St. John's sermon to the brethren in response to Drusiana's passing (67-69, VI). During this sermon Calimachus and Fortunatus enter the graveyard to commit their crime (70-71, VII). This means that in the hagiography God appears twice -- once to Calimachus while St. John is giving his sermon, and a second time when St. John and Andronicus arrive the next morning at the burial grounds to break bread at Drusiana's tomb (72, VIII).

Hrotsvit begins Act V leaving out St. John's sermon, and using Andronicus' delay in telling St. John the whole story as the moment for the two of them to go off to the cemetery. Hrotsvit creates this walk to the graveyard so that while St. John and Andronicus are on their way to the tomb, Calimachus and Fortunatus can attempt their crime. God's appearance to St. John and Andronicus as they are on their way to, and not at the tomb, occurs synchronically with God's appearance to Calimachus. Basically, Hrotsvit has replaced St. John's sermon in the hagiography with Andronicus' and St. John's walk to the graveyard, and unified God's two time-separated appearances in the hagiography into two simultaneous appearances in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*.

Once St. John and Andronicus have arrived at Drusiana's grave, the sequencing of events between the play and the hagiography are once more similar. Yet Hrotsvit's artistry in the way she has edited the hagiography so that she preserves the events most significant to Drusiana and Calimachus, and eliminates the sections which do not suit her hagiographic purposes, is powerful indeed. For what would become of *delectatio et utilitas* were she to include St. John's sermon as it appears in the hagiography? The fact that she left out the most rhetorically didactic and normally most morally educational section of the hagiography in order to more effectively instruct her audience indicates exactly where the difference between the standard treatment of the *exemplum* and tenth-century *delectatio et utilitas* lies. The hagiographic method can only be about the lesson that it is attempting to teach; it tells its listeners how to behave when temptation strikes, which is always in the future, and in that sense it is

always an abstract reference to hypothetical events. Dramatized, the sermon would have forced the audience to sit still and listen to one person speaking a soliloquy of sorts, which would have slowed the movement of the play's action to a virtual halt. This would have created a distracting gravity in which listeners may have stopped to remember their responsibilities, and brooded upon amending their ways.

In the comedic form, which relies almost solely on lively conversational exchange between the characters, the players embody the didactic lesson before the eyes of the audience, rather than explain it. The quick pacing of dialogue and events engenders movement which engages the audience; their conversations allow the audience to identify with the lesson the players are trying to teach in the present moment. The Terentian comedic medium combined with hagiographic content creates the levity of forgetting oneself, and opens listeners to fresh points of view regarding unpleasant aspects of themselves that need improvement.

Thus, Hrotsvit does not include a sermon by St. John, for it would slow the pacing of her play just at the moment when dramatic tensions are mounting. Also, a sermon by St. John would return his centrality to the context of the story, demanding that all stop and listen to him speak. By organizing events as she does, Hrotsvit actually fans the flames of suspense, with her arrangement of short scenes wherein the heroes and villains narrowly miss each other in their pursuits of Drusiana's tomb. This creates a near-slapstick mood that reflects the farcical "running slaves" of Terence's Roman stage.

At this point, when comparing the hagiography with the play, one sees most clearly how the moods of the two works diverge from each other. The hagiographic account of the walk to Drusiana's tomb opens with an almost verbatim quote from the New Testament story of the women's departure for the tomb of Christ on Sunday morning. The hagiography reads, "On the next day, which was the third day after the death of Drusiana, at the hour of early morning . . ." (72, VIII). This invokes a powerful mood of sanctity and reverence for the proceedings being described. Then, the keys to the tomb are found to be missing, and St. John says, "It is fitting that they are lost, for Drusiana is not in the tomb . . .," another allusion to Christ's empty tomb. St. John is confident that they will not need the keys, and trusts that the doors will be open, "since the Lord has already given us many other things." The mood is of rest, peace and thanksgiving.

In contrast, Hrotsvit again edits the hagiography and leaves out the lost keys altogether. She also excludes the sacred language of the first Easter morning, and mentions nothing of time or day when St. John and Andronicus leave for the tomb. She is remaining consistent in her respect for her audience's piety, and her attempt to effectively create a work of *delectatio et utilitas*.

When Hrotsvit's Act VIII opens, St. John still has no idea how Drusiana died, while Andronicus does know the story. St. John repeats his purpose of celebrating Drusiana's funeral. Hrotsvit correctly anticipates that the shocking events involving Calimachus and Fortunatus would weaken the audience's memory of St. John and Andronicus' intention to visit the tomb. Andronicus simply supports St.

John's suggestion that they celebrate the office for the dead saying that it is appropriate, or proper, for St. John to do this; again Hrotsvit is characterizing St. John as the propitious bishop.

The action of the play continues with St. John and Andronicus' walk to the cemetery, and God's appearance to them on the way. By keeping St. John uninformed about Drusiana's death, the saint seems even less saintly in his bewilderment over the reason for God's appearance to them. After all, saints are supposed to divinely understand problematic situations. Hrotsvit lets St. John remain ignorant of the facts which makes him appear even more confounded when God appears to Andronicus and him, and St. John has not a clue what God is talking about: "I still do not understand the reason for this."

Andronicus' response, born out of his obvious comprehension of God's message, makes it all the more obvious that St. John is disoriented and slightly out of control. The lay-person is not supposed to have more insight into the word of God than the bishop. Therefore, St. John is the one who actually converses with the divine spirit of God when He appears; Hrotsvit does not overtly usurp St. John of his role as bishop and saint.

Concerning the hagiography's version, the appearance of God to St. John and the brethren occurs when they arrive at the tomb (73, VIII) The gates indeed need no key, and are open as St. John had predicted. His knowledge of the future lends an authority and reliability to his characterization in the hagiography that Hrotsvit chooses to de-emphasize by leaving the entire event of "the keys" out of the play.

The arrival at Drusiana's tomb signals the beginning of Act IX of the play, the final and longest section of *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*. Here Hrotsvit drops the chapter divisions of the hagiography, and sets Act IX in the graveyard as one long act with several events that includes chapters (73-86, VIII-XIII): St. John's and Andronicus' discovery of the bodies; the exorcism of the snake; the resurrection of Calimachus and Calimachus' confession, repentance and conversion; Drusiana's resurrection; Calimachus' lesson in forgiveness; Fortunatus' resurrection and second death; and St. John's lesson on judgment followed by his closing prayers. Hrotsvit has followed the hagiography's narrative quite accurately here, except she has somewhat altered and lengthened the scene with Calimachus' repentance, and made significant changes in the language of the prayers made by St. John throughout this final section of the play.

The hagiography begins the scene at the tomb with St. John dumbfounded upon his arrival there, for he does not understand what he sees, and does not understand why the Lord has not made this circumstance known to him (73, VIII). Hrotsvit seems to have taken St. John's honest and disarming openness from this hagiographic statement, exaggerated it, and applied it in the previous scenes to her characterization of St. John as being "left out" of the divine line of communications. She thereby undoes the sincere dismay that the blessed disciple shows, making another choice to move her characterization of St. John away from true compassion.

Hrotsvit then has Andronicus explain to St. John what he thinks has happened. This is in keeping with the hagiography (74, IX), only the hagiography does not

include the extended conversation between the two men that Hrotsvit creates here. As Andronicus gives the details, St. John responds with brief remarks as though offended and insulted by Andronicus' story, rather than emotionally touched or disturbed by it. When Andronicus ponders the wondrous wisdom of God, who has differentiated between the crimes of Calimachus and Fortunatus, St. John utters a brief interpretation of the events praising God as "Supreme Judge."⁷⁸ This is significant, for as the play further unfolds, St. John becomes more and more a spiritual "judge" himself.

Then Hrotsvit gives St. John the comment, "We are often able to know the cause of events after they happen," -- a comment that comes across as though St. John is self-conscious that he did not know the events before the fact instead of after, as a good saint and spiritual judge should. This shows Hrotsvit is truly shaping the character of St. John. Hrotsvit adds St. John's prayers of thanksgiving here as well, whereas the hagiography does not delay to move straight for the resurrection of Calimachus in order to understand what has gone on in their absence. By taking so

⁷⁸ Homeyer, *Opera*, pp. 325-333. St. John's brief homily and the other short homilies and prayers which follow, although they contain liturgical vocabulary as Homeyer has shown, are not verbatim repetitions of phrases and sentences from liturgical rites.

Cyrille Vogel and Reinhard Elze, *Le Pontifical Romano-Germanique du Dixieme Siecle* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1963). These liturgical words and phrases are found in the tenth-century Romano German pontifical (see below for specific citations).

Michael Driscoll, telephone conversation (Notre Dame, July 15, 1998). Driscoll has identified St. John's utterances as "pietistic" prayers that correspond with the prayers found in personal writings of the tenth century. Hrotsvit uses the more colloquial language of tenth century piety rather than the actual text from sacred church ritual. This is in keeping with what seems to be Hrotsvit's overall care in her treatment of holy writings and ideologies; she uses the language of personal prayer to poke fun at the way people get caught up in conventions of her day, but she does not poke fun at the conventions themselves by using the language from the liturgy.

much time over things, Hrotsvit's St. John comes across as more caught up in the "wonder of God" than the needs of the people lying dead on the ground before him.

St. John then exorcises the snake in both texts (75, IX), and the phrase he uses in the Latin hagiography, *Discede ab eo quia serviturus est domino nostro Iesu Christo*, is an accurate translation of the Greek. Hrotsvit follows the legend's account of the exorcism almost verbatim: *Discede*⁷⁹ *ab hoc, [crudelis bestia],*⁸⁰ *quia serviturus est Christo*. Where the hagiography then moves directly to the resurrection of Calimachus, which implies that the snake "left" Calimachus right away, Hrotsvit adds a humorous exchange between St. John and Andronicus about the snake's quick departure; Andronicus comments that even though the snake is an "irrational animal" it is "not deaf," and still "obeys" St. John's commands. This could well be a humorous reference to Psalm 58:4, which refers to the poisonous "deaf adder" that closes its ears to truth; unlike the deaf adder, this snake seems to hear everything.⁸¹

St. John replies it is the power of Christ within St. John that the snake obeys, thus reinforcing the holy power of St. John's character. This speaks in a light-hearted way to the many references to "who has an ear listen to what the Spirit is saying" in Revelations, referring to those who can hear the command of God.⁸² Hrotsvit makes

⁷⁹ Romano-German pontifical, v. II, CXV 33, p. 200. In the rite of exorcism, *Adiuro te ergo, serpens antique, per iudicem vivorum atque mortuorum, per factorem, mundi, per eum qui habet potestatem mittere te in gehennam, ut ab hoc famulo Dei, qui ad aecclesiae presepia concurrit, cum comitatu et exercitu furoris tui festinus discedas.*

⁸⁰ Hrotsvit adds this nomenclature.

⁸¹ Homeyer, *Opera*, p. 279. Homeyer notes that the "role of the snake points to Manichean elements" in the legend, citing Richard Adelbert Lipsius, *Die Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden* (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1976), p. 460 ff; and Hennecke, p. 142.

⁸² Rev. 2:7,11,17, 29; 3:6,13, 22.

one other minor but significant change in “the snake;” instead of the snake sitting on top of Calimachus after he dies, as both the Latin and the Greek legends describe, Hrotsvit has St. John and Andronicus find the snake wrapped around both Calimachus and Fortunatus together, which adds to the humor of the scene, and echoes the Old Testament symbol for the spread of worldly sin: a globe circumscribed by a serpent.⁸³

Having freed Calimachus from the snake, St. John proceeds to resurrect Calimachus in both texts (75, X). The prayer that the hagiographic St. John makes, is sincerely addressed to God, asking advice and guidance regarding Calimachus and the events at hand; however, Hrotsvit’s prayer for St. John is distanced from Calimachus, and speaks more to God about the process of the resurrection itself, like the incantation of a formulaic prayer suitable for any resurrection, not just Calimachus’.

Both texts state that Calimachus did not come to his full senses right away (75, X). In the hagiography Calimachus remains quiet for one hour, then St. John begins

J. Schouten, *The Rod and Serpent of Asklepios* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1967), pp. 35-44, 65-70. The snake’s role in the hagiography is greater than it may seem, for Hellenistic culture revered the snake for its healing powers.

In conjunction with the snake’s broader Hellenistic contexts, Hrotsvit’s use of the word “obey” in connection with the snake invokes two specific elements regarding St. John. First, in the *Virtutes Johannis* is the story of “St. John and the Obedient Bedbugs.” St. John commands the bedbugs to leave the bed he is about to sleep in, and they “obey.” In *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* the snake also “obeys” St. John, creating an obvious comedic overtone with the bedbugs. Secondly, St. John’s symbol is a chalice holding a small serpent. The source of this symbol is also found in the *Virtutes Johannis*, the story of St. John’s challenge to drink from a cup of poison to prove, by his survival, that he is the servant of the true God. He survives, showing that he can overcome poison, hence his symbol. Hrotsvit’s use of the word “obey” here may also allude to this symbology; Wolf Traut’s woodcut published with Celtes’ edition of *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* picks up on this humor: St. John walks with his cup tipped, allowing the snake to jump out and bite the man laying on the ground next to Drusiana in her grave, as if St. John commanded the snake to do so.

⁸³ F. R. Webber, *Church Symbolism: An Explanation of the More Important Symbols of the Old and New Testament, the Primitive, the Mediaeval and the Modern Church* (Cleveland: J.H. Jansen, 1927), p. 27. Thus Hrotsvit voices the medieval dichotomy in its alliterative understanding of the serpent as such, a contrast that will be discussed more fully below.

to ask him questions. In Hrotsvit's version Andronicus comments that Calimachus is breathing, but he is in a stupor and immobile. St. John, ignoring Calimachus' stunned condition, then demands "Calimachus, rise in the name of Christ," and asks him to "confess" all that he knows about the circumstances he is in, and to make sure he speaks the truth. Hrotsvit places Calimachus on judge St. John's witness stand, and has him make his confession.

The hagiography portrays this scene simply, with St. John merely asking Calimachus to tell him what happened, and if Calimachus actually raped the body (76, X). Calimachus tells him that God appeared to him as the snake bit Fortunatus and scared Calimachus to death. He repents his sin, and out of the depths of his heart, on bended knee, begs St. John to make him a Christian. St. John rejoices that Calimachus has been so blessed by the Lord, forgives him, and welcomes him as a Christian into the community of the brethren, without any complications or demands (77, X).

Hrotsvit does not let the opportunity slip by for a very entertaining scene at this point. Perhaps inspired by the hagiography's portrayal of Calimachus on his knees begging for forgiveness, Hrotsvit draws out the process of Calimachus' conversion as bishop St. John questions him, and then puts him through a process of repentance in which he must express extreme remorse for his crimes. Calimachus is reduced to begging St. John to forgive him, "to hurry, not to delay." But bishop St. John does delay, almost withholding absolution from Calimachus, in a way that seems to admonish Calimachus rather than reach out to him in brotherly love. St. John calls

him “thrice-unfortunate wretch,” nomenclature of Hrotsvit that does not exist in the hagiography in any form.

Yet when Hrotsvit finally lets St. John forgive Calimachus and bring him into the fold, St. John softens a little, although he still holds his patriarchal distance. He addresses Calimachus as “son Calimachus,” making a gesture towards the affection of “my son,” but not quite meeting the same level of warmth. Hrotsvit gives St. John three prayers, the first blessing the Holy Spirit for liberating Calimachus’ soul from eternal damnation, the second supplicating before God, expressing how overwhelmed he is with God’s mercy and justice, and the third, commenting on how miraculous it is that Calimachus’ sin could be forgiven. All three of these small sermons absolve Calimachus, but they do not embrace him, and St. John’s words work sanctimoniously instead of joyously.

In both the hagiography and *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, Andronicus asks St. John to raise Drusiana, reinforcing the authority of St. John (79, XI). The resurrection of Drusiana that follows is preceded with a heartfelt prayer by St. John in the hagiography, whereas in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, St. John simply turns to her and commands, “Drusiana, Lord Jesus Christ raises you,” a rather cold approach to the heroine of the story. When Drusiana requests the resurrection of Fortunatus, and Calimachus protests, Hrotsvit takes this as another chance to lace more *delectatio* into her play. In the hagiography St. John responds very soberly and earnestly to Calimachus, teaching him the Christian lesson of the sacrifice of Christ for

humankind, and the example of his ever-abundant grace for all people (81, XII).⁸⁴

Hrotsvit lets St. John lecture Calimachus, with Andronicus' support, on all of the reasons why Christians must forgive the "trespasses" of others. This reinforces St. John's spiritual authority, but he does not extend compassion towards Calimachus the way the legend's version of St. John does, making Hrotsvit's St. John seem more of a disciplinarian rather than a type of Christ.

St. John's decision to have Drusiana raise Fortunatus, which is worded similarly in both texts (81, XII), does not take away from St. John's spiritual authority, but rather strengthens it because in so doing he is sharing spiritual power with Drusiana, and showing humility. When Fortunatus is raised, the hagiography says that he is disgusted by the way "the power of these awful people has spread," and he runs away (83, XII). Hrotsvit expands this into a conversation between St. John and Fortunatus, which returns the spiritual authority to St. John. Again, Hrotsvit adds this conversation to her play, intensifying the audience's experience of Fortunatus' cowardly behavior.

When Fortunatus rejects his resurrection and runs away in the hagiography, St. John responds by making a long prayer of exorcism and protection of the community of the brethren of Christ, realizing the evil nature of Fortunatus that had been in their midst (84, XIII). Then St. John breaks bread and offers prayers of

⁸⁴ Romano-German pontifical, v. II, CXXIII 4, p. 223. From the prayer for the liberation of a soul from a demon: . . . *quem demonum malignus conturbat spiritus, et memor esse digneris, quia opus manuum tuarum est et pretioso tuo sanguine eum redimere dignatus es . . . per dominum.*

thanksgiving to God, and they return home. Having arrived home, St. John says “he has been told in a vision” that Fortunatus has died again, three hours ago from the snakebite wound, which is indeed true. Thus the hagiography reemphasizes the sanctity of St. John, who has the power and grace of true prayer, exorcism, blessing, and clairvoyant vision (86-86, XIII).

Hrotsvit leaves out St. John’s long, gentle prayer of protection, and replaces it with St. John’s abrupt banishment and condemnation of Fortunatus to the eternal fires of hell, again depicting St. John’s character as brash and reactive. Hrotsvit draws on imagery and metaphor from the hagiography’s prayer for her version of St. John’s protective condemnation, including the “ancient snake,” and the “bad tree” with its “lust-fruits.” Hrotsvit does not have Fortunatus run away, but he chooses to die again, before the very eyes of St. John and the others who do nothing to help him. He bloats and dies of the snake-bite wound, and St. John’s comment is “He is to die,” implying “It is right he dies,” a rather callous response from a Christian bishop in the face of a man’s death. Considering that St. John is a Christian saint, it seems a little harsh that he would stand by and watch a man die without offering help. By keeping the dead Fortunatus physically in the same area with pontificating St. John, who ignores the lifeless body, she creates an ironic juxtaposition of the living and the dead.

In the hagiography, St. John responds to the news of Fortunatus’ death with the statement, *Habes Filium tuum, Diabole*, and the episode simply closes, “Thus John rejoiced with the brethren in the Lord” (86, XIII). Hrotsvit, in comparison, does not close her story so quickly. She invents an epilogue consisting of a conversation

between Andronicus and St. John that reflects and expounds on Fortunatus' death (while the body is lying there in front of them), and teaches the lessons to be learned from Fortunatus' choice to die. Andronicus questions St. John, and his responses to Andronicus are brief homilies on the dangers of pride.⁸⁵

Hrotsvit does not pass by the chance to use St. John's unique comment in the hagiography, *Habes filium tuum Diabole*; again, she repeats the hagiography's words almost verbatim. In the *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, St. John closes the play suggesting they return home,⁸⁶ and saying, *Diabolo filium relinquamus*. After this statement, St. John expresses the need to celebrate Drusiana and Calimachus' resurrections, and gives thanks to God, the *aequo iudici*, "equitable judge."

Thus Hrotsvit has adapted the character of St. John into a personality that sustains the entertaining esthetic of *delectatio et utilitas*, yet retains the basic structure of the hagiographic original. While she communicates the original *exempla* present in the hagiography of God's boundless mercy for sinners, she also "instructs" the male clergy of her times to examine themselves for pontificating and placing church protocol ahead of human needs.

⁸⁵ Morton Bloomfield, *The Seven Deadly Sins: An Introduction to the History of a Religious Concept, with Special Reference to Medieval English Literature* (Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1952), pp. 69-104. As western theology developed, it was debated whether pride or avarice was the most serious of the seven deadly sins.

⁸⁶ Romano-German pontifical, v. I XVI 9, p. 24. Hrotsvit uses the phrase "you [God], aware of secrets" in St. John's last prayer, from the Ordination of Deacons, . . . *te autem, domine, ea que nobis sunt ignota non transeunt, te occulta non falluit; tu cognitor secretorum, tu scrutator es cordium, tu eorum vitam celesti poteris examinare iudicio quo semper praeuales et admissa purgare et ea que sunt agenda concedere* . . .

CHAPTER III

CALIMACHUS⁸⁷

The *Acta Johannis* legend of Drusiana and Calimachus describes Calimachus as seeming to be one among the brethren of the blessed disciple, but one who is in fact a servant of the “adversary” or Satan (63, IV).⁸⁸ Thus at the onset of the legend, Calimachus is characterized as the villain. His unrelenting determination to pursue his sexual attraction to Drusiana, a married Christian woman, reveals his evil nature. For even though his close friends emphatically advise him against such an endeavor, he does not desist. Thus the legend portrays Calimachus as driven by a love-passion that disturbs and distorts his sense of reality. Although he is not described as insane, he is clearly out of control.⁸⁹

The hagiography states quite clearly that the people speaking to Calimachus are his “intimate friends”; they could be among the followers of St. John, but since Calimachus is a pagan, his intimate friends are most likely not Christians (63-64, IV). They speak very seriously with Calimachus, telling him, even though he knows this

⁸⁷ Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14485. The Emmeram codex shows “Calimachus” spelled with one “l”, which v. Winterfeld also follows.

⁸⁸ The Greek hagiography is most explicit in this characterization; the Latin is less harsh.

⁸⁹ E.R. Dodds, *Euripides* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992). The Greek uses the word *mania* to describe Calimachus’ what Elliot translates as “passion”; *mania* is the same term that Euripides uses to describe the frenzied state of the Bacchantes in his play *Bacchae*.

Eril Hughes, “The Augustinian Elements in Hrotsvit,” *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Rara Avis in Saxonia?* Medieval and Renaissance Monograph Series, ed. Katharina Wilson VII (Ann Arbor, MI:

already, that Drusiana is baptized, a follower of St. John, and that she refuses her marriage bed for her devotion to God even though her husband Andronicus is a Christian. Calimachus' friends go on, reminding him that Andronicus even shut Drusiana into a tomb and threatened her with death if she did not return to their marriage bed. In the face of this choice, she elected to die.⁹⁰ So why should Calimachus think that Drusiana would consider a liaison with him?

The group addresses him with disbelief because he so tacitly disregards Drusiana's reputation saying, "[Do] you alone not know . . .?" which shows that he may be ignoring what he knows already. Even if he does not know what went on between Drusiana and her husband, Calimachus' ignorance shows that he has been out of touch with his community for some time, and his friends are shocked to realize this. The audience's sense that Calimachus is afflicted with more than an infatuation is intensified by his defensive refusal to accept his close friends' warnings. Calimachus seems not only willful, but also dangerous.

There is nothing light-hearted about the opening of the hagiographic legend of Drusiana and Calimachus. A tragedy is impending, and the threatening mood of the saint's legend makes this very clear. Calimachus is in no way interested in romance; he is determined to satisfy his carnal desire. Later in the hagiography it is actually stated that Calimachus' goal is to rape Drusiana, even if she is dead (74, IX).

MARC, 1987), pp. 63-64. The Augustinian reading of Calimachus' obsessive "love".

⁹⁰ The story of Andronicus shutting Drusiana in the tomb and what must have been Andronicus' subsequent conversion is not in the Greek version, but is in the Latin version of the hagiography. Elliot suggests that since there are missing sections in the Greek version, this story is likely part of this gap in the Greek manuscript. See also Junod and Kaestli, pp. 86-91.

Hrotsvit is confronted with a major task in recontextualizing the beginning of the story, and more importantly, reshaping the characterization of Calimachus so that he can successfully step into the buoyancy of the *delectato et utilitas* genre from the stony severity of the saint's legend. She does this by setting up the story as an Ovidian romance with a Christian resolution.⁹¹ The one-sentence synopsis of *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* that she provides at the opening of the play shifts the protagonist role from Saint John to Calimachus, and outlines the "comedic knot" that her play will tie, and untie. She relaxes Calimachus' characterization from the hagiography's insane villain to the Ovidian love-sick youth by describing him as one who loved Drusiana,

. . . *eam non solum vivam, sed etiam prae tristitia atque execratione illiciti amoris in domino mortuam plus iusto amavit* . . .⁹²

(. . . not only when she was alive, but also, out of sadness and the curse of illicit lust -- even when she had died in the Lord -- loved her more than was just. . .)

⁹¹ Andreas Capellanus, *The Art of Courtly Love*, trans. ed. John Jay Parry (New York: W.W. Norton), pp. 4-5. "Love as Ovid conceived it is frankly sensual ("merry sensuality" . . .) . . . It is extramarital and does not contemplate matrimony as its object. Ovid is careful to say that the love he has in mind is not that of maidens or married women, but only such as modesty and the laws permit, and much ingenuity has been expended in showing that his doctrine is really not very immoral according to our present standards. But in the Middle Ages it was assumed as a matter of course that the *vir* who must be deluded, and whom Ovid delighted to delude, was the woman's husband, and his statements that husbands and wives cannot love each other . . . The men of the Middle Ages thought that they had [Ovid's] approval for the dictum that the best partner in a love affair is another man's wife. Ovid does not restrict either men or women to one affair at a time, but he does point out that the matter is greatly complicated if one woman learns of her lover's affair with another. Trouble arises, too, if the lady's husband learns that she is in love with another man, so there is good reason for keeping such an affair secret; moreover, the very fact that it is secret makes it much pleasanter." See also Roger Boase, *The Origin and Meaning of Courtly Love* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1977), pp. 100-116. The Christian Solution to the Ovidian triad was that men who had "lost" their women to "God" simply had to convert as well and accept that their wives had become their beloved sisters, i.e., Andronicus' ultimate acceptance of Drusiana's choice. Junod and Kaestli, v. I, p. 90.

⁹² v. Winterfeld, p. 135.

This description paints a humorous picture of Calimachus; it seems to say, “the poor boy was so sad that his lust for Drusiana didn’t stop even after she died.” This statement does not specify that he actually will try to make love to her dead body; the non-specific nature of the phrase leaves the audience to its own positive assumption that the words “more than was just” simply mean “more than was necessary or called for,” and that Calimachus was merely troubled by the “curse” of his youthful sex-drive after the object of his affection died, an uncomfortable, but also laughable state of affairs. The fact that Drusiana “died in the Lord,” in other words, was a virgin, only creates more sympathy for Calimachus because he apparently never had the remotest chance to quench his sexual thirst.

Pity, and a smile of surprise, actually arises in the audience for the young man, especially when the next phrase says that he was bitten by a snake and dies, a seemingly unfair consequence for the “crime” of having a bad crush on a Christian girl. The resolution that a hero, St. John, appears, and that both Calimachus and Drusiana are resurrected in the Lord seems to say they are now together and “living happily ever after,” fully in keeping with the classical formula for a good comedy that begins with a problem and resolves with a happy ending.

Clearly, Hrotsvit has demonstrated her skill at writing an understatement here. She foreshadows the events to come as if they will be merely silly and innocent, in sharp contrast to the fear-invoking opening of the hagiography. In her play she completely leaves out the description of husband Andronicus’ previously shutting Drusiana in a tomb, a choice which not only helps to lighten the hagiography’s

ominous mood, it relieves Calimachus' character of a good deal of responsibility in relationship to Drusiana. Instead of reading the story of a young man blindly proceeding in the face of Drusiana's proven convictions, Hrotsvit's audience reads about a Calimachus who simply wants to dissuade a Christian married woman from her vows, a ploy that makes Calimachus' character provocative, but not threatening.

Then, by modeling the opening scene of Terence's *Girl from Andros*,⁹³ and following the Ovidian precept that secrecy intensifies romance,⁹⁴ Hrotsvit successfully launches her play into the *delectatio et utilitas* mode with Calimachus asking his friends to discuss something with him in a "secret" place away from the crowd. His friends are more than happy to accommodate him, and show no resemblance to Calimachus' shocked friends as portrayed in the hagiography. At Hrotsvit's hand, Calimachus again evokes sympathy from the audience, for he kindly asks his friends for their attention in helping him deal with a problem, and his friends willingly oblige.

Still, Hrotsvit begins *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* with a mood of suspense by having Calimachus request this conversation in private with his friends. In the next scene, he does not blurt out his problem; his friends have to drag it out of him. This feeds the audience's curiosity, and shows that Hrotsvit's Calimachus, although he may be suffering from his passion, has some self-awareness of his state of

⁹³ Sextus Prete, *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae* (Heidelberg: F.H.KerleVerlag, 1954), p. 58. Palmer Bovie, Constance Carrier and Douglass Parker, eds., trans., *The Complete Comedies of Terence* (New Brunswick, NJ: 1974), p. 11. Simo dismisses the other servants and says to his slave Sosia, "*Sosia, ades dum: paucis te uolo.*" ("Sosia, Wait here a moment. I want a few words with you.") Hrotsvit's opening line for Calimachus: *Paucis vos, amici, volo* (My friends, I'd like to have a few words with you).

⁹⁴ See p. 54, note 91.

mind. Hrotsvit does not portray Calimachus as manic: he asks to speak with his friends privately. Thus Hrotsvit subtly foreshadows Calimachus' capacity to feel shame for his crimes at the end of the play.

In these scenes Hrotsvit has adapted the setting of the holy community of "the brethren" into the Terentian camaraderie of the *amici*, leaving the tenebrous mood of the hagiography behind her for the light-hearted conversation of the Terentian stage. As the exchange between Calimachus and his *amici* progresses, however, the play's "light-hearted conversation" nonetheless reveals a serious conflict: the pagan Calimachus will not take "no" for an answer; he will pursue the Christian Drusiana no matter what his friends advise. With this, Hrotsvit delineates the two sides of the conflict present in the hagiography, and Calimachus' position within that conflict. When the pagan Calimachus challenges his friends' advice, he is indirectly placing himself in opposition to Drusiana, Andronicus, St. John, and the authority of God.⁹⁵ In the minds of the monastic audience, such an opposition against the forces of good can only mean that Calimachus is himself aligned with evil. Thus Hrotsvit indirectly communicates to her audience that Calimachus is "evil," but without overtly labeling him "the servant of Satan" as the hagiography does.

More powerful in this regard, however, is the language that Hrotsvit uses in the last section of this scene to subtly link Calimachus' love-affliction with the

⁹⁵ Wilson, *The Plays*, pp. xxii-xxv. The stark juxtaposition of forces of darkness in opposition to forces of light forms the underlying structure of all of the hagiographies that Hrotsvit uses for her plays, a structure that Hrotsvit maintains, but uses more to serve the purposes of *delectatio* than to strike fear into the hearts of her audience.

“adversary.” Calimachus must progress from the love-sick youth to a young man overwhelmed and possessed by his passions within the relaxed yet astute esthetic of *delectatio et utilitas*. Hrotsvit further develops Calimachus’ identification with the forces of evil, only she does this with a savvy wink between the lines instead of a solemn label in plain print.

Her primary method is “tagging” Calimachus with terms traditionally used by Christian theology in association with the seven deadly sins and the devil. When his friends finally hear who Calimachus loves, the first words they say to him are, *Erras, socie*. The term *erras* means, “You are at fault,” and indirectly implies, “You sin,” to the Christian audience. Then, Calimachus states, “I do not care, if I can attract her to my love.” The words “attract to my love” virtually paint Calimachus as the snake in the Garden of Eden itself, as it attempts to attract Eve to the apple. When Calimachus persists, his friends finally call his “love” for Drusiana his “vanity,” vanity being equal with pride, the most deadly of the seven deadly sins, and the most identifiable fingerprint of the devil on the soul.

Calimachus continues, saying that he is now “driven to desperation,” despair being a sin in itself, for it denies faith in God. His use of “despair” indicates that he is nearing the manic state described in the hagiography. Then his friends defend their honest response to Calimachus by saying, “He who imitates, leads one into a trap, and he who advances flattery, sells the truth.” The Latin words *simulat, fallit, adulationem*, and *vendit veritatem* form a virtual characterization of Satan himself, who as Prince of the World can perfectly imitate the truth, or speak truth, but only out

of selfish gain in order to ensnare the weak-willed soul. With these words Calimachus' friends say overtly that they refuse to engage in such behavior in relationship to him, and indirectly describe exactly how they see Calimachus behaving.

As a final confirmation of Calimachus' actual motivations, he says . . . *mei amorem blandimentis persuadebo*. Simply translated this means, "I will persuade her to my love with flattery," but *blandimentis* also means "with compliments" or "with charm," as well as "with flattery." These words could have been uttered by the snake in the Garden of Eden, and with them Calimachus virtually says to Hrotsvit's monastic audience, "I will go and seduce her with the apple."

At the end of this conversation, the pagan Calimachus invokes "the fates" as his friends say he will not succeed in his endeavors. But interestingly, Hrotsvit does not have them abandon Calimachus. They simply say, "We shall see," and the scene ends.

In the first two scenes, Hrotsvit succeeds in reshaping the characterization of Calimachus from the hagiographer's envoy of hell to the apparent innocence of a passion-driven youth, yet at the same time, because of the word-choices she makes in the last section of this scene, Calimachus is again aligned with the forces of darkness. By using this indirect approach, Hrotsvit preserves the levity of the *delectatio* mood, yet is able to deliver the message required of the *utilitas* form. Especially because she does not let the *amici* abandon Calimachus, the scene leaves the audience with a feeling of hope for his condition, and curious as to what will happen next.

The next “scene” in the hagiography is not a scene at all, but merely one and one-half sentences: “He was even so bold as to send word to her. When Drusiana heard of his disgraceful passion and shameless demands, she became very despondent . . .” (64, IV) Of all the adaptive moves Hrotsvit makes throughout her plays, the scene Hrotsvit creates from these lines is one of the most important in terms of her artistry as a hagiographer, but also as an author in her own right.⁹⁶

Hrotsvit creates this scene, in all of its aspects, from the legend’s vague description of what Calimachus says to Drusiana in his message to her, that it contained “disgraceful passion and shameless demands.” Stated in these terms, the hagiography relates that a sexual pervert has invaded Drusiana’s privacy, even if it was only by letter. Hrotsvit, inspired by Terence’s many conversations between young *adolescentes* and the ladies they love, significantly softens the timbre of Calimachus’ message, at least in the beginning. She sets up a scene where Calimachus and Drusiana actually meet, and Calimachus reveals his “love” to her. The conversation that ensues is hardly romantic in that Cupid is utterly absent from the scene, and the “lady” soundly rejects her would-be lover’s entreaties.

Yet Hrotsvit shows her skill at managing this confrontation between good and evil by disguising it as a quasi-romantic encounter. Calimachus is hiding his desperation very well, “simulating” a polite, romantic approach to Drusiana. First,

⁹⁶ Homeyer, *Opera*, p. 281. Homeyer notes that “äussere” similarities between Hrotsvit’s plays and Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet* have been noted by German scholars, such as this scene between Drusiana and Calimachus.

Calimachus tells Drusiana that he wants to speak to her, calling her “the love of his heart.” Hrotsvit toys here with Drusiana, for Hrotsvit does not have Drusiana reject Calimachus immediately, but rather, she lets Calimachus actually begin to seduce Drusiana, for Drusiana responds to him saying, “Why do you want to speak to me, Calimachus, I wonder?” The “I wonder” reads very provocatively. Calimachus hooks into her provocation repeating, “You wonder?” Drusiana still does not pick up on what he’s doing, and says, “Fully.”

Drusiana seems so taken in by Calimachus that her next line could read, “Oh Calimachus, how I have longed for you.” Calimachus seems to have lured Drusiana into his trap. But Drusiana in fact has not been snared. When Calimachus then says that “he wants to speak to her of love,” she comes to her senses and demands to know, “What love?” She suddenly wakes up to Calimachus’ hook of seduction, returning him to his proper characterization as an intruder in Drusiana’s life.

When she realizes that Calimachus is proposing a romantic liaison with her, she demands to know what “legal” connection he has with her that would justify his love for her.⁹⁷ At this point she is starting to see that Calimachus is not the sincere young man he appears to be, and the audience becomes aware that Drusiana has not been asleep to Calimachus’ hidden motives. Her questions to him shift to a testing of his motivations. Calimachus, in the meanwhile, is making good on his vow to his

⁹⁷ This points up the question of tenth century approaches to love and marriage relationships. Socially-sanctioned male-female relationships were not purely based on romantic attractions, but organized according to lines of kinship and legally planned betrothals. Calimachus, as a pagan, a virtual stranger to Drusiana, has little ground to stand on in approaching her as a suitor.

friends that he will attempt to flatter, compliment, and charm Drusiana into his snare.

His true motives become too visible, however. Calimachus flatters Drusiana by saying that her beauty is the grounds for his “love” for her, and that he “hopes to attain” more of her beauty in the future. When Drusiana hears him utter the word “attain,” she suddenly realizes that he is an opportunist, purely seeking to fulfill his own selfish interests. She sees through Calimachus’ masquerade, and he suddenly becomes the snake holding the apple of flattery right before her eyes. She responds in kind ordering Calimachus, *Discede, discede . . .* (Go out, go out . . .), the same word St. John uses to exorcise the snake away from Calimachus and Fortunatus in the graveyard.⁹⁸ She speaks to Calimachus as a demon to be driven from her presence, calling him a “heinous brotheler” who bewilders her, who is “full of diabolical deception.”

Hrotsvit lets Drusiana “label” Calimachus, not only as her adversary, but as *the* adversary, *diabolos* himself. Calimachus then tries to convince Drusiana to “return his love,” but Drusiana is now fully aware of his act, and repels him utterly. Calimachus ignores rejection and goes so far as to remark that her strong reaction to him is an indication that he has actually touched her and “made her blush.” He does not relent, and pushes Drusiana when she says she will “never change her mind” with his word “Forte” -- another Terentian word,⁹⁹ used in casual conversation to mean “chance (or

⁹⁸ Calimachus is not “obedient” as the snake and the bedbugs, however. He matches Psalm 52’s description of the deaf serpent who cannot respond to truth.

⁹⁹ See Prete, p. 60, l. 80.

Fortune) may work things out.” With this Drusiana finally explodes at him:

insensate et amens, cur falleris? Cur te vacua spe illudis? Quo pacto, qua dementia reris me tuae cedere nugacitati,¹⁰⁰ quae per multum temporis a legalis thoro viri me abstinui?

(Oh foolish and insane one, why do you set snares? Why do you delude yourself with empty hope? By what pact, by what demented proposal of yours would I give in to your empty foolishness, when I have abstained from my lawful husband’s marriage bed?)

Drusiana pulls the mask from Calimachus’ “simulation” of a pure intent towards her, and boldly names him as insane, setting snares, and deluded.¹⁰¹

His “act” now undone, Calimachus makes no further efforts to continue his masquerade, and defiantly advances his actual plan. He swears “by the witness of God and man” that “until she capitulates” he will not “rest” or “desist,” but will “surround her with traps.” Calimachus virtually admits, “I am the wily Serpent, I am Satan himself.” Thus where the hagiography openly labels him as evil, Hrotsvit allows events to unfold until Calimachus has so labeled himself.

Hrotsvit ends this Act with this last line from Calimachus, and the audience realizes that what began as a possible courtly romance has degenerated to a crisis. Calimachus is motivated by *eros*, and Drusiana by *agape*. The two forms meet in beauty, *eros* being the love of and attraction to beauty, and *agape* being the love which creates beauty from an inner spiritual source. *Eros* must sacrifice its appetite

¹⁰⁰ Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p.1223. From *nugae*, meaning o.a. trifles and nonsense; used by Plautus in *Truc.* and *Merc.* This points to Hrotsvit’s familiarity with Plautus as well as Terence.

¹⁰¹ Interestingly, she uses the term “pact,” foreshadowing Calimachus’ “deal” with Fortunatus, and the term “demented thing” has sexual innuendoes, as well as an inference to the snake that St. John later exorcises from the graveyard.

and serve *agape* in order for the two forces to peacefully co-exist, as Hrotsvit's episode between Calimachus and Drusiana makes very clear.

At this point, the *delectatio* seems nearly to have left *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*. Modern audiences must remember, however, that Hrotsvit's audience, reading Hrotsvit with as much of a Terentian as a Christian paradigm in their minds, would yet find a delightful note of comedy in this scene, for the *adolescentes* of Terence's plays were not used to being overtly sexually denied by their women. From a Christian perspective Calimachus is clearly an evil force, but from the Terentian view he is the rich father's spoiled son who did not get what he wanted, and has become laughable in his irascible display of temper towards the meek little woman who denies him. With these Terentian associations, Hrotsvit preserves the *delectatio* mood, advances the events of the play into crisis conditions, and the audience does not know whether to laugh or to cry.

Most importantly, Hrotsvit demonstrates her ability to develop effectively a scene that does not at all occur in the hagiography, yet incorporates the hagiographical with the necessary Terentian elements, enhancing the whole of *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*.

With Drusiana's prayer to die, Hrotsvit returns to the hagiographical sequence of events (62-64, IV). In the hagiography, the brethren have been celebrating St. John's return while Calimachus "sends word" to Drusiana of "disgraceful passions and shameless demands." Drusiana does not relate to Calimachus as a criminal; she is more concerned that she has been an "accessory to a blow" that "struck an ignorant

soul.” She sees Calimachus as vulnerable, not as an emissary of the Devil. She says that if he had been “filled with God’s word,” “he would not have flown into such a passion” (64, IV). Hrotsvit almost follows the hagiography’s characterization of Calimachus in Drusiana’s eyes. Drusiana complains to God that her beauty has deceived her, not Calimachus. She prays to die so that she will not “be the ruin of that alluring youth,” rather than the hagiography’s “weak soul.” Hrotsvit characterizes Calimachus as “alluring,” virile and handsome, not weak, which makes him much more akin to the Terentian *adolescens*, and therefore more accommodating to *delectatio et utilitas*.

The hagiography portrays Calimachus differently in his message to Drusiana, as opposed to Drusiana’s prayer about him. In his message, Calimachus is a perpetrator of evil, but in Drusiana’s prayer she describes Calimachus as afflicted by evil. Hrotsvit’s characterization, although much longer in Act II, also shows Calimachus as a perpetrator, and Drusiana’s prayer also speaks of him as a victim. The hagiography wants its audience to differentiate between the sinner and the sin, and Hrotsvit follows suit and differentiates as well. Both texts require that the audience begin to separate Calimachus’ *mania* from his human identity.

Drusiana’s death indicates that God agrees with the hagiographer that Calimachus either is seriously dangerous, or in serious danger. Her passing further incriminates Calimachus, for if he was not a threat in some way, God would not have needed to protect Drusiana by letting her escape through death. When, in the hagiography, Andronicus tells St. John the circumstances around Drusiana’s death,

St. John is very sad (65,V). This is the first moment that St. John meets Calimachus, although indirectly. Calimachus most likely has been portrayed to St. John as an offender of one of his disciples and a harbinger of evil. As earlier discussed, Hrotsvit does not have Andronicus discuss the details of Drusiana's death with St. John until they are at her tomb, so Calimachus' characterization as evil is again de-emphasized in the play, compared to the hagiography.

In Act VI, Hrotsvit sustains her choice to relieve her play of the hagiography's intensity with the conversation she creates for Calimachus and Fortunatus at Drusiana's tomb.¹⁰² The hagiography has only two lines of dialogue; the greater part of this chapter is descriptive prose. The mood of the hagiography is heavy and foul with Calimachus' perverted mental state and the heinous crime he is attempting to commit.

Calimachus' *mania* reaches its full expression in this chapter of the hagiography (70, VII). It indicates that Calimachus conceived of his plan to bribe Andronicus' steward before he went to the tomb. The bribe, therefore, is completely Calimachus' doing, and the crime premeditated. Hrotsvit makes a significant change in the story here, treating this scene with a light touch, by having Calimachus arrive at the tomb distraught and without an obvious plan, although Calimachus still knows what he "needs" to relieve his distress. Hrotsvit has Calimachus beg Fortunatus for his help, placing himself like putty in Fortunatus' hands. Calimachus says he will die if

¹⁰² The Latin hagiography is quite explicit in its description of Calimachus' undressing and approach of Drusiana's corpse. The Greek hagiography is much less explicit.

Fortunatus does not help him. Thus Hrotsvit characterizes Calimachus as needy and anxious, instead of determined and diabolical.

By doing this, Hrotsvit causes Calimachus to fall victim to Fortunatus right away. Fortunatus inflames his sexual obsession by telling him that Drusiana's body has remained perfectly intact; in other words, Calimachus most definitely would want to "have" it. Then he tells Calimachus that he can have the body in exchange for money. Hrotsvit thus characterizes Calimachus as Fortunatus' victim, where the hagiography depicts Calimachus as the aggressor, and Fortunatus as the unfortunate victim. In essence, Hrotsvit shapes the hagiography's criminal bribe into a payment for goods delivered, creating humor and striking the chord of Terentian comedy.

As to be expected, this shift lightens Calimachus' characterization, and makes him desperate, helpless, out of control, and "in" the hands of Fortunatus, instead of powerfully manipulating Fortunatus himself. Hrotsvit emphasizes that Calimachus is afflicted with desperation. Calimachus responds to Fortunatus' offer like a desperate "john" on the street who has at last found the neighborhood *leno*. Hrotsvit reverses the "bribe": Fortunatus "bribes" Calimachus with Drusiana's body for the sake of getting rich quick. Beside himself with need, Calimachus gives Fortunatus all the money that he has on him, and promises to give him more at his earliest possible convenience. This shows that Hrotsvit consciously depicts Calimachus as arriving at the tomb unconscious of money, and that Fortunatus' "bargain" catches Calimachus by surprise. Hrotsvit could have given him the line, "If I knew I needed my check-book, I would have brought it."

In contrast to Hrotsvit's now comical mood, after briefly relating Calimachus' pre-meditated bribe of Fortunatus, the hagiography continues with the two men at Drusiana's tomb, undressing the corpse. Hrotsvit makes another significant change here in that she leaves the undressing of Drusiana's body out of this scene of the play entirely. This eliminates a good deal of the lugubrious malevolence communicated by the hagiography. In the Greek version Calimachus revels in his acquisition of Drusiana at last, saying that although she rejected him in life, in death he now will "dishonor her corpse." As they are undressing the corpse, Calimachus and Fortunatus say, "What have you gained unhappy Drusiana, could you not have done this while you were alive? It need not have grieved you if you had done it willingly." The Latin reads similarly: "What have you gained unhappy Drusiana, denying in life what you now will endure in death?" (70, VII). The hagiography characterizes Calimachus as a man so driven by sex that Drusiana has become nothing but a target, a lifeless means of satisfying his deranged "need." Here he is indeed a devil, ready to consume its prey.

Hrotsvit, of course, does everything possible to leave these evil men in the hagiography, and out of her play. She retains the idea of a conversation between Calimachus and the corpse, but reworks Calimachus' remarks to the deceased Drusiana, so that they reflect the desperate infatuation Hrotsvit has chosen to emphasize, and not the sexual psychosis described in the hagiography.

Hrotsvit focuses on how beautifully whole Drusiana's body has remained, as Fortunatus says when he gives Calimachus the body. This creates the sense in the

audience that Calimachus is not really in love with a dead woman, but with her radiance, recontextualizing her as beautiful, not dead. In turn, Calimachus becomes slightly less perverted, significantly lifting the mood.

Calimachus' speech as he approaches his heinous crime, however, reminds the audience that Calimachus is truly mad, as he speaks to Drusiana's body as if she were listening, saying how much he loved her and chiding her for resisting him. Finally Hrotsvit brings his deranged intentions into full expression as he says, "Now it is within my power to assail you with any injuries I like." As in Act II, Hrotsvit first presents Calimachus as the love-sick *adolescens*, and then slowly reveals his madness, until it comes into full view at the very end of the act. By so doing, she masterfully transforms the unthinkable into exciting theatre, and makes the lesson of the *Legend of Drusiana and Calimachus* palatable to her audience. For who could even continue reading after the hagiography's scene at the tomb with Calimachus and Fortunatus? In *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, the true purpose of *delectatio et utilitas* is realized: make the lesson learnable by making it enjoyable.

In both the hagiography and the play, as Calimachus is just about to "injure" Drusiana and evil nearly triumphs over good, the snake appears, kills Fortunatus and frightens Calimachus to death (71, VII). The hagiography's narrative of this event is brief, but it does state specifically that the snake hisses around Calimachus' feet, Calimachus falls as he passes out, and the snake sits on him. Hrotsvit is not so specific. Fortunatus sees the snake and is bitten, and as if the snake somehow makes Calimachus wake up to what he is doing, Calimachus cries out lamenting that

Fortunatus “deceived him” into doing “this detestable deed.” The hagiography makes no mention of a sudden shift in Calimachus’ self-awareness; Hrotsvit again has “lifted” Calimachus’ characterization into a lighter frame of reference. In both the hagiography and the play, Calimachus dies from fear; in other words, he is a coward. But in the context of Hrotsvit’s play, Calimachus who “dies out of fear” seems trapped, vulnerable, and laughable in contrast to the hagiography which seems to say that the villain Calimachus gets what he deserves.

The next reference to Calimachus is made by God, who in the hagiography appears to St. John and the brethren at the entrance to the tomb, telling them that He has come “for the sake of Drusiana whom you have now to resurrect, and for the sake of him, who is lying dead next to the tomb: they will be honored in the name of God” (73, VIII).¹⁰³ Hrotsvit’s treatment of Calimachus does not differ a great deal in this regard. She uses virtually the same words that the Latin hagiography does to designate both Drusiana and Calimachus for resurrection in God’s name. Thus from this point, the characterization of Calimachus as an evil man, shifts to one blessed in the eyes of God.

The hagiography continues as Andronicus describes to St. John the circumstances he perceives have led to the strange things they have found at the tomb (74, IV). This is St. John’s first encounter with Calimachus, and it is here that he is identified in the Latin version as Calimachus, “prince of Ephesus”, and in the Greek

¹⁰³ This is the Latin version. The Greek hagiography does not say that anyone except Drusiana is to be raised at this point in the narrative.

as “the very prominent Ephesian, Calimachus.” Hrotsvit never refers to Calimachus’ high social standing, perhaps because it would demand special treatment in the dramatic setting, and while the typical Terentian *adolescens* hails from a rich family, he is not of royal descent.

Further, the hagiography presents Andronicus’ description of events to St. John as rather matter-of-fact, characterizing Calimachus as “loving my sister,” and as having told many that “. . . if she would not yield to him alive, rape would be committed on her death.” He also speculates that Calimachus “no doubt” bribed Fortunatus with “a great sum of money” in order to get into the tomb.¹⁰⁴

Hrotsvit follows the hagiography’s characterization of Calimachus; Andronicus refers to Calimachus as the cause of Drusiana’s death, a “madman,” consumed by passions that forced him to bribe Fortunatus in order to commit his crime. But Hrotsvit adds levity to Andronicus’ comments with interjected remarks from St. John such as “Miserable wretch!” and “Incomparable sacrilege!” She does not include Calimachus’ fear-weighted threat, as the hagiography relates, to rape Drusiana even in death.

Towards the conclusion of the drama, Hrotsvit begins to insert quite overtly the *utilitas* that she is attempting to bring to her audience with her skills at *delectatio*. She begins another embellishment on the hagiography here that continues throughout

¹⁰⁴ This is one point effected by Calimachus’ fame and wealth; Fortunatus would have recognized the Prince, Calimachus, and known him to have plenty of money to spend, although the hagiography does not overtly make this connection.

the rest of *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* as Andronicus and St. John interpret the meaning of the events in the play as they unfold throughout Act IX.

In their discussion they conclude that Calimachus, because he was “blinded by carnal desire” was not acting consciously, and therefore his sin was forgivable in God’s eyes. The hagiography simply has Andronicus request Calimachus’ resurrection in order to discover what he actually did, which Hrotsvit eventually gets to as well. Both the hagiography and the play deal with the snake, which must be removed, in order to resurrect Calimachus. The hagiography devotes all of one sentence to this event; Hrotsvit expands it into a six-line exchange between St. John and Andronicus, as earlier mentioned.

The exorcism of the snake is a key part of Calimachus’ characterization. In order for Calimachus to be resurrected, he must be cleared of the manic evil spirit inhabiting his body. St. John’s exorcism of the snake from the graveyard can be seen as the exorcism of the manic evil spirit that “possesses” Calimachus. When the snake leaves, Calimachus’ passion cannot return to him, or “bite him again” as Hrotsvit says.¹⁰⁵ This exorcism might be compared to Christ’s exorcising a man of demons into a herd of pigs;¹⁰⁶ here St. John exorcises the demon in Calimachus into the snake that (obediently) carries the evil spirit away.

¹⁰⁵ Romano German pontifical, v. 1, XL 109, p. 162. Hrotsvit’s Latin uses a phrase found in the rite of the Dedication of a Church, . . . *Domine Deus omnipotens, cui astat exercitus angelorum, dignare respicere et benedicere hanc creaturam incensi, ut omnes languorum daemonumque insidiae odorem ipsius sentientes fugiant et separentur a plasmate tuo, quod filii tui pretioso sanguine redemisti, ut numquam ledantur a morsu serpentis antiqui. per [Domino].*

¹⁰⁶ Mark 5.

When St. John exorcises the snake, he says “Leave him who is to be a servant of Christ.” From this moment on, Calimachus is released from servitude to the devil and consecrated to the service of Christ. This event thus forms a turning point in both the hagiography (75, X) and the play.

In *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, Andronicus says that this must be done so that Calimachus is not “bitten” again, in other words, is not repossessed by his obsession once resurrected. This exorcism scene continues Hrotsvit’s characterization of Calimachus as a good man who has been possessed by sinful ways, and who is able to be cleansed of evil. The exchange of curt remarks she creates between Andronicus and St. John also reduces the terror Calimachus’ “possession” by an evil spirit otherwise invokes.

In this scene Hrotsvit’s dichotomous relationship with the alliterative and symbolic meanings of the snake come together with the multi-strated contexts that would have spoken vividly to her medieval audience. As earlier described, Calimachus’ passion can be understood alliteratively as the Luciferic “snake” of the Garden of Eden, the adversary himself. In contrast, the physical animal of the snake that simultaneously relieves Calimachus of his sexual mania, alliteratively foreshadows the resurrection of his spirit in Christ as told in the Old Testament story of Moses and the brazen serpent. In the Gospel of John, 3:13, the brazen serpent on a pole becomes a symbol of the resurrection: “And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that those who believe in him may not perish, but may have life everlasting.” Similarly Calimachus is resurrected in his

confession of faith in Jesus Christ.

Another aspect of the snake's relationship to resurrection is the shedding of its old skin for the sake of the new. The ancient symbol of the serpent shedding its skin, representative of death and rebirth, continued as the standard depiction of the serpent in medieval bestiaries.¹⁰⁷ This image shows the snake passing through a narrow opening in a tower gate to scrape off its old skin to reveal the new. St. Paul's second letter to the Corinthians, 5:17, corroborates the bestiaries; it reads, "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new."

This imagery is reflected in the hagiography's serpent, but even more clearly underscored by St. John and Andronicus' conversation concerning it in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*. The serpent "obeys" St. John, and in the end saves Calimachus from his crime through the command of St. John. It thereby distinctly facilitates Calimachus' resurrection and rebirth as a Christian. Hrotsvit's treatment of the serpent underscores this powerful imagery in the hagiography, and greatly enhances the *delectatio* of *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*.

From the moment that Calimachus is raised, both the hagiography and the play

¹⁰⁷ Louis Charbonneau-Lassay, *The Bestiary of Christ*, trans. abrid. M. Dooling (New York: Viking Penguin, 1991), pp. VII-XV, 153-163. "When the early pilgrims to holy places and the Crusades returned to the West . . . the stories they brought back, as well as the works of art . . . had a strong influence on religious and secular art in central Europe. . . The animals, birds, trees, [etc.] who filled their tales were taken over by the Western symbolists to represent the gifts of God and even Christ himself," p. VIII. Thus strong overlaps in interpretations of symbols such as the serpent permeated medieval western culture. Richard Barber, *Bestiary: Being an English Version of the Bodleian Library, Oxford M.S. Bodley 764 with All the Original Miniatures Reproduced in Facsimile* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1993), p. 196, for image of snake passing through tower gate.

portray Calimachus as a whole person who is truly repentant for his evil deeds. The hagiography describes Calimachus as dazed for one hour after his resurrection, but soon fully cooperative concerning St. John's questions. He tells the truth when asked if he perpetrated his crime against Drusiana. He does blame Fortunatus for leading him into his criminal behavior, but otherwise is quick to beg for forgiveness and conversion to Christianity.

In the hagiography, when St. John asks Calimachus if he violated Drusiana's corpse, Calimachus explains that God appeared to him and his description is innocent and uncomplicated. God's appearance to him indicates that God sees him as worthy of saving, despite his tarnished soul, hence everyone else must come to grips with the truth of his new characterization. He reveals his lack of Christian education when he resists the idea of Fortunatus' resurrection, but St. John duly instructs the new disciple. Calimachus offers no further resistance, and is not mentioned again in the hagiography.

Hrotsvit is very true to this sequence of events in her adaptation of the legend. She expands the repentance and conversion segments of the play's Act IX into conversation between St. John and Calimachus, which becomes comedic when presented in continuous question and answer form. In the process of Calimachus' repentance, Hrotsvit exaggerates Calimachus' self-blame, and portrays him as desperate for absolution and conversion to Christ as he had been for sex and fulfillment from Drusiana. When Drusiana is resurrected, Calimachus praises God, and although he does not openly apologize to her, he comments to her, "Thanks be to God the great

healer,¹⁰⁸ who resurrected you in joy, you who died in extreme sadness.” His words to Drusiana seem to indicate that he knows he was the cause of her sadness, thus Hrotsvit indirectly shows him as being sorry for his actions.¹⁰⁹ When he resists Fortunatus’ resurrection, Calimachus becomes the young *catachumen* who needs instruction from the bishop, in this instance, St. John. Calimachus dutifully listens, and at the end of the lesson is filled with holy fear of God’s judgment.

Thus Calimachus is saved. He is transformed, in both the hagiography and *Resucitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* from a passion-possessed, prideful pagan to a mild-mannered, repentant Christian. Hrotsvit systematically plays down the hagiography’s characterization of Calimachus by leaving out the details that show him as a perverted sex criminal. Thereby eliminating the tragic mood of the story, Hrotsvit instead recreates Calimachus as the love-sick *adolescens* as conceived by Terence, and as the suffering lover who is separated from, and must recover, his lady as described by Ovid. Hrotsvit makes Calimachus more a victim of circumstances rather than a victimizer of others. As a Christian he is emotional and somewhat nervous, but suitably humbled.

¹⁰⁸ Romano German pontifical, v. IICXLIII 12, p. 260. From the rite of anointing the sick, *Adesto, domine, quesumus, humilitatis nostrae obsequiis, eisque benignus cooperator assiste, ut . . . vigoris et sospitatis plenitudo succedat, relictoque inbecillitatis grabatto, ad te medicum supernum vultum et mentem erigat et pro sospitatis restitutione laudes nomini tuo competentes in aeternum persolvat. per dominum.*

¹⁰⁹ John T. McNeill and Helena M. Gamer, *Medieval Handbooks of Penance* (New York: Octagon Books, 1965), pp. 3-20, 271-345. Calimachus makes two “confessions,” the first is his confession of his crime for which he is shriven by St. John (his long, drawn-out inquisition of Calimachus seems to be subjecting the man to a form of penance). Vernon H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963), pp. 13-33, 65-107. The second confession is Calimachus’ confession of faith, or *homologia*, his acknowledgment and acceptance of Jesus Christ as his savior. Hrotsvit’s audience, steeped in the church rituals of confession, penance, and *homologia*, would have brought a background of understanding to Hrotsvit’s version of these traditions, a background to which Hrotsvit’s humor clearly speaks.

CHAPTER IV

DRUSIANA

The legend of Drusiana and Calimachus within the *Acta Johannis* introduces Drusiana in the context of Calimachus' conversation with his friends who are attempting to dissuade him from his pursuit of this married, Christian woman (63, IV).

Drusiana has insisted on a chaste marriage with her husband, who is a person of high social standing in Ephesus. She did not easily win her chastity from him, for he locked her in a tomb when she would not consent to his demands to return to their marriage bed. She was ready to die before she would commit the "repulsive act."¹¹⁰

Thus, in the opening of the hagiography, Drusiana is characterized as a very devout follower of Christ, devoted unto death to her faith. She is courageous, a defender of Christ and his teachings. As might be expected, when this pious woman

¹¹⁰ Drusiana characterizes the Christian epitome of the female disciple of Christ, exemplifying the heroic values of the Benedictine order of women. Rather than seek a physical, romantic union with her husband, she seeks spiritual, mystical union with God. This poses challenges which she faces courageously, even unto death. The chaste woman knows she will win her union with Christ, the heavenly bridegroom. Christ as bridegroom is presented in several of the New Testament parables including the Pharisees and the fast in Mk. 2:19, the wedding feast in Mt.: 22:1-14, and the wise and foolish virgins in Mt. 25:1-13.

Columba Marmion, O.S.B. *Sponsa Verbi: The Virgin Consecrated to Christ*, trans. Francis Izard, O.S.B. (London: Sands and Co., 1925), p. 64. From St. Bernard of Clairveaux's *Cantica*, sermo LXXXIII: "This [spiritual] contract of marriage [with God] is truly holy, truly spiritual; but the term contract is not sufficiently expressive; it is a commingling, a veritable embrace, such an identification of wills that the two make but one."

Newlands, p. 374. Explains, "The source of the nuptial imagery associated with virginity is the Song of Songs, which was generally viewed as an allegorical dialogue between Christ and the Church, or between Christ and the human soul." Provides thorough notes on patristic sources to *sponsa verbi* teaching and tradition.

receives word from Calimachus of his designs on her, she is shocked and dismayed.

Hrotsvit, in choosing this hagiography, has in the character of Drusiana a true Christian heroine who exemplifies every ideal to which Hrotsvit has devoted her life. Thus she is gentle in her treatment of Drusiana's character, and does not diverge a great deal from the dignified portrayal Drusiana is given in the hagiography. In the second scene with Calimachus, as invented by Hrotsvit, she lets Drusiana be drawn in by Calimachus enough to give her a human personality, not that of an ivory icon above human emotion. Hrotsvit gives Drusiana a powerful will and a temper to match, for when Drusiana recognizes Calimachus' trickery, she virtually exorcises him out of her sight, using the same language as St. John when he exorcises the snake from Calimachus.

If Hrotsvit's Terentian parody is at work here, it is making a parody not of Drusiana, but of the women in Terence's plays, for no woman in one of those plays would refuse one of the rich, comely *adolescentes* in the way that Drusiana rejects Calimachus. Thais might reject her lover out of jealousy, but never would she reject him for being sexually attracted to her, which is exactly Hrotsvit's point. For Hrotsvit and her Benedictine audience, the "rejection" scene is very significant, for it is a graphic demonstration of the ethic of heroic chastity at work, exactly her goal in writing her plays as stated in her introduction.

As Carol Newlands explains, "The highest aspiration of a young woman in Terence's world, marriage, here becomes elevated to a spiritual plane through the

concept of the mystic union of Christ and the dedicated virgin as a *sponsa Christi*.”¹¹¹

In the legend, Drusiana demonstrates the metamorphosis of the woman’s sense of self within the early Christian and medieval world view.

As earlier stated, Hrotsvit wrote the scene of Drusiana and Calimachus’s conversation into the play. It is not present in the hagiography in any form. To Hrotsvit’s Benedictine audience, Drusiana’s unmitigating rejection of Calimachus is the most important statement in the play, more than any of the divine judgment and grace *exempla* at the end of the play. This scene can be read as a redemption of Eve: Drusiana does what every nun wishes that Eve would have done. Hrotsvit did not miss this opportunity to reverse Eve’s fate.¹¹²

Regarding the hagiography, Hrotsvit’s scene serves to lift the mood of Calimachus’ insistent pursuit of Drusiana in the hagiography (63-64, IV) while showing that Drusiana is truly not safe with him. Nevertheless, Hrotsvit uses Drusiana’s heroic bravery when confronted by the conventional male demands for sex in her times to make the men who pursue her look silly and weak. As Dronke says about Hrotsvit’s plays, “Weak women show their power, strong men go under,”¹¹³ or in Hrotsvit’s own words, . . . *praesertim cum feminea vinceret et virilis robur*

¹¹¹ Newlands, p. 374.

¹¹² Sticca, “Sin and Salvation . . .” p. 4. Sticca points to the saying of Saint Jerome, *Mors per Evam: vita per Mariam* (Death through Eve, Life through Mary). This legend brings both the Eve and the Mary archetypes together; Hrotsvit demonstrates the later Christian medieval teaching, as Sticca says, of “Mary . . . as the new Eve . . . just as Eve, by her disobedience, brought death upon the human race, so Mary, by her obedience, brought salvation.” Drusiana is heroically obedient to the teachings of the church. Hrotsvit reinforces the virginal, Marian, archetype by having Drusiana so vividly refuse Calimachus’ entreaties.

¹¹³ Peter Dronke, *Women Writers*, p. 71.

confusioni subiaceret (it is a fragile woman who is victorious and a strong man who is routed with confusion).¹¹⁴

Drusiana achieves this reversal by making God her “spouse;”¹¹⁵ the men in her life lose their centrality in her eyes and therefore are weakened. Andronicus has given up on his wife to paddle after St. John, and Calimachus is sexually “enraged” by her commitment to God. Unfortunately, much of the humor in this scene results from its contradiction of anti-feminist attitudes within Christian culture, for women were traditionally meant to be meek, self-blaming, and subservient, and in Hrotsvit’s hands the effect of this reversal from this norm is as comedic as it is inspiring.¹¹⁶

Drusiana’s prayer for death is a very serious matter (64, IV), and is in fact very heroic. But it also invokes laughter from audiences when this play is performed. Christopher St. John remarks in the closing of his, “A Note on the Acting of the Plays,” that “Drusiana’s prayer that she might die rather than yield to Calimachus was greeted with shouts of laughter.”¹¹⁷ Hrotsvit, by leaving out the earlier story of Drusiana’s nearly fatal imprisonment in a tomb,¹¹⁸ makes it appear as though Drusiana is severely over-reacting to Calimachus threats of love. The audience is unaware that this is not the first time that Drusiana has been so threatened, and the choice of sex or death is not something she contrived. By removing the history of Drusiana’s death-

¹¹⁴ von Winterfeld, p. 106. Translation by Sandro Sticca in “Sin and Salvation . . .”, p. 9.

¹¹⁵ Marmion, pp. 15-16. The commitment of the beloved to Christ as spouse is total and devoted.

¹¹⁶ Sticca, “Sin and Salvation . . .” p. 9. Indeed, Hrotsvita’s characterization of her women constitutes a radical departure from medieval tradition, for, transcending the frequent vacuities of antifeminine textual exegesis, she provides, in stages of extraordinary rich meaning and poetic power, a vision of women triumphant over the demonic forces.

¹¹⁷ St. John, p. 159.

wish from the play, Hrotsvit allows Drusiana to come across as rather hysterical.

Even in her wish for death, Drusiana remains selfless, for she prays that she might die, “so that she will not become the ruin of that charming young man.”

Hrotsvit does not change Drusiana’s prayer in the hagiography more than syntactically (64, IV). Drusiana’s concern is that she not become the instrument for another person’s demise, therefore her death-wish is also heroically selfless, the selflessness reflecting her humility, the highest of Christian virtues.¹¹⁹

When the two men arrive at the tomb (70, VII), Hrotsvit adds Fortunatus’ comment that Drusiana’s body has remained beautiful and perfectly in tact, even in death. The saint’s body that does not decompose in death is one of the hallmarks of the saint in the hagiographic tradition; in light of Calimachus’ desires this fact works against Drusiana, and its irony produces a humorous effect. If she were not so saintly and good, her body would be less desirable to this fiend.

Hrotsvit plays down the undressing of the body, and makes only one reference to it during Calimachus’ explanation to St. John. The most grizzly moment in the hagiography occurs as Calimachus and Fortunatus are undressing the corpse (70-71, VII); playing down this scene significantly lifts the mood of the play. When Drusiana is resurrected in the Greek hagiography, she awakens and must get dressed right away for she is standing in nothing but her “shift”(81). The Latin version omits this remark.

¹¹⁸ Junod and Kaestli, pp. 86-91.

¹¹⁹ Sticca, “Sin and Salvation . . .” p. 13. “Drusiana’s prayer is an act of sacrificial immolation, for, in its ultimate perspective, it is not only a commitment to salvation and a refusal of sin, but a sacrifice of the self for the sake of another. It is an act of Christian charity, a pure example of the *imitatio Christi*.” Thus Drusiana becomes a type of Christ.

Hrotsvit omits this as well, for it diminishes Drusiana's power, not only of her resurrection, but more importantly, of her very identity as a chaste and therefore self-respecting Christian woman. To have her appear half-naked before Hrotsvit's modest audience could be read as though Drusiana in fact had leanings towards the *meretrix* role after all.

When Drusiana is resurrected in Hrotsvit's play, as well as in the hagiography (80, IX), no mention is made of her having to take any time to "come around" from the experience as Calimachus must do. She is immediately alive and energetic, an indication that her "death" has not been so far removed from the realm of the spirit as Calimachus'. She goes to Fortunatus to resurrect him with a joyous and resolute attitude.

St. John, in passing the task of resurrection to Drusiana, is sanctioning her power and identity in the eyes of her, and in turn Hrotsvit's, community in a radical way, for women, even saints, by Hrotsvit's time, had lost any position in the church's political hierarchy.¹²⁰ Drusiana's power to resurrect Fortunatus not only sanctions her power as a Christian, but her power as a woman in the church, a point that would speak deeply to Hrotsvit's audience.

¹²⁰ Another woman in the *Acta Johannis*, Cleopatra, performs the resurrection of her dead husband, Lycomedes, at the behest of St. John (18-25). Thus Drusiana is not the only woman to perform this miracle in the *Life of St. John*. Hrotsvit makes no mention of Cleopatra for this would decrease Drusiana's power in the eyes of Hrotsvit's audience.

Benedicta Ward, *Miracles and the Medieval Mind* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), pp. 3-32. Drusiana's power of resurrection is not hers alone in the whole of the *Acta Johannis*. This is not the case for Drusiana in Hrotsvit's play; her performance of a resurrection as a woman, for Hrotsvit's times, would have been a very potent way of demonstrating Drusiana's spiritual and heroic power, making her a type of Christ, after his example in His resurrection of Lazarus. The capacity to perform such miracles signified sanctity.

On a spiritual level, Hrotsvit's demonstration of the power of forgiveness in the legend is the most moving element of this story, and Hrotsvit does not downplay this or edit it in any way. In fact she intensifies Drusiana's power of forgiveness with St. John's education of Calimachus when Calimachus protests the idea of resurrecting Fortunatus.

Drusiana, after her resurrection of Fortunatus, has no further lines in Hrotsvit's play, nor does she have anything more to say in the hagiography. Hrotsvit follows the legend here and lets Drusiana go to the "golden background" of the story as the unfortunate end of Fortunatus takes over the stage. Yet Drusiana stands as the true conqueror of the forces of evil in the legend, and the events which follow her forgiveness of Fortunatus are the direct effects of her final action in the play as well. St. John utters blessings at the end of both the hagiography and the play, but it is Drusiana's heroism that has given St. John cause to raise his prayers of thanksgiving.

CHAPTER V

ANDRONICUS

The hagiography introduces Andronicus early in the *Acta Johannis* as “Captain Andronicus, one of the most prominent Ephesians,”¹²¹ before he is converted to Christianity. James speculates that the story of his actual conversion is part of the section of the *Acta Johannis* that is missing. Throughout the rest of the hagiography, Andronicus is characterized as one of the main disciples of St. John, and the husband of Drusiana. The blessed disciple and his entourage stay at Andronicus’ home in Ephesus (62, IV), and while St. John is there the incident involving Drusiana and Calimachus occurs.

Andronicus belongs to and represents the greater contexts of the hagiography, as a political leader of Ephesus, the host of St. John, and the spouse of Drusiana. He is characterized as an authoritative and demanding husband. When his wife Drusiana converted to Christianity and thence refused their marriage bed, he had her shut into a tomb, to remain there until death if she continued to refuse conjugal relations. Drusiana, firm in her faith, refused him, and chose to die. The section of the hagiography that explains the actual outcome of this crisis is missing, but Drusiana does live, and Andronicus converts to Christianity. In the rest of the hagiography he

¹²¹ Elliott, p. 315.

refers to Drusiana as “my sister,” and seems very well-adjusted in this role, having relinquished his earthly forms of power to the service of St. John and Jesus Christ.

From the onset of the play, Hrotsvit emasculates Andronicus’ character from “captain” to “private” Andronicus. In terms of adaptations to character, the change she makes in the legend’s Andronicus to the Andronicus in her play is the greatest in comparison with the other characters in this drama. She does this in order to satisfy the Terentian as well as the Ovidian models she is following.

Hrotsvit shapes Andronicus’ character so that it plays off St. John much as the “running” *servus* plays off the *paterfamilias* in a Terentian comedy. Regarding Ovidian features, Andronicus becomes a parody of Ovid’s cuckolded husband in his marriage to Drusiana, first competing with Christ for his wife, and then chasing down Calimachus for attempting to rape her.

As described, Hrotsvit leaves the episode of Andronicus’ confinement of Drusiana out of the play entirely. This serves to lighten Andronicus’ character significantly. He is first introduced by the *amici* in Act I who refer to him as “Prince Andronicus” and the husband of Drusiana. His social standing is made clear, and in explaining that Drusiana insists on a chaste marriage, it becomes known that Andronicus is also a Christian, and a disciple of St. John.

Hrotsvit’s acts I and II leave Andronicus out of the picture, except for his existence as Drusiana’s husband which determines much of the tension in these two acts. In the hagiography Andronicus is not present when Drusiana dies (64, IV); the ensuing scene introduces Andronicus as he is pouring out his grief to St. John (65, V).

Hrotsvit, in having Andronicus present at Drusiana's death, sets up Andronicus so that, like a sad little boy running to papa, Andronicus can go find St. John and cry like a baby to him about Drusiana's death. As a result of "running to St. John," he appears to be an emotional weakling, dependent on St. John's authority. Since this is his first appearance in the play, it is powerful in establishing his character in the mind of the audience, and seems to show that Hrotsvit consciously chose this means of introducing him.

In the hagiography, Andronicus tells St. John the cause of Drusiana's death when St. John asks him about it after she is interred (66,V). Hrotsvit switches this to Andronicus' disadvantage as well, for instead she has St. John ask Andronicus right away about the cause, when Andronicus is still in the throes of his emotions about her death. This gives Andronicus cause to answer that he will tell St. John about it later "after he has convalesced." Seeming to feel a bit too sorry for himself, the egocentricity of Andronicus "feelings" within his personality thus stands out even more.

In general, Hrotsvit follows the hagiography in its separation of Andronicus from Drusiana as man and wife, and the re-establishment of their relationship with St. John at its center as their spiritual teacher. Although not overtly, Hrotsvit in her treatment of Andronicus and Drusiana's relationship, turns him into a kind of "Joseph" figure who is as it were, present at the nativity, but does not have a whole lot to do. Drusiana never addresses Andronicus directly, in the hagiography or the play, which shrinks Andronicus' importance in the eyes of the audience. After Calimachus has been raised, Andronicus asks if Drusiana can now be resurrected, in the legend and the

play (79, XI). Drusiana chose to die without a thought of Andronicus, nor does she ask for him once she is resurrected. Hrotsvit does not change this for it enhances the way she has relegated Andronicus to the sidelines of Drusiana's life, although Drusiana seems to be the center of his.

In the middle and latter part of the play, Andronicus more or less represents "the brethren" in the hagiography. Everywhere that St. John goes in the legend, he is accompanied by an entourage of his followers, or brethren; Hrotsvit replaces the hagiography's anonymous crowd of "brethren" with the single character of Andronicus. This is not that great of a change, since Andronicus is with this group of followers throughout the story. Interestingly, crowds of people do not appear on the Terentian stage; rarely are there more than five or six actors on stage at one time, and usually there are only two or three. So paring down "the brethren" in the hagiography to Andronicus' single person also serves Hrotsvit's Terentian approach to her play.

During Hrotsvit's long Act IX, Andronicus has the opportunity to "tell on" Calimachus and Fortunatus as he explains to St. John the strange events that seem to have gone on at Drusiana's tomb. Then, Andronicus becomes a bystander, watching all the events that transpire, but uttering "divine commentary" in response to St. John's speeches and prayers, as though Andronicus is offering the antiphonal response to a priest during mass. These responses are not present in any way in the original legend.

Thus Hrotsvit shifts Andronicus in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* from a highly authoritarian, masculine personality to a subservient disciple who looks to St.

John for his authority and his identity. He is a mere shadow in relation to his wife, whom he has lost to God and St. John. In so doing, Hrotsvit changes the focus on Andronicus from the hagiography's fear and austerity to her version of *delectatio et utilitas*.

CHAPTER VI

FORTUNATUS

The *Acta Johannis* introduces Fortunatus to the legend at the point that Calimachus bribes him to let Calimachus into Drusiana's tomb (70, VII). The hagiography is very clear that Calimachus "bribed the greedy steward Fortunatus with money." Thus Fortunatus is consistently portrayed as an accomplice to Calimachus and a villain in the story. Hrotsvit follows the hagiographic rendition of Fortunatus' character quite accurately, except for one major change: she has Fortunatus demand money from Calimachus who is frenzied with desire for Drusiana's body, instead of the legend's version in which Calimachus comes to the grave with money for the bribe. Hrotsvit puts the moral weight of the crime on Fortunatus' shoulders, and creates a Calimachus who is dependent on Fortunatus for his needs. Hrotsvit also sets Calimachus up to owe Fortunatus money for his favor, making Calimachus financially dependent on Fortunatus as well.¹²²

This clever usurpation of the master's power by the servant/slave is very reminiscent of the slave/master relationship in Terence's comedies, in which various circumstances of bribes and payments arise between the pimp, the slave, and the

¹²² Calimachus becomes indentured to Fortunatus, an early literary manifestation of the Faustean theme.

slave's master.¹²³ When Fortunatus "hands over" Drusiana's body to Calimachus, as macabre as it may seem, a parallel is created between Terence's *leno*, his *meretrix*, and the *adolescens* paying for her body/services. Fortunatus becomes the *leno*, Drusiana the *meretrix*, and Calimachus the *adolescens*. Although quite outrageous, for audiences familiar with Terence's comedies these parallels actually serve to lighten the contextual horizon of the dark deed that Calimachus and Fortunatus are ready to commit, for the Terentian overtones are a cue to not take the villains too seriously; their evil plans may not turn out as they hope.

As earlier stated, Hrotsvit leaves out the hagiography's narrative of Calimachus and Fortunatus as they disrobe Drusiana's body (70, VII). Hrotsvit limits her Acts VI and VII to Fortunatus' demand for money, his showing Calimachus the way to Drusiana's body, and the attack of the snake. Hrotsvit communicates between the lines the terrible crime almost perpetrated on Drusiana's corpse, avoiding the shockingly specific language of the hagiography.

The attack of the snake not only fulfills the *deus ex machina* of the hagiography, but realizes the audience's "Terentian" expectations for an unexpected and comedic disruption to Calimachus' and Fortunatus' mischief. The hagiography records clearly that the snake bites Fortunatus, and frightens Calimachus to death (71, VII). Hrotsvit is true to the hagiography in her rendition of this part of the story in her play.

¹²³ See Terence's Sannio in *Adelphoe*.

In the hagiography, when Andronicus explains to St. John what he thinks has gone on at the tomb, he refers to Fortunatus as his “accursed steward” (74, IX). In Hrotsvit’s version of this scene, Andronicus uses the term “wicked slave.” Hrotsvit, in keeping this nomenclature, subtly links Fortunatus with the frustrations that the *paterfamilias* and the *adolescens* suffer at the hands of their not only scheming, but also aggravating and bumbling slaves, thus widening the context of Fortunatus’ “wickedness” into a comic characterization.

When Drusiana resurrects Fortunatus in the hagiography, Fortunatus takes one look at the holy people around him and runs away overwhelmed by their goodness (83, IX); the brethren and St. John later learn that he has died of the snakebite when they return to the home of Andronicus (86, XIII). Hrotsvit conducts more of a conversation between Fortunatus and St. John; when Fortunatus rises, he is immediately defensive, much like a bear who has been unexpectedly wakened from his comfortable underground den. Hrotsvit uses much the same line from the hagiography in Fortunatus’ response to the abundance of goodness all around him: he does not want anything to do with it. Hrotsvit does not have him run away, but rather he dies again from the snakebite, on the spot, creating an almost slap-stick scene with Fortunatus’ unexpected “rise” and equally sudden “fall.”

St. John’s prayer that follows corresponds with the prayer in the hagiography, except that it does not have the hagiography’s litany of protective invocations at its

end (84, XIII).¹²⁴ Deleting this from St. John's prayer makes Hrotsvit's version much less serious; the legend's prayer deems Fortunatus a truly evil force which demands that every aspect of the brethren's community be cleansed by "God our Judge" (84). Both prayers mention the metaphor of the ancient snake,¹²⁵ evil fruit from the evil tree,¹²⁶ and rejection from the flock of the faithful.

Hrotsvit then replaces St. John and the brethren's breaking of bread and the service of the Eucharist at the tomb,¹²⁷ with a Platonic dialogue between the student, Andronicus and the teacher, St. John. In this series of questions which Andronicus puts to St. John regarding the events that have just transpired, St. John explains that Fortunatus was wholly captured by the sins of envy and pride.¹²⁸ Once again, by leaving out the service of the Eucharist in the hagiography, Hrotsvit preserves the sanctity of the mass that would have been held truly holy by her audience. Not only does she preserve the sacred elements of the hagiography in this, but she takes advantage of the opportunity to serve the *utilitas* of her play by explaining the final *exemplum* in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*.

¹²⁴ St. John's prayer shows a strong resemblance to the Romano German pontifical's prayers for exorcising demons.

¹²⁵ Genesis 3.

¹²⁶ Matthew 7:17

¹²⁷ Peter Brown, *The Making of Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978). It was a standard custom to visit the graves of the deceased, have meals there, and share in familial community in Hellenistic times. The early Christian graveyard did not have the stigma of a "fear of ghosts" that it later came to have. Hrotsvit leaves out the hagiography's mood of communal sharing, allowing only the "spooky" connotations of "the dead" to remain.

¹²⁸ Morton Bloomfield, *The Seven Deadly Sins: An Introduction to the History of a Religious Concept, with Special Reference to Medieval English Literature* (East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1952), p.69 ff. Bloomfield cites John Cassian from his *Institutes* VII:7, "How great is the evil of pride, that it rightly has no angel, nor other virtues opposed to it, but God Himself as its adversary."

Hrotsvit closes with a prayer of thanksgiving from St. John, in which he invites those present to “. . . leave the devil’s son to his father” and celebrate Drusiana and Calimachus’ resurrections along with Calimachus’ conversion to Christianity. St. John praises God for his discretion as divine judge in knowing who is to be punished and who is to be saved; thus Hrotsvit picks up on the line from the hagiography’s earlier prayer which mentions “God as our judge.” The hagiography closes at Andronicus’ home. When the brethren hear of Fortunatus’ death, St. John comments, “You have your child, devil!” The Latin reads, *Habes Filium tuum Diabole*. Thus Hrotsvit has taken this line almost verbatim from the hagiography.

Calimachus begins as the “servant of the devil,” but both the legend and Hrotsvit’s play end with Fortunatus designated as the “devil’s child.” In *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*, Fortunatus takes on more of an opportunistic and mischievous quality than an evil one, because Hrotsvit has left out the scenes from the hagiography that portray him as truly evil. She thereby achieves the *delectatio et utilitas* strategy in her play.

CHAPTER VII

GOD

The final character to discuss in the legend of Drusiana and Calimachus in the *Acta Johannis* and *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* is that of God, for through a study of His portrayal is revealed the nature of the meaning and the message animating both texts. The *Acta Johannis* was written in the second-century A.D., and *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* in the tenth-century A.D.; the difference in time is reflected in the difference in the theology at work in Hrotsvit's play. This in turn shapes the *exempla* that the text communicates. The *delectatio et utilitas* esthetic adds yet another dimension to these varying perspectives.

In the *Acta Johannis* legend, God appears to St. John and the brethren at the entrance to the tomb, and to Calimachus when he is about to defile Drusiana's corpse. The text of the legend describes the first appearance of God "... at the tomb of Drusiana we saw a beautiful youth smiling." And Calimachus relates that God appeared to him, "... as a beautiful youth covering [Drusiana] with this cloak. Rays of light fell from his face upon hers ..." This imagery is typical of early representations of Christ, who is often portrayed as a young, beardless shepherd in artistic representations of him from the same time period. Often referred to as Christ the

Good Shepherd,¹²⁹ the emphasis in these descriptions of him is his light-filled being and his loving acceptance, protection and forgiveness of those who turn to him. It is this youthful Christ that the thousands of early Christian martyrs followed into their deaths and rebirth in heaven.

Hrotsvit remains absolutely true to the hagiography's representation of the "beautiful youth" in her rendition of the story, but she adds another dimension to God--an emphasis on divine judgment--that reflects the seven hundred years of Christian theological development that had transpired since the writing of the *Acta Johannis*. For once Christianity became the state religion under Constantine in the fourth century, the "beautiful youth" became part of the legal system, and thus the loving shepherd graduated to the role of divine judge. This is not to say that the aspect of divine judgment was absent from early Christian theology; only that the emphasis shifted to "God as Judge" by the time of Justinian, as is reflected in the rise of the Byzantine images of Christ Pantocrator. This portrayal of God, now fully bearded, seems to say that the "beautiful youth" has come of age, and that the members of the *collegium Christi* must first qualify in order to be members.¹³⁰

¹²⁹ Thomas F. Torrance, *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959), p. 23. John 10:11 "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd lays down his life for his sheep." This parable is part of the Christian teaching on divine grace. "God's love is bestowed spontaneously and freely, and is not evoked by anything in His creatures. . . also in the commandment to give uncalculating and unconditional love to your neighbor because that is how God manifests His love towards us" as in Matthew 5:44. "Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be children of your Father in heaven, who makes the sun rise on the good and the evil, and sends rain on the just and the unjust."

In other words, by Hrotsvit's time, the emphasis on the divine judgment of sin and grace had increased significantly, as the liturgical developments of "Last Judgment" theology show.¹³¹ The Augustinian doctrine of predestination of souls for salvation or damnation had long influenced medieval theology by Hrotsvit's times, and the idea of "God's elect" was firmly rooted in Christian belief.¹³² This development is notable not only in liturgical records, but also in medieval art, which increasingly portrays the moment of the Last Judgment as newly dead souls are weighed in the scales of St. Michael for their weight in good deeds; those heavy with virtue are received upward by heaven's angels, and those too light of merit are pulled downward by hell's demons.¹³³

Wilson asserts that Hrotsvit's Christology demonstrates that:

¹³¹ New Catholic Encyclopedia, VI, p. 767. Pope Gregory (c.540-604) added lines to the *Hanc igitur* of the Mass: "Dispose our days in your peace. Also, save us from eternal damnation and command that we be numbered in the flock of your elect." Mary Phillips Perry, "On the Psychostasis of Christian Art," *Burlington Magazine*, vol. 22 (1912 -13): 94-105, 208-218. The cult of St. Michael the archangel also grew steadily after his appearance in Gargano, Italy in the sixth century where an important shrine to him was created. St. Michael took over the ancient role of Mercury as "weigher of souls" at death, and usher of souls to heaven. The symbol of St. Michael carrying the scales of judgment in which he weighed human souls to see if they merited heaven, became synonymous with the moment of death. St. Michael was invoked at the deathbed in the sacrament of the last unction, for along with weighing the soul, he also was responsible for carrying the worthy soul to Abraham's bosom in heaven.

Olga Rojdestvensky, *Le Culte de Saint Michel et le Moyen Age Latin* (Paris: Auguste Picard, 1922), p. 34, 35, 38. Translation for this thesis by Helen Wencke. "Saint Michael was the saint most representative, if not the most popular, of the Carolingian period. . . This cult is characteristic of the eighth and ninth centuries to the same degree as were those of Christ and the Holy Virgin in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries . . . The numerous foundings of basilicas dedicated to Saint Michael by emperors Otto I, Conrad II, and Henry II, almost always occurred after victories in which the Archangel had brought them help."

¹³² J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978), pp. 38-ff. Augustine, *De praedestinatione sanctorum*, ch. 19, *De civitate dei* 15 1:1.

¹³³ Snyder, p. 289. These factors all contribute to the elaborate artistic representations of the Last Judgment as described in St. John's revelation in the Apocalypse portraying St. Michael weighing souls in the portals of the great Romanesque cathedrals such as Autun. Angels guide the worthy to the gates of heaven, and devils lead the unworthy into the mouth of hell.

... [T]he New Testament notion of divine justice by a just and benevolent God - - with Christ as the champion of men combating the guiles of Satan and rescuing repentant sinners from his claws. Her conception of Christ, which closely corresponds to tenth-century iconography and doxological depiction, is clearly that of Christ Pantocrator, the triumphant Christ.¹³⁴

The many prayers and short sermons that Hrotsvit adds to *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* bear out this description of the tenth century's shift towards Augustinian "Last Judgment" theology. These include St. John's response to Andronicus' interpretation of God's differentiation between a sin out of "ignorance" and a sin out of "malice:"

With what wonderful exactness the Supreme Judge examines the deeds [of human beings]. How even the scales in which He weighs the merits of each individual . . . None can understand, none explain. Human wisdom cannot grasp the subtlety of . . . divine judgement.¹³⁵

No such prayer occurs in the hagiography, nor does St. John's prayer that closes

Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi:

... Let us give thanks to God, the equitable Judge who knows our secrets' inmost recesses, and who alone assesses all things, and who in weighing all things is always fair, allotting to everyone according to his merits his deserved gain or punishment.¹³⁶

It could be argued that this is also the lesson of the hagiography, and that Hrotsvit simply drew this meaning from the legend and highlighted it. On one level this is of

¹³⁴ Katharina M. Wilson, *Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: The Ethics of Authorial Stance*, Davis Medieval Texts and Studies VII (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988), p. 33. Wilson compares Hrotsvit's theology to Augustine's *De civitate dei*, 14.15-16: "Like Augustine, Hrotsvit propounds the world view that, excluded from heaven, Satan the eternal tempter is ever at work to seduce man. Through sin, man relinquishes his free servitude to God to become a bondsman of the devil. Christ (paradigm of triumphant self-sacrifice), born of the Virgin (paradigm of unswerving, unquestioning submission to God's will), assumes human form to save sinners and to found *sancta ecclesia*, the *civitas coelestis* on earth.

¹³⁵ St. John, pp. 60-61.

¹³⁶ Wilson, p. 68.

course true, because the legend's St. John does address God as "our God and judge who are like you and your nature." But the standard reading that the apostolic fathers give to this legend, according to Dorn, is the lesson of God's grace towards sinners, and His capacity to forgive even the most heinous crimes. This is the obvious lesson which St. John teaches Calimachus when he resists Fortunatus' resurrection, as well as the lesson contained in Drusiana's forgiveness and resurrection of Fortunatus. Clearly, the legend's message of God's forgiveness and grace is central to its original *exemplum*.

Yet the theme of divine psychostasis of souls and God's discerning judgement is also inherently present in the hagiography, as in the statement "devil take your child" which St. John makes at the end of the legend. Taken in conjunction with Calimachus whom God chose to save, "devil take your child" is a unique verbal image of St. Michael's scales, with Calimachus being lifted up to heaven from one side of the balance, and the devil "taking his child" Fortunatus down to hell from the other.¹³⁷

Hrotsvit as Teacher and Playwright

Hrotsvit thus successfully meets the criteria of the *delectatio et utilitas* esthetic in her play *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*. She presents the hagiographic *exempla*, or lessons, with entertaining effectiveness. The often dark and saturnine mood of the *Acta Johannis* legend is lifted as she writes Terentian dialogue at

¹³⁷ Another important parable to this idea is from Matthew 25:31-46. "And he will separate them one from another, as the shepherd separates the sheep from the goats; and he will set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left."

exempla, or lessons, with entertaining effectiveness. The often dark and saturnine mood of the *Acta Johannis* legend is lifted as she writes Terentian dialogue at moments which otherwise are tragic and intense, such as Calimachus' approach of Drusiana, and Fortunatus and Calimachus at the graveyard. She gives Andronicus the Terentian role of the "running slave" who follows after his master's every whim. She keeps the momentum of the Terentian comedy moving by omitting moments from the hagiography that upset, frighten or shock the audience by exaggerating them, and offsetting what must remain so that it becomes funny, as in Drusiana's prayer to die, and the death of Fortunatus on stage.

In her treatment of her cast of characters, she changes the group dynamics from the *fraternitas* of the early Christian community to that of the bourgeois Terentian family and of Ovidian romance. The roles each character plays speak to the audience on multiple levels, offering fertile ground for the audience's imaginative associations and entertainment. If staged (or imagined) in Benedictine costume, the monastic life of the tenth century is also added to the layering and interplay of Roman, early Christian and tenth-century cultures.

Hrotsvit's profile as a playwright thus emerges from an identity that can be misunderstood by the apparent overlapping of hagiographic, monastic and Terentian elements that lose their relationship to each other unless Hrotsvits' process of adaptation from the original hagiography is well defined. Hrotsvit's talent as a deeply insightful, imaginative and adept authoress emerges not in her ability to invent, but in her talent for assimilation and juxtaposition which in turn yields a new form: the

liturgical comedy.

At the heart of her creativity lies the ethic of service to the message she is communicating to her audience through the characters she forms by combining the Christian and the Terentian communities. These messages are particularly Hrotsvit's for they are born from the combination of genres. She states overtly that chastity is the virtue which all women must steadfastly uphold, and she says more subtly, in honoring that commitment, avoid hysterical behavior. She chastises the dry and empty pontificating bishops, who are more conscious of protocol than procedure, along with the priests and monks who have lost their identity by bowing to the bishop's every move.

Hrotsvit still serves the lessons of the original legend that encourage sinners to trust in God's willingness to forgive those who turn to Him, but they must remember that this turning to God is a constant activity of the heart, not a momentary decision in crisis. She speaks to the professed Christians to practice discretion in their judgement of others, for human beings can rarely see the total picture of another's life circumstance. And she warns that God does exact consequences for the abuse of others by those who refuse self-awareness and the grace of God's love.

As has been shown, her accomplishment has been made possible by adhering to the balancing force of the *delectatio et utilitas* esthetic that does not let a lesson go by without a smile, but equally does not let a smile go by without a lesson. In so doing, a serious hagiography becomes a comedic play, whose humor says a great deal. Thus, in terms of genres, *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* qualifies as a

hagiography, only the playwright-hagiographer is remembering Drusiana more than St. John.

Drusiana's sacrifice, moreover contains the promise of Calimachus' redemption through grace, and in fact God himself, as a true *deus ex machina*, descends on earth in the figure of a beautiful youth to raise Drusiana from the dead, and with her, Calimachus, who lies outside the tomb.¹³⁸

Hrotsvit successfully shows how the force of a woman's will to withhold her body from the selfish sexual demands of a man can facilitate the miracles of resurrection and conversion, and cleanse community of harmful imbalances.

Thus the Bollandists list Hrotsvit's plays as versions of the saints' lives they concern in the index to the *Acta Sanctorum*. Ultimately, Hrotsvit's commitment to *delectatio et utilitas* makes her a hagiographer above all else, for it is in the hagiographic intent of teaching the *exemplum* that her author's heart lies. That she has been successful in her attempt is clear, as Erhard Dorn pointedly remarks,

The literary effectiveness of the Calimachus subject speaks for itself, and has found its most beautiful rendition in the dramatized version of Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim, who expresses the theme of the grace of God for the unworthy sinner in a more effective form than the Greek original.¹³⁹

From this one can conclude that Hrotsvit's decision to create a hagiography that uses *delectatio* to communicate its message was effective.

Yet the question remains, since the prayers in the original hagiography are to a God of Grace, and Hrotsvit's several passages about God as Divine Judge are not,

¹³⁸ Sticca, "Sin and Salvation . . ." p. 13.

¹³⁹ Dorn, p. 72. The legends of *Thais* and *Maria and Abraham* that Hrotsvit also used for her plays are to be found in this collection of "sinning saints" stories.

how should we explain Hrotsvit's clearly discernable shift in emphasis, from the hagiography's God of Grace and Mercy, to God the Divine Judge as portrayed in her play? On one level, this shift may simply reflect the growing trend in early medieval thought and art as referred to above. On another level, Hrotsvit's decision is dictated by her consistency in following the *delectatio et utilitas* principle. Seen from that perspective, the hagiography's message of God's grace and forgiveness, while speaking to the concept of *utilitas*, does not quite satisfy Hrotsvit the playwright's demand for *delectatio*. The element of divine judgment lends itself more to *delectatio* when seen in terms of popular images such as St. Michael's scales and the Boethian Wheel of Fortune.¹⁴⁰ Divine judgment is akin to *delectatio*, for there is an element of surprise in discovering who will rise and who will fall, since the human mind cannot comprehend the wisdom behind God's discretion. As St. John corroborates in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi*: "None can understand [the mind of God], none explain. Human wisdom cannot grasp the subtlety of . . . divine judgement."¹⁴¹

Thus Hrotsvit's emphasis on divine judgment in *Resuscitatio Drusianae et Calimachi* shows her commitment to the *delectatio et utilitas* esthetic. Doing so gives a light-hearted spin to the otherwise ominous inevitability of one's own judgment in the eyes of God that can be met either with fear and negative foreboding, or with hope and positive anticipation. The *delectatio et utilitas* approach to this *exemplum* teaches

¹⁴⁰ Boethius, *Consolation of Philosophy*, trans. H.F. Steward, E.K. Rand, F.J. Tester (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), Book III. Although the concept of the Wheel of Fortune was a pagan idea, it remained popular throughout the Middle Ages.

¹⁴¹ St. John, pp. 60-61.

that although the judgment of God is inevitable, it is better to relate to it with a light heart, since only God knows “our secrets’ inmost recesses, he alone assesses all things and in weighing all things is always fair.”

It seems then that the key to understanding Hrotsvit’s plays lies in her attempt to provide both *utilitas* as well as *delectatio* in her hagiographic method. As I have hoped to show in this study, Hrotsvit does so successfully. Not only does she retain her faithfulness to the hagiographer’s purpose in providing spiritual edification, but at the same time she also shows her artistry as a playwright in providing such edification in an entertaining mode.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abou-el-Haj, Barbara. The Medieval Cult of Saints: Formations and Transformations. (Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Affeldt, Werner. Frauen in Spatantike und Frühmittelalter. (Signmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1990).
- Alexander, Anthony. College Sacramental Theology. (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1961).
- App, Austin J. "Roswitha Puts Love into Drama." The Magnificat 70 (1942).
- Astell, Ann W. The Song of Songs in the Middle Ages. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990).
- Astell, Ann W. Job, Boethius, and Epic Truth. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994).
- Axton, Richard. European Drama of the Middle Ages. (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1974).
- Barber, Richard. Bestiary: Being an English Version of the Bodleian Library, Oxford M.S. Bodley 764 with All the Original Miniatures Reproduced in Facsimile. (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1993).
- Barlow, Claude W., trans. Iberian Fathers: Martin of Braga, Paschasius of Dumium, Leander of Seville I Fathers of the Church (Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1969).
- Barlow, Marjorie Dana. "Printed Editions." Hrotswitha of Gandersheim: Her Life, Times and Works and a Comprehensive Bibliography, Haight, Anne Lyon, ed. (New York: The Hrotswitha Club, 1965).
- Baumstark, Anton. Vom geschichtlichen Werden der Liturgie. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971).

- Benedict. The Rule of Saint Benedict, trans. McCann, Dom Justin. (Birmingham: Stanbrook Abbey Press, 1937).
- Bergman, Sr. Mary Bernardine. Hrosvithae Liber Tertius, Dissertation. (St. Louis University, 1942).
- Berschin, Walter. "Passio und Theater. Sur Dramatischen Struktur einiger Vorlagen Hrotsvits von Gandersheim," The Theatre in the Middle Ages, Mediaevalia Lovaniensia I, XIII. (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985).
- Bevington, David. Complete Works of Shakespeare. (New York: Harper-Collins, 1992).
- Bevington, David. email conversation (University of Chicago, March 9, 1998).
- Bialas, Andrew A. The Patronage of Saint Michael the Archangel. (Chicago: Clerics of St. Viator, 1954).
- Binsse, Henry B. "The Birth of Christian Drama." Catholic World 103 (1916): 135.
- Bishop, Edmund. Liturgica Historica: Papers on the Liturgy and Religious Life of the Western Church. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).
- Black, Jonathan. "The Use of Liturgical Texts in Hrotsvit's Works." Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Rara Avis in Saxonia? Medieval and Renaissance Monograph Series VII. (Ann Arbor, Michigan: MARC, 1987).
- Blaschfield, Evangeline Wilbour. Portraits and Backgrounds. (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1917).
- Bloomfield, Morton. The Seven Deadly Sins: An Introduction to the History of a Religious Concept, with Special Reference to Medieval English Literature. (Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1952).
- Boase, Roger. The Origin and Meaning of Courtly Love. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1977).
- Boase, T.S.R. Death in the Middle Ages: Mortality, Judgment and Remembrance. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972).
- Boethius. Consolation of Philosophy, trans. Stewart, H.F., Rand, E.K., Tester, F.J. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990).

- Bonfante, Larissa. The Plays of Hrotswitha of Gandersheim. (New York: New York University Press, 1979).
- Boussard, Jaques. The Civilization of Charlemagne, trans. Frances Partridge. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).
- Bouyer, Louis. Rite and Man: Natural Sacredness and Christian Liturgy, trans. M. Joseph Costelloe. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963).
- Bouyer, Louis, Leclercq, Jean, and Vandenbroucke, Francis. The Spirituality of the New Testament and of the Fathers: A History of Christian Spirituality I. (New York, 1963).
- Bovie, Palmer, Carrier, Constance and Parker, Douglass, eds., trans. The Complete Comedies of Terence. (New Brunswick, NJ: 1974).
- Bradshaw, Paul F. Daily Prayer in the Early Church: A Study of the Origin and Early Development of the Divine Office. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).
- Brown, Peter. The Making of Late Antiquity. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978).
- Brown, Raymond E. The Community of The Beloved Disciple. (New York: Paulist Press, 1979).
- Brown, Raymond E. The Churches The Apostles Left Behind. (New York: Paulist Press, 1984).
- Burns, N.T., and Reagan, C.J. Concepts of the Hero in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1975).
- Butler, Cuthbert. Benedictine Monasticism. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1924).
- Butler, Sr. Mary Margaret, R.S.M. Hrotsvitha: The Theatricality of Her Plays. (New York: Philosophical Library, 1960).
- Campbell, Thomas L. Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite: The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1981).
- Capellanus, Andreas. The Art of Courtly Love, trans. ed. John Jay Parry. (New York: W.W. Norton).

- Catholic Church. Breviarum Monasticum. (Mechliniae: H. Dessain, 1901).
- Catholic University of America. New Catholic Encyclopedia. VI, VIII (New York: Mcgraw Hill, 1967).
- Chambers, E.K. The Mediaeval Stage I. (Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1903)
- Charbonneau-Lassay, Louis. The Bestiary of Christ, trans. D.M. Dooling. (New York: Viking Penguin, 1991).
- Coffman, George R. "A New Approach to Medieval Latin Drama." Modern Philology 22 (1925).
- Colunga, R.P. Alberto, and Turrado, Laurentio, eds. Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Clementinam. (Bibliotheca de Autores Cristianos, 1959).
- Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, eds. The New Testament, translated from the Latin Vulgate. (Paterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1941).
- Constable, Giles. Medieval Monasticism: A Select Bibliography. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976).
- Coulter, Cornelia. "The 'Terentian' Comedies of a Tenth-Century Nun." Classical Journal 24 (1929).
- Cozens, M.L. Handbook of Heresies. (New York: Canterbury Books, 1928).
- Creizenach, Wilhelm. Geschichte des Neuren Dramas. (Halle: 1911).
- Dalmais, I.H. Introduction to the Liturgy, trans. Capel, Roger. (Baltimore: Helicaon Press, 1961).
- Daly, Lowrie J. Benedictine Monasticism: Its Formation and Development Through the 12th Century. (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965).
- DeleHaye, Hippolyte. The Legends of the Saints. (New York: Fordham University Press, 1962).
- deLubach, Henri. Medieval Exegesis I-. (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998).
- Dioceses Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis. Collectio Rituum. (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1954).

- Dodds, E.R. Euripides. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).
- Dolger, Franz. "Die Ottonenkaiser und Byzanz." Karolingische und Ottonische Kunst, ed. H. Subin, et al. (Wiesbaden: Franz Steinner, 1957).
- Dorn, Erhard. "Der Sündige Heilige in der Legende des Mittelalters." Medium Aevum-Philologische Studien 10 (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1967).
- Driscoll, Michael. Telephone conversation. (Notre Dame University, July 15, 1998).
- Dronke, Peter. Poetic Individuality in the Middle Ages. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970).
- Dronke, Peter. The Medieval Poet and His World, *Storia et Letteratura* 164 (Rome, *Storia et Letteratura*, 1984).
- Dronke, Peter. Women Writers of the Middle Ages: A Critical Study of Texts from Perpetua to Marguerite Porete. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).
- Dronke, Peter. Nine Medieval Latin Plays. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Duchesne, Mgr. L. Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution. A Study of the Latin Liturgy up to the Time of Charlemagne, trans. McClure, M.L. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1910).
- Durkheim, Emille. The Elementary Forms of Religious Life. (London: Allen and Unwin, 1964).
- Echols, Anne. An Annotated Index of Medieval Women. (New York: M. Wiener, 1992).
- Eckenstein, Lina. Women Under Monasticism. (New York: Russell and Russell, 1963).
- Ellard, Gerald. Ordination Anointings in the Western Church Before 1000 A.D. (Cambridge: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1933).
- Elliot, Alison Goddard. Roads to Paradise: Reading the Lives of the Early Saints. (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1987).
- Elliott, J.K. The Apocryphal New Testament. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).

- Endepols, H.J.E. Hrotsvitha van Gandersheim Leesdrama's II I. (Utrecht: Het Spectrum, 1950).
- Ennen, Edith. Frauen im Mittelalter. (München: C.H. Beck Verlag, 1985).
- Fabricius, J.A. Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti. (Hamburg, 1703).
- Fichtenau, Heinrich. Living in the Tenth Century: Mentalities and Social Orders, trans. Patrick Geary. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).
- Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler. The Book of Revelation: Justice and Judgment. (Philadelphia: Fortress Books, 1985).
- Franz, Adolph. Die Messe im Deutschen Mittelalter. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963).
- Gold, Barbara K. "Hrotswitha Writes Herself: Clamor Validus Gandeshemensis." Sex and Gender in Medieval and Renaissance Texts, Gold, Barbara K., Miller, Paul Allen, Platter, Charles, eds. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997).
- Goodspeed, Edgar. The Apostolic Fathers: An American Translation. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950).
- Gould, Graham. The Desert Fathers on Monastic Community. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- Grashof, Otto. Das Benediktinerinnenstift Gandersheim und Hrotsvitha, die "Zierde der Benedictinerordens," Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benedictiner und Cistercienser Orden 6 (1885).
- Haarsen, Meta. "Manuscripts." Hrotswitha of Gandersheim: Her Life, Times and Works and a Comprehensive Bibliography, Haight, Anne Lyon, ed. (New York: The Hrotsvitha Club, 1965).
- Haight, Anne Lyon. Hrotswitha of Gandersheim, Her Life, Times, and Works and a Comprehensive Bibliography. (New York: The Hrotsvitha Club, 1965).
- Hardison, O.B., Jr. Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages: Essays in the Origin and Early History of Modern Drama. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965).

- Harper, John. The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century: A Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).
- Heaven or Hell: The Last Judgment. (Dallas: Swan/Jones Productions, 1995).
- Heinrich, Sr. Mary Pia. The Canonesses and Education in the Early Middle Ages, Dissertation. (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1924).
- Hennecke, Edgar. New Testament Apocrypha I-II, Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, ed., English translation edited by Wilson, R.Mcl. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964).
- Henry, Hugh T. Catholic Customs and Symbols. (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1925).
- Heussi, Karl. Kompndium der Kirchengeschichte. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1922).
- Homeyer, Helena. Die Wiederweckung der Drusiana und des Calimachus. (Hamburg: 1931).
- Homeyer, Helena. "Imitatio und Aemulatio im Werk der Hrotsvitha von Gandersheim." Studi Medievali 10 (1968).
- Homeyer, Helena. Hrotsvitae Opera. (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schoningh, 1970).
- Homeyer, Helena. Hrotswitha Werke. (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schoningh, 1973).
- Hudson, W.H. "Love-drama of the Tenth Century." English Historical Review 3 (1981).
- Hughes, Andrew. Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office: A guide to their organization and terminology. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982).
- Hughes, Eril. "Augustinian Elements in Hrotsvit's Plays." Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Rara Avis in Saxonia? Medieval and Renaissance Monograph Series VII. (Ann Arbor, Michigan: MARC, 1987).
- Igný, Gueric of. Liturgical Sermons, trans. Monks of Mount Saint Bernard Abbey. I CF 8. (Spencer, Massachusetts: Cistercian Publications, 1970).

- Jaeger, C. Stephen. The Origins of Courtliness--Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals--939-1210. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985).
- James, E. O. Seasonal Feasts and Festivals. (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1961).
- James, E. O. Christian Myth and Ritual: A Historical Study. (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1973).
- Jones, Cheslyn, Wainwright, Geoffrey, Yarnold, Edward, and Bradshaw, Paul. The Study of Liturgy. (London: SPC, 1992).
- Jones, Leslie Webber and Morey, J.R. The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence Prior to the Thirteenth Century. (Princeton, 1930).
- Junod, Eric. The Mass of the Roman Rite: To the Time of Gregory the Great, trans. Francis A. Brunner. (Vienna: Herder Verlag: 1959).
- Junod, Eric. Liturgie der Christlichen Fruhzeit: Bis auf Gregor den Grossen. (Switzerland: Universitätsverlag Freiburg: 1967).
- Junod, Eric, and Kaestli, Jean-Daniel. Acta Johannis, Corpus Christianorum, series Apocryphum I-III. (Brepols: Turnhout, 1983).
- Kahler, Ernst. Studien Zum te Deum: Und Zur Geschichte des 24. Psalms in der Alten Kirche. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958).
- Kay, Richard. The Broadview Book of Medieval Anecdotes. (Broadview Press: Peterborough, Canada, 1988).
- Kee, Howard Clark. The New Testament in Context: Sources and Documents. (New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1984).
- Kelly, Henry Ansgar. The Devil, Demonology and Witchcraft: The Development of Christian Beliefs in Evil Spirits. (New York: Doubleday, 1974).
- Kelly, J.N.D. Early Christian Doctrines. (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978).
- Klauser, Theodor. A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections, trans. Halliburton, John. (London: Oxford University Press, 1969).
- Klimberg, J., and Schulte, J. Deutsche Dichtungen des lateinischen Mittelalters für den deutsch-und latein Unterricht. (Münster: 1926).

- Körntgen, Ludger. Studien zu den Quellen der frühmittelalterlichen Büssbücher. (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1993).
- Kronenberg, Kurt. Roswitha of Gandersheim: Leben und Werk. (Bad Gandersheim: Verlag C.F. Hertel, 1962).
- Lambert, R.S. Calimachus. (Wembly Hill, Middlesex: Stanton Press, 1922).
- Langosch, Karl. Dulcitius; Abraham. (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, 1967).
- Lawson, John. A Theological and Historical Introduction to the Apostolic Fathers. (New York: Macmillan, 1961).
- Lazius, W. Abdiae Babyloniae Episcopi, et Apostolorum Discipuli, de Historia Certaminis Apostilici . . . (Bale: 1552).
- Leclercq, Jean. The Love of Learning and the Desire for God. (New York: Mentor Omega Book, 1962).
- Leeming, David Adams. Mythology: The Voyage of the Hero. (New York: Harper & Row, 1981).
- Lefevre, Eckard. Die Expositionstechnik in den Komodien des Terenz. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969).
- Lewis and Short. A Latin Dictionary. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- Leyser, Karl J. Rule and Conflict in an Early Medieval Society: Ottonian Saxony. (Bloomington, IN, 1979).
- Lipsius, Richard Adelbert. Die Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden. (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1976).
- Lipsius, Richard Adelbert, ed. Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha I-III. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1919).
- Lueken, Wilhelm Michael. Eine Darstellung und vergleichung der jüdischen und der morgenländisch-christlichen Tradition vom Erzengel Michael. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1898).
- MacDonald, A.J. Authority and Reason in the Early Middle Ages. (London: Oxford University Press, 1933).

- Maginnis, Sr. Eugenia. The Four Dramas of Roswitha, a Nun of the Tenth Century, masters thesis. (University of Minnesota, 1917).
- Magnin, C. Theatre Europeen: Theatre anterieur a la Renaissance. (Paris, 1835).
- Marmion, Columba, O.S.B. Sponsa Verbi: The Virgin Consecrated to Christ, trans. Izard, Francis, O.S.B. (London: Sands and Co., 1925).
- Marshall, Mary H. "Theatre in the Middle Ages: Evidence from Dictionaries and Glosses." Symposium (1950).
- Marygrove College. Into Her Own: The Status of Woman from Ancient Times to the End of the Middle Ages. (Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1972).
- McCracken, George E. Early Medieval Theology IX. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957).
- McGinn, Bernard. Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil. (New York: Harper Collins, 1994).
- McGinn, Bernard. Apocalypticism in the Western Tradition. (Hampshire, Great Britain: Variorum, 1994).
- McGinn, Bernard, Meyendorff, John, Leclercq, H. Jean, eds. "Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century." I World Spirituality. An Encyclopaedic History of the Religious Quest XVI (New York: Crossroads, 1987).
- McNamara, Jo Ann, Halborg, John E., and Whatley, E. Gordon, eds. Sainted Women of the Dark Ages. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1992).
- McNeill, John T., and Gamer, Helena M. Medieval Handbooks of Penance. (New York: Octagon Books, 1965).
- Meyendorff, John, and McGinn, Bernard, eds. Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century. (New York: Crossroad, 1985).
- Migne, J.P. "Hrotsvithae Opera," Patrologiae cursus completus Tonius CXXXVII, Series Latina, Tomus I (Paris, 1853).
- Nagel, Bert. Hrotsvit von Gandersheim. (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1965).

- Nagel, Bert. Hrotsvit von Gandersheim: Samtliche Dichtungen. (München: Winkler-Verlag, 1966).
- National Bible Press. Holy Bible: Authorized King James Version. (Philadelphia, 1944).
- Nausea, F. Anonymi Philalethi Eusebiani in vitas, miracula passionisque apostolorum rhapsodiae. (Cologne, 1531).
- Neufeld, Vernon H. The Earliest Christian Confessions. (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963).
- Neumann, Friedrich. "Der Denkstil Hrotsvits von Gandersheim." Festschrift für Hermann Heimpel. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht 3, 1972).
- Newlands, Carol E. "Hrotswitha's Debt to Terence." Transactions of the American Philological Association 116 (1986): 369-391.
- Newman, F.X., ed. The Meaning of Courtly Love. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1967).
- Nichols, John A., and Shank, Lillian Thomas, eds. Medieval Religious Women: Distant Echoes I CS 71. (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1984).
- Noble, Thomas F.X., and Head, Thomas. Soldiers for Christ. (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995).
- Ordination of Deacons, Priests and Bishops. Study Edition. (Washington: United States Catholic Conference Publications Office, 1979).
- Palazzo, Eric. Les Sacramentaires de Fulda: Etude sur l'iconographie et la liturgie a l'epoque ottonienne. (Munster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung GmbH, 1994).
- Parsch, Pius. The Church's Year of Grace I-V. (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 5 1970).
- Paxton, Frederick S. Christianizing Death: The Creation of a Ritual Process in Early Medieval Europe. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990).
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. The Shape of Death: Life, Death, and Immortality in the Early Fathers. (London: Macmillan, 1962).

- Pelikan, Jaroslav. The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of the Doctrine: III The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300). (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978).
- Perella, Nicolas James. The Kiss Sacred and Profane: An interpretive History of Kiss Symbolism and Related Religio-Erotic Themes. (Berkely: University of California Press, 1969).
- Perry, Mary Phillips. "On the Psychostasis of Christian Art." Burlington Magazine. 22 (1912 -13).
- Pfiegler, Michael. Dokumente zur Geschichte der Kirche. (München: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1957).
- Pitt-Rivers, George. The Riddle of the "Labarum" and the Origin of Christian Symbols. (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1966).
- Postlewaite, Thomas, and McConachie, Bruce. Interpreting the Theatrical Past: Essays in the History of Performance. (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1989).
- Power, Eileen. Medieval Women. (London: Cambridge University Press, 1975).
- Prete, Sextus. P. Terenti Afri Comedieae. (Heidelberg: F.H. KerleVerlag, 1954).
- Przywara, Erich. Frühe Religiöse Schriften. (Einsiedeln: Johannes-Verlag, 1962).
- Radermacher, L. Griechische Quellen zur Faustsage. (Wien: Holder-Pichler-Tempsky A.-G., 1927).
- Ranft, Patricia. Women and the Religious Life in Premodern Europe. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996).
- Rees, Elizabeth. Christian Symbols, Ancient Roots. (London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 1992).
- Reifenberg, Hermann. Messe und Missalien im Bistum Mainz Seit dem Zeitalter der Gotik. (Münster Westfalen: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960).
- Reynolds, L.D. and W.G. Wilson. Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968).

- Riche, Pierre. Daily Life in the World of Charlemagne, trans. McNamara, Jo Ann. (University Park, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978).
- Ripperger and Ryan. The Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1941).
- Rojdestvensky, Olga. Le Culte de Saint Michel et le Moyen Age Latin. (Paris: Auguste Picard, 1922).
- Rolt, C.E. "Dionysius The Areopagite on The Divine Names and The Mystical Theology." Translations of Christian Literature I. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1957).
- Rosenthal, Joel T., ed. Medieval Women and the Sources of Medieval History. (Athens, Ga: University of Georgia Press, 1990).
- Rostov, Saint Demetrius of. The Great Collection of the Lives of the Saints, trans. Thomas Maretta I September. (House Springs, Missouri: Chrysostom Press, 1994).
- Rudwin, Maximilian. The Devil in Legend and Literature. (La Salle, Il: Open Court, 1959).
- Runciman, Steven. The Medieval Manichee: A Study of Christian Dualist Heresy. (New York: Viking Press, 1961).
- Russell, Jeffrey Burton. Lucifer: The Devil in the Middle Ages. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990).
- Rutledge, Dom Denys. Cosmic Theology: The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of Pseudo-Denys: An Introduction. (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1965).
- Sandmel, Samuel, ed. The New English Bible with the Apocrypha. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976).
- Scanlon, Charles, L.A.M., and Scanlon, Cora Carroll, A.M. Latin Grammar: Grammar, Vocabularies, and Exercises in Preparation for the Reading of the Missal and Breviary.
- Schäfer, K. Heinrich. Die Kanonissenstifter im Deutschen Mittelalter. (Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1965).

- Schauffler, Robert Haven. Halloween. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1948).
- Schouten, J. The Rod and Serpent of Asklepios. (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1967).
- Schulhoff, Else. Die Erwächung des Calimachus: Ein Schauspiel. (Berlin: 1921).
- Schütze-Pflugk, Marianne. Herrscher- und Märtyrerauffassung bei Hrotsvit von Gandersheim. (Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag, 1972).
- Shahar, Shulamith. The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages, trans. Chaya Galai. (London: Routledge, 1990).
- Sill, Gertrude Grace. A Handbook of Symbols in Christian Art. (New York: Collier Books, 1975).
- Simpson, Robert L. The Interpretation of Prayer in the Early Church. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965).
- Snyder, James. Medieval Art: Painting, Sculpture, Architecture 4th-14th Century. (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1989).
- Société Bollandiana, eds. Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina Antiquae et Mediae Aetatis I-II. (Brussels: Societe Bollandistes, 1898-1911).
- Solano, Jesus. Textos Eucaristicos Primitivos Volume II. (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1954).
- St. John, Christopher. The Plays of Roswitha. (New York: Cooper Square, 1966).
- Sticca, Sandro. "Christian Drama and Christian Liturgy." Latomus. Revue d'Etudes Latines XXVI. (1967).
- Sticca, Sandro. "Hrotsvita's Dulcitius and Christian Symbolism." Mediaeval Studies 32. (1970).
- Sticca, Sandro. The Latin Passion Play: The Origins and Development. (Albany: State University of New York, 1970).
- Sticca, Sandro. "Hrotsvita's Abraham and the Exegetical Tradition." Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Lovaniensis. (Leuven: University Press, 1973).

- Sticca, Sandro. "Sin and Salvation: The Dramatic Context of Hrotswitha's Women." The Roles and Images of Women in the Middle Age and the Renaissance, ed. D. R. Radcliff-Umstead. (Pittsburg, 1975).
- Sticca, Sandro. "Drama sacro e realismo comico nel teatro medioevale tedesco e francese (X-XII secoli): da Hrotswitha di Gandersheim al *Mystere d'Adam*," in *L'Eredita Calssica nel Medioevo: Il Linguaggio Comico* (Viterbo: 1979).
- Sticca, Sandro. "Sacred Drama and Comic Realism in the Plays of Hrotswitha of Gandersheim." The Early Middle Ages Acta VI The Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies. (Binghamton: SUNY, 1979).
- Sticca, Sandro. "Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim," Dictionary of the Middle Ages, Strayer, Joseph R., ed. VI (American Council of Learned Societies, 1985).
- Sticca, Sandro. "Sacred Drama and Tragic Realism Hrotswitha's Paphnutius." The Theatre in The Middle Ages, *Mediaevalia Lovaniensia I XIII*. (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985).
- Sticca, Sandro. "The Hagiographical and Monastic Context of Hrotswitha's Plays." Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Rara Avis in Saxonia? Medieval and Renaissance Monograph Series VII, Katharina Wilson, ed. (Ann Arbor: MARC, 1987).
- Sticca, Sandro. "La *Passio* e la *Compassio* nel teatro medioevale abruzzese: il contesto teatrale e spirituale," La Letteratura Drammatica in Abruzzo Oliva, Gianni, and Moretti, Vito, eds. (Roma: Bulzoni Editore, 1995).
- Strecker, Karl. "Hrotsvithae Opera." Bibliotheca Teubneriana. (Leipzig, 1906).
- Suchomski, Joachim. Delectatio und Utilitas. (Francke: Bern, 1975).
- Tarr, Judith. "Terentian Elements in Hrotsvit." Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Rara Avis in Saxonia? Medieval and Renaissance Monograph Series VII. (Ann Arbor, Michigan: MARC, 1987).
- Tauler, John. The Inner Way Being Thirty-Six Sermons for Festivals. (London: Methuen, 1909).
- Thompson, Bard. Liturgies of the Western Church. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980).
- Tillyard, H.J.W., trans. The Plays of Roswitha. (London: Faith Press, 1923).

- Tischendorf, C., ed. Acta Apostolorum Aprocryphae I-III. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959).
- Torrance, Thomas F. The Doctrine of Grace in The Apostolic Fathers. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm.B.Eerdmans, 1959).
- Traupman, John C. The New College Latin and English Dictionary. (New York: Bantam, 1966).
- Tschan, Francis J. Saint Bernward of Hildesheim: His Life and Times I-III. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1942).
- Tunison, Joseph Salathiel. Dramatic Traditions of the Dark Ages. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1907.89).
- Tydemann, William. The Theatre in the Middle Ages: Western European Stage Conditions, c.800-1576. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
- Uitz, Erika, Patzold, Barbara, and Beyreuther, Gerald. Herrscherinnen und Nonnen: Frauengestalten von der Ottonenzeit bis zu den Staufern. (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1990).
- Unterkircher, Franz. Das Kollektar-Pontifikale des Bischofs Baturich Von Regensburg (817-848). (Freiburg, Switzerland: Universitätsverlag, 1962).
- Vickery, John B., and Sellery, J'nan M. The Scapegoat: Ritual and Literature. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972).
- Vogel, Cyrille. Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to The Sources. (Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1981).
- Vogel, Cyrille, and Elze, Reinhard, eds. Le Pontifical Romano-Germanique du Dixieme Siecle I-II 227. (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1963).
- Waddell, Helen. The Wandering Scholars. (London: Constable, 1927).
- Waddell, Helen. Beasts and Saints. (London: Constable, 1934).
- Waddell, Helen. Stories from Holy Writ. (New York: Macmillan, 1950).
- Waddell, Helen. The Desert Fathers. (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1957).

- Ward, Benedicta. Miracles and the Medieval Mind. (University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1982).
- Ward, Benedicta. Signs and Wonders: Saints, Miracles and Prayers from the 4th Century to the 14th. (Norfolk, Great Britain: Galliard, 1982).
- Webber, F. R. Church Symbolism: An Explanation of the More Important Symbols of the Old and New Testament, the Primitive, the Mediaeval and the Modern Church. (Cleveland: J.H. Jansen, 1927).
- Wemple, Suzanne Fonay. Women in Frankish Society: Marriage and the Cloister 500 to 900. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981).
- Wemple, Suzanne Fonay. "Monastic Life of Women from the Merovingians to the Ottonians." Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Rara Avis in Saxonia? Medieval and Renaissance Monograph Series VII. (Ann Arbor, Michigan: MARC, 1987).
- Wiegand, Sister Mary Gonzalez. The Legends of Hrotsvitha. (St. Louis University, 1935-1936).
- Wilder, Amos N. Early Christian Rhetoric The Language of The Gospel. (London: SCM Press, 1964).
- Willis, G.G. A History of Early Roman Liturgy. (London, 1994).
- Wilson, Katharina, ed. Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: Rara Avis in Saxonia? Medieval and Renaissance Monograph Series VII. (Ann Arbor, Michigan: MARC, 1987).
- Wilson, Katharina. Hrotsvit of Gandersheim: The Ethics of Authorial Stance. Davis Medieval Texts and Studies VII (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1988).
- Wilson, Katharina. The Plays of Hrotsvit of Gandersheim. (New York: Garland Publishing, 1989).
- Winklhofer, Alois. Kirche in den Sakramenten. (Frankfurt am Main: Josef Knecht, 1968).
- Winterfeld, Paul von. "Hrotsvits literarische Stellung." Archiv für das Studium der neueren Literaturen 114 (1905).
- Winterfeld, Paul von. Hrotsvitha Opera. Monumenta Germaniae Historica 34. (München: 1978).

Wolf, Ludwig, ed. Die Gandersheimer Reimchronik des Priesters Eberhard. (Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1927).

Wordsworth, John. Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book. (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1964).

Wright, F.A. "Tenth-Century Feminist." Nineteenth-Century and After 107 (1930).

Young, Karl. The Drama of the Medieval Church II. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933).

Zeydel, Edwin. "Knowledge of Hrotsvita's Works Prior to 1500." Modern Language Notes 62 (1944).

Zeydel, Edwin. "A Chronological Hrotsvitha Bibliography through 1700 with Annotations." Journal of English and German Philology 44 (1947).