



Drama and Sermon in Late Medieval England

Performance, Authority, Devotion

Charlotte Steenbrugge



EARLY DRAMA, ART, AND MUSIC

Drama and Sermon
in Late Medieval England

EARLY DRAMA, ART, AND MUSIC

Series Editors

David Bevington
University of Chicago

Robert Clark
Kansas State University

Jesse Hurlbut
Brigham Young University

Alexandra Johnston
University of Toronto

Veronique B. Plesch
Colby College ME

Medieval Institute Publications is a program of
The Medieval Institute, College of Arts and Sciences



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Drama and Sermon
in Late Medieval England
Performance, Authority, Devotion

by
Charlotte Steenbrugge

Early Drama, Art, and Music

MEDIEVAL INSTITUTE PUBLICATIONS
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo

Copyright © 2017 by the Board of Trustees of Western Michigan University

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Steenbrugge, Charlotte, author.

Title: Drama and sermon in late medieval England : performance, authority, devotion / by Charlotte Steenbrugge.

Description: Kalamazoo : Medieval Institute Publications/
Western Michigan University, [2017] | Series: Early drama, art, and music |
Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017043666 (print) | LCCN 2017043819 (ebook) |

ISBN 9781580442787 (electronic book) |

ISBN 9781580442770 (hardback : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: English drama--To 1500--History and criticism. |
Sermons, Medieval--England. | Drama, Medieval--History and criticism. |
Theater--England--History--Medieval, 500-1500. | Sermons in literature. |
Bible plays, English--History and criticism. | Christian drama, English
(Middle)--History and criticism.

Classification: LCC PR641 (ebook) | LCC PR641 .S84 2017 (print) |

DDC 822/.109--dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2017043666>.

ISBN: 9781580442770

eISBN: 9781580442787

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in, or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

Every effort has been made to obtain permission to use all copyrighted illustrations reproduced in this book. Nonetheless, whosoever believes to have rights to this material is advised to contact the publisher.

Chapter 2

Performing Sermons

TWO AREAS OF INFLUENCE repeatedly come to the fore in scholarly discussions of the connections and similarities between the medieval sermon and drama. One is the use of theatrical traits in sermons, the other is the preacherly tone and style of didactic passages in plays. This chapter will assess the former; chapters 3 and 4 will look more closely at the latter.

Medieval sermon scholars, like scholars of medieval drama, constantly have to face the difficulty of reconstructing an ephemeral performance from written source material. There are extremely few secondary witnesses to sermons preached in late medieval England that could help build a better picture of such performances, and the reliability of such eye-witness accounts in general is doubtful. Chroniclers, for example, often approach the preaching event from a specific angle that benefits their own narrative, and in any case these writers tend to focus on the exceptional rather than the ordinary.¹ It is no coincidence that we have much more information about famous and extraordinary preachers such as the Italian Franciscan Bernardino da Siena than we do about the average Sunday sermon. The main source of information used in this chapter when trying to reconstruct what late medieval English preaching would have been like will consequently consist of the surviving sermon texts themselves, although evidence from the *artes praedicandi* will also be used.

The sermon texts are, however, a problematic source of information about preaching. Some medieval English sermons may have been intended for reading rather than oral delivery.² It has been argued, for example, that it is more likely that the “sermons” from *Jacob’s Well* were experienced through private reading than public preaching.³ Another important complication when trying to reconstruct a performance from a written sermon is that in many cases the written sermon was probably not trying to replicate an oral performance, and consciously adopted different generic pointers, or at least actively omitted oral features.⁴ Thom Mertens has argued

that these texts are better treated as belonging to their own literary genre than seen as “watered-down” versions of preached sermons.⁵

As noted in the introduction, only a small sample of sermons has presumably survived and it is not clear how representative that sample is. Veronica O’Mara has argued that sanctorale preaching was more popular than the textual evidence suggests, but that the stories narrated in such sermons were so memorable and so well known that they did not need to be written down.⁶ Helen Leith Spencer has similarly claimed that the sermons on offer would have been more diverse than the large collections of *de tempore* and *de sanctis* sermons allows us to reconstruct.⁷

Another issue is the diversity of the sample of surviving sermons. Some sermons are extremely short. A sermon on Luke 6: 36 is a mere 66 lines long and seems to be (near) complete as it ends with the intimation of the final prayer (“Amen. Qui cum Patre ...”).⁸ Some are very long. A sermon that was probably written for the feast of the Annunciation and Passion Sunday in 1414 takes up nearly 26 pages in its modern edition.⁹ Some employ the modern, or thematic, structure; the sermon of Hugh Legat from Worcester Ms F 10 is a good example, as both the sermon text and the marginalia accentuate its structure, as in “I seyde firste & principalich” and “primum membrum primi principalis” respectively.¹⁰ But many sermons, such as those in John Mirk’s *Festial*, do not use such a well-defined structure. Some, such as a Palm Sunday sermon on the theme “Quid vultis mihi dare et ego vobis eum tradam,” regularly use Latin.¹¹ Some use little to no Latin. Apart from the rubrics with the first words of the Gospel lesson of the day, the sermons in *The Northern Homily Cycle* tend not to use any Latin. Some sermons repeatedly address the audience. Others use audience address more sparingly; Mirk, for instance, tends not to address the audience much in the course of his sermons and when he does so, he deliberately uses such address to draw attention to particularly pertinent points or to aid the flow of the argument.¹² It is, then, important to bear in mind these differences in style and even in content between the sermons.

Furthermore, many of the surviving Middle English sermons are presumably model sermons, primarily intended as building blocks for other preachers rather than to be preached verbatim. For instance, the “sermons” in the *Speculum Sacerdotale* contain several instances of duplication and cannot have been performed as they stand. Its editor points to “the encyclopedic nature” of this work and sagely remarks that “in a work of that purpose such duplication might even be a virtue.”¹³ The chap-

ter on satisfaction in this compilation is undoubtedly aimed at helping a priest assign appropriate satisfaction to confessants; it is not intended for preaching.

How preachers used model sermons is difficult to ascertain; presumably the usage varied greatly. Monica Hedlund remarks that a sermon preached at Vadstena, while based on a model sermon by Nicola de Aquaevilla, “is really a new sermon, with a new focus, much more colourful than the original one.”¹⁴ The “serene impersonality” of most Middle English sermons is then probably due to their status as model sermons and is unlikely to reflect the reality of preached sermons in late medieval England.¹⁵ Jussi Hanska, conversely, has noted that, where both the written model sermon and a *reportatio* of the preached sermon survive, the differences between the two tend to be minimal.¹⁶ Consequently, he argues that “it is safe to assume that model sermons also reflect quite well the style and content of actual Sunday sermons.”¹⁷ It is in any case reasonable to suppose that the influence of model sermons on preaching events was substantial, as model sermons were the most important aid to preachers.¹⁸ For a later, Protestant preaching tradition Arnold Hunt notes that printed sermons influenced preaching both directly, as model sermons were used in the pulpit, and indirectly “in conditioning clerical expectations of what a sermon should be.”¹⁹ It is probable that the influence of model sermons in the medieval period was similarly direct and indirect, although the availability of model sermons in written form must have been more limited than in the later period, and their influence, as a result, somewhat reduced.

In several instances, the surviving sermon was evidently not intended to be preached as it was recorded. While many of John Mirk’s sermons could be preached without much ado, several others end very abruptly. The *Festial* is explicitly said to be intended for the use of fellow preachers and presumably Mirk considered these men to be able to supply the remainder of well-known stories and some concluding lessons without further assistance. This is the case for the text on the feast of St. Nicholas, which ends “he was in þe chapel of hys faderes yfound *et cetera*,”²⁰ for example. Thomas Cyrcetur’s sermon for Good Friday ends with a sudden note to look elsewhere (“Nota alibi.”) for information about the Last Supper.²¹ The sample text for Epiphany in the *Speculum Sacerdotale* seems to contain a suggestion for expansion by potential preachers in “And therefore cometh to churche, *et cetera*.”²² The sermon for the Second Sunday in Advent in *The Northern Homily Cycle*, conversely, states that the extensive Latin passage on the Fifteen Last Signs is to be omitted if delivered to a lay

English-speaking audience: “Isti versus omittantur a lectore quando legit Anglicum coram laycis.”²³

Other sermons, on the other hand, contain information that strongly suggests that they were preached without significant changes and alterations, as in:

Her ich hade cast to ha told 3ow how 3e schuld ha desired charite, how 3e schuld ha gotin it, & how 3e schuld ha kept it, but, for because þat vr zungiste brother declarid it to 3ow so wel & so openliche þis dei seueniþ, þervorni i pas ouer & drawe to an hende-ward.²⁴

Taken together with other references in this sermon, we can assume that it was intended to be preached “e þis holi tyme o lente,” in a specific town (“þis toun”), at a religious institution of some description (“an hows of religiun swich on as tis is”), by a member of that house of religion (hence the reference to “vr zungiste brother”), and to a mixed congregation (“3if þe be a man of þe world, occupi þe a-bowte bodiliche trauaile ... 3if þe be a man of holi chirche, go bid þi bedis”).²⁵ Another sermon was apparently preached by a junior member of a religious institution by way of replacement: “Sirs, my lord shuld haue preched here hym-selfe þat is here presente now, but he is a litill dezeded; and þer-fore he ordeynt me to preche in is stede.”²⁶

Most sermons are less forthcoming with information about the circumstances of their delivery, but many of them still contain markers that indicate that they were (at least in part) intended for an oral preaching event, even if they might never have been preached. Mirk’s sermon for the Eve of Pentecost, for instance, encourages the audience to kneel at the end of the sermon with “3e schul now knele down.”²⁷ The preacher also urges sinful members of the congregation to come to confess to him before the next Sunday in the same sermon:

Wherefore I charge 3ow, if þer be any man or womman þat is fallyn in any grevous synne, þat 3e comyn to me and clanse 3ow þerof or Sondag comme, and I wil be redy to help in alle þat lythe in me wyth gode wylle.²⁸

While Mirk’s *Festial* is a model sermon collection, the author evidently envisaged preachers using his sermons in oral preaching contexts.

Although the use of such phrases as “I shall tell you” are relatively rare in Mirk’s *Festial*, they can be found here too, as in “And 3itte, for to ster 3ow more in conciens, I schal telle 3ow þis ensampul,” “þan to styr 3oure

deuocion þe more to þis holy sacrament, I telle 3ow þis ensaumpul,” and “þerfore takyth hede what I haue sayde to 3ow and worcheputh Goddys body ... os I haue sayde to 3ow.”²⁹ The characterization of the audience as a listening one is regularly encountered in other sermons too. For example, in the sermon for the First Sunday in Advent in *The Northern Homily Cycle*, we find “Of hir wil ik aperteli telle, | Yef ye will list and lithe mi spel” (157–58) and “Nou haf ye herd twifald tocom” (273). The preacher, on the other hand, is typically said to speak, as in the examples above; further examples of such practices are easily found in other sermons.

Despite the fact that we have very little evidence to link surviving sermons to actual preaching events, despite the fact that many sermons may have been conceived as model sermons rather than as material to be preached directly to a congregation, and despite the fact that some sermons may have been primarily intended (and appreciated) as texts for reading, the surviving sermons pay considerable attention to the orality of the preaching event. When treated with due caution, these texts can therefore be used to gain further insight into the performative nature of a preached medieval English sermon.

The fact that the performative angle of sermons is the most difficult to recreate is especially frustrating because the quality of delivery can have a significant impact on the quality of the sermon. In early modern England, audiences were acutely aware of the fundamental importance of performance for preaching. Elizabeth I reportedly judged one sermon as “one of the best Sermons She ever heard, and the worst she ever read.”³⁰ Dedicatory epistles in printed sermon collections from the Renaissance frequently lament the unavoidable losses experienced when turning the spoken word into writing.³¹

That awareness is also well attested for the medieval period. One sermon theorist, the fourteenth-century Dominican Thomas Waleys, claims that “modus ipse dicendi non minus proderit audotiribus quam res dicta” (“the way of speaking itself will carry to the hearers no less than the thing said”).³² Chaucer’s Pardoner starts by proudly highlighting his performative skill, to which he subjugates the importance of content:

“Lordynges,” quod he, “in chirches whan I preche,
I peyne me to han an hauteyn speche,
And ryngge it out as round as gooth a belle,
For I kan al by rote that I telle.
My theme is alwey oon, and evere was—
Radix malorum est Cupiditas.” (*Pardoner’s Prologue*, 329–34)³³

A little later he describes some of his bodily movements as well:

Thanne peyne I me to strecche forth the nekke,
 And est and west upon the peple I bekke [nod],
 As dooth a dowve sittynge on a berne [barn].
 Myne hande and my tonge goon so yerne
 That it is joye to se my bisynesse. (*Pardoner's Prologue*, 395–97)

Both his volume and movements suggest transgressions of the acceptable norms laid out in the *artes praedicandi*, as we shall see, and evidently this character does not present us with the portrait of an ideal preacher. But notwithstanding the Pardoner's dubious morality, his limited range of subjects, and the questionable appropriateness of his performance style, he is depicted as a reasonably successful and impressive orator. The importance of the performance aspect is also foregrounded in the *exemplum* of an eager preacher botching a good sermon due to lack of performative competence.³⁴ The famous preacher Jacques de Vitry admitted that bad delivery ruined his sermons when he first started to preach, and Humbert of Romans, a Master General of the Order of Preachers, conceded that some preachers simply cannot cope with narrating *exempla* and should therefore refrain from doing so.³⁵

The preachers in these instances see the performative angle as a handmaiden to an effective delivery of the content, but at times medieval audiences were apparently more interested in the performance than in the content of a sermon. A Cologne audience listened patiently to a sermon in Latin by the great preacher Bernard of Clairvaux, but could not be bothered to stay for the translation of that same sermon into German.³⁶ Evidently, in this instance people were more excited by the performance aspect, and by the celebrity factor, than by any prospect of spiritual edification. This perceived danger that too impressive or too pleasing a delivery might draw audiences away from the moral and religious lessons of the sermon seems to have been omnipresent for preaching theorists.

Generally speaking, the *artes praedicandi* betray little interest in the performative aspects of preaching. The *Tractatus Eximii Doctoris Henrici de Hassia de Arte Praedicandi* is a good case in point. Its discussion of theme, divisions, the proper use of authorities, and various other aspects of sermon composition is prolific but its comments regarding performance are limited to three remarks. Firstly, “Elocutio debet habere vocem acutam in proferendo, austeram in corrigendo, benivolam in

exhortando” (“The oral delivery should be characterized: in exposition, by a sharp voice; in correction, by an austere voice; in exhortation, by a kindly voice”).³⁷ Secondly, it assigns different exclamations to exhortation and correcting: “Exclamatio debet fieri per O in hortando, per Ve in corrigendo” (“Exclamation should be made by *Ob* in exhorting, and *Alas* in correcting”).³⁸ Finally, common flaws of preaching are listed, and some of these relate to delivery: “Vitia moralia, artificialia: ignorantia praedican-dis—intollerabile vitium; infacundia—naturale; digitorum demonstratio nimia; capitis iactatio; oculorum clausura; applicatio defectuosa” (“Faults of character and skill: the preacher’s ignorance—an intolerable vice; lack of fluency—a natural vice; excessive pointing of the fingers; tossing of the head; closing of the eyes—defective application”).³⁹ The overall sense generated by the *artes praedicandi* is that, while an intelligible delivery is clearly indispensable for a successful sermon, most discussion on delivery is aimed at containing performative aspects.

That is not to say that these manuals recommend a flat delivery. The necessity of linking content and tone of voice is often highlighted in sermon manuals. The *Tractatus Solemnis de Arte et Vero Modo Predicandi* has quite an extensive section on the different “modes of locution” to be used in preaching.⁴⁰ It recommends using all of the following when appropriate: vigor, wonder, grief and lamentation, horror and agitation, irony and derision, elation, impatience and indignation, joy, and hate.⁴¹ However, sermon theorists counsel restraint here as well. Alan of Lille warns that, should the audience be too moved by the sermon and start to weep, the preacher “debet aliquantulum immorari” (“should hold back a little”).⁴² Certainly, shouting and whispering are deemed to be unacceptable by Thomas Waleys:

Qui vero nunc in altum vocem elevat, nunc vero ad imma deprimit, omnes auditores offendit, non solum quia tales subitas mutations ... odit natura, sed etiam quia quando clamorem extollit ad sidera, offendit eos qui sibi vicini et propinqui sedent vel assistunt; quando vero nimium vocem deprimit, offendit distantes, quia videtur quaedam secreta mysteria hiis qui sibi propinqui sunt velle communicare, et in eorum auribus susurrare quae vellet a magis distantibus occultare.

[Those who raise their voice and then suddenly speak with a low voice offend all the listeners not only because human nature ... dislikes these sudden changes but also because when the cry reaches the stars it hurts those who are sitting or listening near the preacher; when the preacher lowers his voice, he offends those who are sitting

far from him because it seems he wants to say something secret only to those who are next to him whispering to them something he wants to keep from the others.]⁴³

When using a particular mode of locution, accompanying gestures may be necessary too, as stipulated in the *Tractatus Solemnis de Arte et Vero Modo Predicandi*, where hatred is associated with the preacher turning away his face and joy with the preacher lifting up his hands.⁴⁴ This treatise also names “sleepy delivery” as a flaw in a sermon.⁴⁵ Thomas Waleys, likewise, reminds the preacher to ensure “ne videlicet sit velut statua immobilis” (“that he does not look like a motionless statue”), although he also warns against “motibus inordinatis” (“immoderate movements”).⁴⁶

While flatness is evidently not advocated in sermon manuals, many references to performance aspects of sermons in the *artes praedicandi* consist of prohibitions of their use. The author of the *Tractatus Solemnis de Arte et Vero Modo Predicandi* lists excessive noisiness, pointing with the finger, and head tossing as faults in a sermon, as we have seen.⁴⁷ Humbert of Romans disapproves of “inordinatum motum corporis, ut videlicet faciem non deformet, caput non agitet, manibus non percutiat, pedibus non calcet, et similia” (“immoderate movement of the body, that is do not deform the face, do not shake the head, do not clap the hands, do not kick with the feet or other similar things”).⁴⁸ Chaucer’s satirical portrayal of the Pardoner, whose preaching involves impressive volume, bird-like head movements, and roving eyes, also suggests that exuberant performance styles did not necessarily find favor in the laity’s eyes.

Indeed, condemnation of styles of delivery that are deemed to be too “theatrical” is something of a *Leitmotif* in sermon manuals. In his *Summa de Arte Praedicatoria*, Alan of Lille discommends using

Rythmorum melodias et consonantias metrorum, quae potius fiunt ad aures demulcendas, quam ad animum instruendum, quae praedicatio teatralis est et mimica, et ideo omnifarie contemnenda

[rhythmic melodies and musicality, such words are made to attract the ears rather than to instruct the soul. This kind of preaching is a theatrical one and similar to mime; hence it has to be condemned in every way.]⁴⁹

Thomas of Chobham tells the preacher that he

uidelicet ut non habeat oculos inflammatos et manus vagabundas admodum pugnantium uel gesticulantium. ... Unde manifeste patet

quod qui in predicatione tales gestus faciunt, stulti reputantur, et magis uidentur esse histriones quam predicatores.

[may not have fiery eyes and waving hands as fighters ... Hence it is obvious that those who make these gestures while preaching are considered to be like fools; they are more similar to actors than to preachers.]⁵⁰

These condemnations of “theatrical” elements show that many sermon theorists’ understanding of the theater should not be taken to relate solely to what we would now consider to be drama. While some medieval plays do use music or stage fighting, neither “rhythmic melodies and musicality” nor “fighters” are archetypal characteristics of medieval (English) drama per se. Instead, this negative contrast is a cliché that goes back to early Christian times, when authors such as Augustine and Gregory compared the “moral performance” of the preacher unfavorably with the deceitful performance of the theatrical actor, as we saw in the previous chapter.⁵¹ This rejection of specifically “theatrical” elements in preaching by sermon theorists should consequently not be used as straightforward evidence of a possible influence of contemporary drama on sermons.

It is difficult to deduce an accurate image of preaching in performance from the evidence of these *artes praedicandi*. The repeated prohibitions and condemnations of lively gestures suggest that at least some preachers used them. In fact, Thomas Waleys claims to have observed preachers that moved so forcefully that they nearly fell from the pulpit.⁵² About a century later, the Council of Nantes of 1431 decreed that “preachers should avoid making terrible outcries, waving their hands about wildly, posturing excessively, and gesticulating outrageously,” which may indicate that some French preachers did employ such a style of delivery.⁵³ The correspondence between sermon theory and preaching practices was by no means perfect. Sometimes the theorists did not even follow their very own guidelines when composing actual sermons. In Alexander of Ashby’s *De Artificio modo predicandi* only one of the sample sermons follows the rules laid out in the first part of the treatise.⁵⁴ It is then possible that preachers routinely disregarded the prescriptions of the *artes praedicandi*; that they did so occasionally is beyond doubt. Some continental preachers clearly went beyond what was deemed to be appropriate in the manuals. Vincent Ferrer is reported to have wept and gesticulated during his sermons and to have inserted long silences into his discourse.⁵⁵ One German audience member described Giovanni da Capestrano as preaching “with his hands and feet” in 1452.⁵⁶

On the other hand, most of the preaching treatises are conventional and may include such prohibitions merely because their predecessors did; that is, these prohibitions do not prove that such “excesses” did actually happen, and they certainly do not indicate that they happened often. Preachers such as Vincent Ferrer and Giovanni da Capestrano were far from ordinary and these preachers probably became famous because of their adoption of marked performative features that made their preaching style extraordinary. We should beware of treating the practices of such famous preachers as if they were the mainstream. It seems more probable that the average preacher aimed for a delivery that was lively enough to attract the audience’s attention and goodwill but modest enough to advertise his moral standing and to underline the serious, spiritual content of the event. Such a style would have had much in common with the moderate modes of delivery advocated by the *artes praedicandi*.

In the discussion so far I have carefully avoided using the adjectives “theatrical” or “dramatic” to describe preaching practices. I have also pointed out that the manual writers’ references to “theater” should be understood in a loose sense that need not refer to late medieval plays. In doing so I do not mean to imply that there was no overlap between the performance aspect of sermons and drama; on the contrary, I believe that the performance styles of sermons and drama must to some degree have been similar. I am, nonetheless, unconvinced by many scholars’ attempts to find theatrical aspects in sermons because they often seem to ignore the fact that much medieval literature would have been performed orally in a great many instances. As a result, scholars tend to highlight the use of *performative* features rather than typical *theatrical* features in their discussions of the theatricality of sermons. Thus Karen Bjelland’s notion that the use of quoted speech and prosopopoeia in the *South English Legendary* is such that the text becomes essentially dramatic appears to disregard the common use of these features in many other kinds of medieval literature.⁵⁷

Even dialogue, favored by Alan J. Fletcher and Valentina Berardini as a hallmark of theatricality, is hardly the preserve of the theater.⁵⁸ That does not mean that a dialogue embedded in a sermon could not become dramatic in performance, but presumably no more so than a dialogue in a romance or debate poem or dream vision. There are some interesting examples of performance markers in both devotional and secular texts that are neither sermons nor plays, including “Alle herkneth to me nou” and “Gilote e Johane” in Harley 2253, for instance.⁵⁹ Indeed, a dialogue in a sermon would probably have been more akin to one in these several

other literary genres, as these would likely all have been impersonated by one speaker only, whereas a dialogue in a play it would as a matter of course have been uttered by two or more actors, making the performance of dialogue in sermons and drama distinctly dissimilar.

In fact, neither Alexander of Ashby nor Thomas Chobham refers to the theater as a rhetorical parallel to preaching, although poetry and philosophy are mentioned in that capacity.⁶⁰ It therefore seems to me more realistic to think of elements such as the use of dialogue, gestures, and exclamations as sharing a common performance style that was adopted in various literary genres, rather than postulating a special relationship between drama and sermons.⁶¹

That is perhaps especially pertinent for Middle English preaching, which seems, on the whole, to have been less exuberant than some continental examples.⁶² It is interesting to note in this regard that, although some late medieval English preachers were evidently popular and able to attract sizable crowds, none of them acquired the fame of a Bernardino da Siena or other star preachers. The general impression generated by the texts is that, although Middle English sermons would have been lively and engaging in performance, their writers consciously eschewed a more impressive performative style.

This does not mean that the sermon writers overall were not careful to employ the performative, oral aspect of the sermon to great effect. One common strategy to ensure that the audience remains attentive to the preaching event is the use of (rhetorical) questions. This method is very useful for presenting a particular snippet of information with special emphasis. For example, “But what is þe ende of all þis myschef? Trewly, euerlastyng dethe”⁶³ is much more emphatic than the declarative alternative would have been. Such questions break up the flow of the discourse and provide a welcome change of intonation in delivery. At times, rhetorical questions are used to engage and to teach the audience indirectly. When a preacher wonders “Is not he dombe and vers þan dombe þat may shewe is synnes to þe preest and amende hym þer-of, and will not, but leseþ hym-selfe þorow is awn wilfulnes?”⁶⁴ the audience is clearly supposed to answer resoundingly, if silently, with a yes and to act in an opposite way to this “vers þan dombe” man. Likewise, in the following example, the audience is evidently supposed to reorient their love to God:

3if þe kans loue a man for þin owne profitt & tin owne avauntage,
whi kans nat loue him þat wil 3e þe for þi loue þe riche reem of
heuene? 3e, 3if þu kans forþurmore loue a bodi for is vertues & is

goodnes, whi kanst nat loue him þat is, as Daudid seith, *deus uirtutum*, “lord of all vertues’ & god of alle goodnes?”⁶⁵

Another good example of preachers exploiting the performative, oral nature of the event occurs in the use of dialogue, such as the debate between the devil, St. James, and St. Peter about a soul, followed by Mary’s judgment, in *The Northern Homily Cycle*’s sermon for the Fourth Sunday in Advent. As this is one of the more “dramatic” passages I have encountered in late medieval English written sermons, it is worth quoting in full:⁶⁶

And Sain Jam said to the fend:
 “Quider wil to wit mi pilgrim wend?”
 And he ansuerd and said, “Til helle,
 Thar he sal for his sinnis duel,
 For he was his awen ban,
 Forthi in him part haf ye nan,
 Wit riht and resoun he es mine,
 To wend wit me til helle pine.”
 Than ansuerd Sain Jam for his man,
 And said, “Thou lies, traytour Satan,
 Thou wat wel, thef, thou havis the who [blame],
 For in my nam himself he sloh,
 He wend wel that thou havid ben I,
 Quen thou gert him do his folye;
 In deed was he til me bowxom,
 And forthi sal he wit me com.”
 The fend said, “That mai noht be,
 Wit riht and law mai thou se
 That he es min thoru jogement,
 For quen he on his vayage went,
 He filed his sawel dedelye
 Wit the filth of licherye;
 And sithen wit his awen knife
 He set him selvin of his life.
 Wy, sai me, Jam, on quatkin wisse
 Moht he mar dey in mi servise?
 Loc quether I wit riht and lawe,
 May him wit me til helle drawe?”
 Sain Jam ansuerd and said him to:
 “Wrang no wille I nan thee do,
 Bot yef we wil the sothe treye,
 Gon we til dom of our Leuedye,
 And als scho demes sal it be,

For that es riht als think me.”
 And Sain Peter, his felawe
 Said, “This think me right and lawe;
 Mari,” he said, “es god justise,
 Scho wil do wrang on nane wyse.”
 Quen thai com bifor ur Leuedye,
 Scho demid son wit hir mercye:
 At that sawel til the bodie
 Suld turn, and penance do worthi;
 And said, “This sawel, als it nou isse,
 Mai nangat [in no way] cum til hevin blis,
 Ar it be clensted in bodye
 Of sin, wit penanze worthi.
 Forthi for jugement gif I,
 That it turn til the bodye,
 And clenst it wit penanze,
 And yem [protect] it sithen fra meschanze.”
 The fend for this dom was sarie,
 And ille payed that our Leuedye
 Havid reft him wit riht jogement
 That man that he wit gil [guile] had schent. (207–60)

The sedate tone and proper vocabulary of the devil is perhaps a little underwhelming; it would certainly have been entertaining to hear him express his frustration at the Virgin’s decision. We could also have had a greater moment of tension before her judgment. Despite a strong desire to present a lively narrative, the writer of this sermon does not allow these opportunities for exuberant performance, transgressive language, and tension to distract him from his interest in the rights and wrongs of the soul’s situation. Of course, such more exuberant performance elements may have been added in various deliveries of the passage, but on the whole both this text and others suggest that medieval English preachers carefully and consciously circumscribed the performative elements of their sermons and, concomitantly, maintained a clear focus on the didactic content.

This passage compares starkly with the surprisingly non-dramatic presentation of the Temptation of Christ in a Lenten sermon. The first temptation is presented with direct speech for both the devil and Jesus, but even so a section reminding us of Jesus’s ability to perform the feat and explaining His reasons for refusing to turn the stone into bread intervenes between the two speeches. Its leisurely pace and stress on the didactic lesson arguably robs this passage from developing into a dramatic dialogue,

although the use of direct speech did no doubt provide a change of tone in performance. But this minor dramatic element in the first temptation is discarded in the remainder of the scene, as the other two temptations are dismissed with:

In þis manner and oþur mo tempted þe feend oure Lord for to witt
wheþur þat he was Goddes sonne or noon. But oure Lorde answered
hym so wisely þat þe feende wist not what he was.⁶⁷

This preacher was not interested in the dramatic potential of the narrative but in its didactic import. At times, then, the use of dialogue in sermons was used to enhance their performance aspect, but English preachers were generally careful not to divert attention from their moral and religious lessons.

Audience address is another method preachers employed to ensure a successful delivery. At the same time, interaction with the audience regularly serves the preacher's didactic ends in Middle English sermons. Whereas many sermons use direct speech in the portrayal of the Last Judgment to some performative effect, a few insert direct audience address in this narrative foremost as a means to underscore the lessons of the passage. The *Speculum Sacerdotale* provides us with a good example of the former method:

And then that kynge schal say to hem þat schall be on his rizt honde:
“Venite, benedicti, *et cetera*. Comeþ to me, 3e blissid children of my
fadur ... for I hungred, and ye 3aue me mete” ... And then schall
tho riztwisemen seyn: “Lord, when sawe we the hungry and fedde
the?”⁶⁸

The damned are addressed and dismissed in a similar manner. One can easily imagine that the preacher may have used various modes of locution, such as wonder and anger, and appropriate gestures, such as turning away his face, as recommended in the *artes praedicandi*, to make this dialogue more impressive in performance.

But some preachers improve on this method by casting their congregation in the role of the damned souls:

The thryd dethe, þat ys dethe of body and sawle togedyr, and þat ys
most to be drede, for in þat ys no redempcyon ne turnyng agayne
qwen almyghty God schall say to þe, “Ite, maledicti, in ignem
eternum, qui preparatus est diabolo et angelis eius”. “Gose, 3e cur-
set, into þe fyre of hell qwech ys ordente to þe deuell and all hys

angellys". Fyrst þis Lorde says, "Ite", "Go 3e". 3ette þu may aske grace of þi Lorde and say, "Lorde, and we schall go fro þe and no3te abyde with þe, we beseche þe, gyf vs þi blesyng." Then comus þe secunde worde and forbarrus hom qwen he says, "Maledicti", "curset" or "warede". 3ette may þu aske anoþer grace and say ...⁶⁹

And so it continues, with the damned repeatedly and unavailingly asking for grace until the final dismissal with "'Et angelis eius', þat is, 'to þe deuell and all hys angellus.'" ⁷⁰ Arguably, the use of Latin and translations into English in this passage undermines its dramatic potency by arresting the flow of the narrative. Likewise, while the five requests and six rejections clarify the structure of the passage and hammer home the supplicants' lack of success, the repetition of the almost identical requests and rejections vary too little to develop either the narrative or the characters. There is no sense, for instance, that the damned become increasingly distressed or that they finally realize the justice of their damnation or that they come to understand the full implication of God's dismissal: their second request is to be spared pain, and so is their final request. The liveliness of the exchange is held in check by its structure and content. As a result what we have here is not a dramatic exchange, as such, but rather a stylized, formal dialogue, more reminiscent of the liturgy than of surviving Middle English drama, that lends the passage an aura of awesome grandeur and highlights the finality of God's decision, while engaging with the audience directly. I imagine it would have been striking in performance and that it would have brought home the didactic message very effectively.

Generally speaking, the surviving vernacular sermons from late medieval England suggest that the writers were fully aware of the oral, performative angle to preaching, but that they chose to exploit this aspect in moderation, never losing sight of the didactic aim of the event. In fact, Holly Johnson has argued that, unlike many other devotional treatises on the Passion, English Passion sermons carefully control and contain the emotional responses of the congregation in order to emphasize the doctrinal importance of the Passion.⁷¹ While Mirk's Good Friday sermon is perhaps not the best example of a sermon which prioritizes *theology*, it certainly does not build up to an emotive climax either. The rather short passage on the Passion is almost upstaged by the vivid account of Pilate's life which precedes it. And it is followed by yet another captivating *narratio*, demonstrating the value of forgiving one's enemies, that also concludes the sermon. Nor is Jesus given an extended speech to rouse the emotions

of the listeners; instead, Mirk chose to focus on identifying Jesus's sayings and on explaining the religious usefulness of these utterances for the medieval laity:

And so whan he schulde dyen, he began, as Ion Bellette telleth, and saythe: "*Deus meus, Deus meus, respice*", and so forth alle þe ix psalmus sewing forþe til he come to: *In te, domine, speravi*, and so at þe vers: *In manus tuas, domine*, wyth þat he 3af vp þe goste, 3efvying a hegh ensampull to vche criston man and womman for to haue þat verse in mynde when he scal 3oldon vp þe goste. Wherefore vche man þat can rede schulde say þaise psalmus þis day, and he þat sayse hem vche Fryday he sal newre dyon none evel deþe.⁷²

It is clear that Mirk's main aim was not to generate an emotive response to the Passion for this sermon, but that, above all, he sought to teach his listeners about useful prayers and proper Christian forgiveness. This focus on the didactic side of the passage also entailed curtailing its performative element to some extent.

Similarly, a sermon for the Fifth Sunday after Trinity incorporates direct speech, thereby providing an opportunity for appropriate voice modulation, which would undoubtedly have been entertaining in a good delivery. But the responses are too short and fragmented genuinely to engage the listeners with a "play-world" within the sermon:

If case be þat a man wolde sey to a grete slogard and to a grete slepar, 'Whi whilt not þu aryse up on the Sondagis and on other festival dayes and come to the chyrche and 3efe a duw attendaunce to the devyne servyce of God and to all his seyntis?' Anon he wyll make hus excuse and sey, "I am olde", or "sekely", or "the weder is colde and I am febyll", or he wyll excuse hym and sey, "I have a gret howsolde", or ells he haþe sum odur ocupacion to do.⁷³

The various excuses of the sluggard could have been incorporated into one speech to allow for an extended impersonation. There are several other examples where the potential for "dramatic" impact is not exploited to the full in the surviving material, and often the reason for that choice appears to have been didactic.

Another thing Middle English sermons tend to have in common is their monologic and authoritative stance, which must have had a significant impact on their performance style as well as their reception by listeners. This authoritative stance does not mean that preachers never admit their own fallible human nature; they mention their sinful human-

ity in references such as “to delyuere vs owt of al maner þraldum oþ þe deuel, Crist come in-to þis world ... & deliuerd vs from al maner subiection”⁷⁴ and “Of usself haf we noht bot sin” (*Northern Homily Cycle* 1.145). There are numerous examples where the preacher includes himself in the lessons to be learned and implemented, as in “And kepe we trewly þe Commaundementes,”⁷⁵ and in

Allas for schame to owre pride, God his in þe rythe, and 3itte he treuth wyth vs þat bene in þe vronge. He profurreth mercy or we hit askon, he mekuth hym to vs þat displesuth hym, and scheweth luf⁶

The humanity, and concomitant sinfulness, of the preacher is not ignored in sermons.

But examples where preachers assume a position of authority with regard to the congregation are legion. The preacher is often presented as more knowledgeable than his auditors. A discussion on the meaning of the theme is introduced with “And I schulde openliche declare 3ow to what entente Seynt Poul seyde þis word, i most tel 3ow sumwhat þe effecte oþ þe pistol oþ þis same day.”⁷⁷ The preacher of a Palm Sunday sermon promises to use the Bible as proof in order to enhance his listeners’ understanding of his argument: “Frendes, 3e shall vndirstond, as I may prove be holy scripture.”⁷⁸ Mirk announces that he will tell an *exemplum* “for to ster 3ow more in conciens.”⁷⁹ Another preacher highlights how he will amend the moral state of his addressee: “To þe, sir, I sey somewhat at þis tyme, so to enforme þe þat I may brynge þe fro vnkeendnesse to keendnes a3eyn” and “And now I shall tell þe how þou schuldeste contynue and make ende in þi keendnes.”⁸⁰ The teaching role of the preacher and the audience’s duty to listen and learn are then frequently and carefully stressed. The didactic nature of the preaching event itself is also often underlined, as in “And þu wil schortelich bere a-way þe mater of þis sermon, take hede!”⁸¹ One *exemplum* is introduced with “Wilte her how horrible þis synne is ... bi a litel tale? & i pray þe, take hede, vor it is rith a notable tale.”⁸² Mirk advises the listeners “Holduth þis in 3oure mynde and I hope it schal put away pride.”⁸³ Some of these sermons were intended for a mixed audience, so that members of the clergy in the audience are included in that position of relative inferiority.

The audience’s position of intellectual inferiority also comes to the fore when the preacher carefully circumscribes the listeners’ knowledge and understanding. One preacher firmly steers the congregation away from certain difficult topics with “þe argymentes and þe skill þat may be of

þe Sacramente ... longeþ not to þe.”⁸⁴ Hugh Legat admonishes the congregation to attend sermons, even if they cannot fathom the content of the discourse, for such a lack of comprehension does not hinder the sermon’s beneficial impact:

The ij [second kind of] pepul ther ys also qui dicunt [that say] the prechwure spekyth so hye diuinite, so depe clerge, no man may conseyue what he talkyt. Wherefor hem semyþe bot a spendyng and wastyng of tyme to zeue hym any audyens. Truly, god men, talia verba [such words] be lewed and vnwytty, for as Origin seyt, super iudicium, zeue hyt be so that wrettys and charmys that diuerse pepil berun abowt here neckys, of the wyche they con ful lytyl scille or ryzt nozt, be of suche vertu to saue men fro bodylyche sykenes, myche more þe worde of God ys to the lowe here of swche vertu that hyt wol kepe hym fro gostelych sykenes, of al hit be nawt fullyche conseyut. ... Thus, than, seth ze se wyle [well] that ze may nowzt be excused be lackyng of conyng noþer dulnes of whyt, sekyt no suche ocasionse to be myche absent fro Holy Churche prechyng, bote buþe as gode childrun oztute to be, as Y seyde at the bygynnyng.⁸⁵

This all adds up to foster a suitably passive and uncritical reception of sermons as a genre by the congregation. The sermon audience, even if it consists of clergy, is then generally taken to be in a position of spiritual inferiority, in need of the preacher’s sage council and advice.

Indeed, the audience is regularly told how to live their lives by preachers, as in “Firste I sey ze schall be devowte and holy in prayer.”⁸⁶ One preacher warns his listeners to have “no lust or no likyng e smell- yng’ of hote spiceri, hote erbis or ani oþer þat mithte stir þe to vlesliche lustis.”⁸⁷ Another admonishes his listeners not to confess to “ronners ouer cuntreys”⁸⁸ who “for a peny or tweyn”⁸⁹ confess and absolve children who have murdered one of their parents! Somewhat similar advice is given in another sermon, where the audience is explicitly told to confess only to “þi nawne parson or parysh prest as þin awne curatte and, wythowtyn hys leue, þu awe noght to schryue þe to nan oþer.”⁹⁰ This sermon also encourages an anti-Lollard attitude: “And þefore, for Goddys loue, bese ware of slyke wykkys pepyll ... and kepe zow stedfastly in þis fayth.”⁹¹ A clerical audience is reminded to pray, and blamed for not doing so in:

But perauntur, þe seith to me “sir, me tunge is for þe most part so drie & so weri what i sei ani þyng, þat i mai nat bidde me bedis, i-make no praours, no i mai nat dur ani while e seyng of my sawter.”

... Whan þe schalt serue God, a-non rith þe tunge is drie, but it is nat veri vor to stonde al day ... iuggyng þi neȝebours, demyng þi breþerin & ti souereyne þat is a-bowte þe.⁹²

Mirk gives specific advice about how to fast during Lent: one must not eat before noon or remain too long at the table, one must not eat “to freschelych” or any kind of “flesse-mete and whyt-mete,” and one must fast both night and day.⁹³ In another sermon, he admonishes the congregation to leave their oaths and swearing and to do reverence to Christ’s Passion and wounds instead.⁹⁴

Even the preacher’s *captatio benevolentia* can assert the audience’s need to listen to the preacher. The opening prayer for a St. Nicholas Day sermon aims to ensure “þat it so be þat I may haue grace so to preche and teche you to vake, þat I may haue þanke of God, and þat ȝe may haue þe sone grace to ryse owte of þe slepe of synne.”⁹⁵ The “positional rhetoric” of the preacher is then normally one of authority and sermons do not engage in a debate with their listeners.⁹⁶ A great many more examples of such an authoritative and monologic stance by preachers could be adduced, and indeed many more will be encountered in the remainder of this book.

Conversely, Katherine Ludwig Jansen has argued that this view of the sermon is mistaken:

Sermons were not always, as is commonly assumed, some sort of monolithic institutional discourse imposed from on high on the passive lay subject. They could be, in Bakhtin’s terms, dialogical in that it is not just the institutional voice, or the preacher’s voice, that is contained in them; frequently, if we listen carefully, the voice of the audience can also be discerned.⁹⁷

I would propose instead that, when preachers incorporate such other voices, it is normally to silence them and to reject their notions outright. In a sermon for the Feast of Mary Magdalene, the audience’s curiosity is acknowledged but condemned, and they are told to believe unquestioningly in all the Church teaches:

þu þan to aske knowlegyng of God or hys pryuitese be kindly reson qwath for þi febylness and hys excellens þu art not worthy to consayue yt ... Sen þi wyttys þan bodyly are so febyll þat þai may not bryng þe in to þe knowlegyng of lele trowth, I counsele þe after þe ensampyll of þis haly woman ... so most ȝe trowe in techyng of haly kyrke and seke be na resun to proue ȝowre trowth⁹⁸

Some resistance to the idea that hell and damnation await those who do not distribute their wealth charitably comes to the fore in another sermon, but the preacher is quick to stress the truth of such people's postmortem fate:

But trowe þou well, þoo þat God suffure þe to haue þi will here in þis world, þat he will not punysche þe þer-fore in a-noþur world, for þi grett rycheſe? I ſey be þou neuer ſo grett in þis werld, and þou loue not þi God more þan þi good, leue well þat þou ſhalte haue ſorowe þer-of.⁹⁹

In a late fifteenth-century sermon, the preacher utterly rejects the idea that the pope and priests are not able to forgive sins, an idea that some members of the congregation apparently maintain:

Here thiſelf that art vnlearned and lackeſt a perfit moder wit, then þu ſeyſte that the pope and þeſe prelatis of the chyrche of God may not forzeſe ſynne. And hereto I anſwere and ſey þiſ: for vnto the ordur of preſthode is committed *potestam Petri ligandi atque ſoluendi in celo et in terra*: “He hath þe power of Peter to bynde and to vnbynde in heven and in erthe.”¹⁰⁰

In these examples, the (projected) congregation can indeed be heard, but the relationship between it and the preacher is hardly dialogical.

In other instances, the information supposedly sought by members of the congregation is entirely devout and clearly aligned with orthodoxy. In one case, the lay listeners are credited with a pious desire of knowing more about the Last Judgment. This projected quest of knowledge is evidently approved by the preacher, who answers it to the best of his abilities:

But peraventure þou þat art a lewde man, þou wold witt ... when þe Day of Dome ſhall be, and alſo where it ſhall be, in erthe or in heven or elſe beneþ þe erthe. For-ſothe, frendes, where it ſhall be, I ſhall tell þe ... But trewly what tyme and when it ſhall be and wheþur nyght or day, þer is no clerke in erthe ne aungell ne poſtell ne ſeynt in heven þat can tell þat day.¹⁰¹

In these sermons, the projected voice of the congregation is adopted either to affirm their orthodox piety or else to reprove, correct, and silence them.

The Middle English sermons are then, generally speaking, prescriptive, authoritative, and monologic. Such labels almost necessarily raise “the spectre of the constricting, over-protective Church,” as Meg Twycross has so picturesquely described it.¹⁰² In the case of the sermons, this is probably correct—but we should be charitable enough to add that, if one

believes as the Church did, much was at stake. Consequently, this prescriptive didacticism and authoritative stance was likely due primarily to a real sense of concern for the spiritual welfare of the listeners. Not teaching the laity properly would have put their souls in danger of damnation and that would, in turn, have endangered the soul of the preacher whose duty it was to teach his flock. This vital importance of the sermon presumably added a sense of urgency, which is easy to overlook, to the delivery of the sermon for many a preacher and audience member.

Despite the many difficulties and uncertainties that are inevitably encountered when trying to recapture something of the preached Middle English sermon, three main aspects come to the fore so regularly that we can assume they must have been reasonably standard. Firstly, medieval English preachers were fully aware that the success of their sermon relied to a great extent on the quality of the delivery and consequently utilized various means to enhance that aspect. Nonetheless, the delivery of Middle English sermons, generally, seems to have been relatively subdued and the performance elements carefully subjugated to the religious content and didactic aims of the sermon. As a result, it seems that late medieval English sermon writers did not attempt to emulate performance aspects that are typical of contemporary drama. This restrained performativity and concomitant focus on their didactic content is the second trait these texts tend to have in common. Thirdly, most sermons consistently adopt a tone of authority and spiritual superiority over their audiences that does not encourage participation in, or even an active reception of, the discourse. As we shall see in the following chapters, the didacticism and authority of medieval English drama operated in fundamentally different ways. Despite the undeniable performative quality of these sermons, it is therefore safe to say that their style of delivery, didactic stance, and relation to the audience are distinct from late medieval English religious drama, and that the performativity of both genres developed and operated independently.

NOTES

¹ Thompson, "From Texts to Preaching," p. 25.

² Spencer, *English Preaching*, p. 38.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 214–15.

⁴ Mertens, p. 299.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 293.

⁶ O'Mara, "Saints' Plays," p. 265.

⁷ Spencer, *English Preaching*, p. 30.

⁸ Ross, p. 140.

⁹ O'Mara, *Four*, pp. 23, 79–105.

¹⁰ Grisdale, p. 5.

¹¹ Ross, pp. 30–35.

¹² Volk-Birke, p. 117.

¹³ Weatherly, p. xxxvi.

¹⁴ Hedlund, p. 140.

¹⁵ Spencer, *English Preaching*, p. 70.

¹⁶ Although the reliability of *reportationes* must also be treated cautiously. For example, some of them are in Latin, whereas the sermon was preached in the vernacular (Thompson, "From Texts to Preaching," p. 17).

¹⁷ Hanska, p. 299.

¹⁸ D'Avray, p. 78.

¹⁹ Hunt, p. 182.

²⁰ Powell, p. 17.

²¹ Fletcher, *Late Medieval*, p. 159.

²² Weatherly, p. 19.

²³ Thompson, after l. 180.

²⁴ Grisdale, p. 49.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 27, 25, 39, 49, 38.

²⁶ Ross, p. 59.

²⁷ Powell, p. 146.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 116, 146, 159.

³⁰ Bulwer, pp. 6–7.

³¹ Crockett, p. 14.

³² Although he seems to be more concerned with a clear rather than impressive delivery: "Studet igitur praedicator, inter coetera, praecipue habere modum dicendi intelligibilem et allectivum, quia modus ipse dicendi non minus proderit audotiribus quam res dicta." ("Let the preacher therefore take care, most importantly among these factors, to have a way of speaking that is intelligible and comprehensible, because the way of speaking itself will carry to the hearers no less than the thing said." *De modo componendi sermones cum documentis*, Cap. I as quoted in Murphy, *Rhetoric*, p. 334).

³³ Benson.

³⁴ Berlioz and Polo de Beaulieu, p. 20.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 18–19. Humbert’s comment implies that narrating *exempla* requires a very different performative skill to delivering the remainder of sermon staples, such as quoting authorities.

³⁶ Kienzle, p. 110.

³⁷ Caplan, p. 155.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 156

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

⁴⁰ The term “mode of locution” derives from Kienzle, “Medieval Sermons,” p. 99.

⁴¹ Caplan, pp. 56–57.

⁴² Kienzle, p. 99.

⁴³ Berardini, p. 78.

⁴⁴ Caplan, p. 57.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

⁴⁶ Berardini, p. 80.

⁴⁷ Caplan, p. 58.

⁴⁸ Berardini, p. 80.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

⁵¹ Kienzle, pp. 96–97.

⁵² Berardini, p. 80.

⁵³ Taylor, “French Sermons,” p. 731.

⁵⁴ Donavin, p. 281.

⁵⁵ Sánchez, p. 808.

⁵⁶ Kienzle, p. 108.

⁵⁷ Bjelland, p. 231.

⁵⁸ Fletcher, “Performing,” pp. 89–90, and Berardini, pp. 81, 83.

⁵⁹ Fein, Raybin, and Ziolkowski.

⁶⁰ Murphy, *Rhetoric*, pp. 312, 322.

⁶¹ Occasionally, preachers used props. Roberto da Lecce, for example, employed a crucifix and crown of thorns during his preaching (Kienzle, “Medieval Sermons,” p. 106). In such instances, the link between preaching and drama seems much more direct. However, there are relatively few known instances of prop use in sermons, and none of those that I am aware of relate to late medieval England.

⁶² Although Valentina Berardini states that performance indicators are to be found in various English sermons as well as those of Bernardino da Siena, she describes the English material as being “more understated” and “more subdued” (p. 81).

⁶³ Ross, p. 239.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

⁶⁵ Grisdale, p. 11.

⁶⁶ This passage is still less “dramatic” than the Harrowing of Hell episode in an Old English homily, which consists almost entirely of dialogue and direct speech

by a number of characters—Symeon even embeds quoted speech in his utterance (Hulme, p. 23)—and which stipulates modes of locution, as in “Seo helle þa swa swyðe grislice þuss cwæð” (“hell then said thus so very horribly,” *ibid.*, p. 25).

⁶⁷ Ross, p. 142.

⁶⁸ Weatherly, p. 113.

⁶⁹ Fletcher, *Late Medieval*, pp. 220–21.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 221.

⁷¹ Johnson, pp. 333–34.

⁷² Powell, p. 108.

⁷³ Fletcher, “Performing,” p. 99.

⁷⁴ Grisdale, p. 27.

⁷⁵ Ross, p. 106.

⁷⁶ Powell, p. 98.

⁷⁷ Grisdale, p. 25.

⁷⁸ Ross, p. 171.

⁷⁹ Powell, p. 116.

⁸⁰ Ross, pp. 31, 34.

⁸¹ Grisdale, p. 21.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 39.

⁸³ Powell, p. 80.

⁸⁴ Ross, p. 128.

⁸⁵ Fletcher, *Late Medieval*, pp. 88–89.

⁸⁶ Morrison, p. 220.

⁸⁷ Grisdale, p. 44.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

⁹⁰ O’Mara, *Four*, p. 90.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 89–90.

⁹² Grisdale, p. 38.

⁹³ Powell, p. 79.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

⁹⁵ Ross, p. 47.

⁹⁶ The term “positional rhetoric” is borrowed from Swan, p. 179.

⁹⁷ Jansen, p. 7.

⁹⁸ O’Mara, *Four*, pp. 111–12.

⁹⁹ Ross, p. 174.

¹⁰⁰ Morrison, p. 188.

¹⁰¹ Ross, p. 173.

¹⁰² Twycross, “Books,” p. 88.