



Liturgical Drama and the Reimagining of Medieval Theater

Michael Norton



EARLY DRAMA, ART, AND MUSIC

Liturgical Drama and the
Reimagining of Medieval Theater

EARLY DRAMA, ART, AND MUSIC

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



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Liturgical Drama and the
Reimagining of Medieval Theater

by
Michael Norton

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
are available from the Library of Congress.**

ISBN: 9781580442626

eISBN: 9781580442633

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

An Improbable Fiction: Confronting “Liturgical Drama”

FOR THE SCHOLARS OF the mid-nineteenth century, the metaphor “liturgical drama” proved an epiphany, and it prompted a reimagining of theater history that placed the path travelled by medieval theater from the cult to the stage parallel to that followed by the theater of the ancients. The narrative seemed so correct, the plot so compelling, that the metaphor “liturgical drama” came to be reified as category, and over the next century and three-quarters this category came to embrace an ever-burgeoning, and ever more incongruous, collection of liturgical rites and religious plays. This new notion, however, did not sit well with all.

Dislodging the Liturgical Theory

In 1907, John M. Manly disputed what he saw as a Darwinian model of incremental change that had governed earlier discussions of the development of drama in the Middle Ages.¹ Stimulated by the mutation theory of Dutch botanist Hugo De Vries,² Manly argued that the dramatic forms of the Middle Ages did not develop from one another in incremental steps as was generally believed, but developed spontaneously at different times and for different reasons. Concerning drama’s origin within the medieval liturgy, Manly observed that “There was no gradual accumulation of scarcely perceptible variations, changing the non-dramatic into the dramatic so insensibly that the moment of the change could not be indicated. On the contrary, there was a large amount of variation of non-dramatic form which, however wide the variation, never resulted in drama; and then with absolute suddenness came the drama, created at one moment, created without any reference to the futile variations that had preceded.”³ This same principle held also for later forms of medieval drama. Concerning the miracle play, Manly observed, “So far as the evidence shows, there was no gradual transition of liturgical play to miracle-play, or of undramatized legend to drama. When once the necessary elements came together, the new

species existed; a moment before, and there was nothing like it; the combination was made, and the new species was complete.”⁴ To be sure, Manly’s critique was directed neither toward the liturgical theory for drama’s birth (or rebirth) *in* the liturgy nor toward the notion of liturgical drama itself. Rather his critique was directed toward the theory of drama’s evolution *from* the liturgy—toward the processes by which those activities that scholars had deemed to be drama had actually emerged and on the relationships that might or might not have existed among the various forms.

The first challenge to drama’s liturgical origin came a generation later. In his 1930 Columbia University dissertation, Oscar Cargill cast aside the theory of medieval drama’s liturgical roots and offered medieval minstrels as the agents responsible for drama’s rebirth. In the preliminary survey that opened his study, Cargill announced his intention to direct attention to the “inadequacy of the so-called ‘liturgical theory’ to account for the origin of the mystery plays.”⁵ Cargill’s critique was mounted on two fronts. First, he argued that neither the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue that preceded the Easter Mass nor the *Visitatio Sepulchri* that concluded Easter matins (the “trope” and the “sepulchrum” in his vocabulary) should be seen as drama since the intent for both was lyrical and religious rather than histrionic. Concerning the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the *Regularis Concordia*, he observed that “The direction to the monks to approach the sepulchre ‘as if seeking something’ may well be understood as informing them of the precise nature of their part in the symbolical ceremony rather than instructing them in the art of histrionic representation. If one were to become acquainted for the first time with the Mass by reading the *Ordinary*, one might think that Office far more ‘dramatic’ than it actually is.”⁶ Summarizing his discussion of the early settings of the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue, he observed further that “We may doubt not only that these pieces are dramatic, but also that it has been established that there is any tendency in their growth toward the dramatic. It is consistent with the general history of the liturgy to suppose that all that these composers were aiming to produce was a lyrical and religious effect.”⁷

Second, with regard to the religious plays of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries—and here he is speaking of such presentations as the Beauvais *Danielis Ludus* and those of Abelard’s student Hilarius—these came not from within the liturgy but from without. Rather than outgrowths of their supposed liturgical predecessors, these represented corruptions of the liturgy by composers and performers outside of the monastic and clerical ranks. The new dramas that had found their way into the

liturgies of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were the result of contamination rather than innovation, forced into the liturgy by the “professional actors of the day, the minstrels.” The relationship between the drama and the liturgy, he concluded, was the reverse of what had been claimed.⁸

The response to Cargill’s thesis was both swift and scathing. George R. Coffman took Cargill to task for Cargill’s insufficient command of the scholarly literature on medieval drama, citing some sixty seminal studies that Cargill had failed to consider.⁹ Grace Frank criticized Cargill’s “series of surmises based for the most part on insufficient evidence, or by proofs consisting largely of vague generalizations and rhetorical questions.”¹⁰ Neil C. Brooks similarly observed: “This study, which has as its purpose ‘to direct attention to the inadequacy of the liturgic theory’ of the origin of the religious drama, abounds in confusion, misstatement, and futile reasoning from inadequate knowledge.”¹¹ After a withering critique of the substance of Cargill’s book, particularly its second chapter, Brooks concluded that

All who read this study in the light of some knowledge of the liturgic drama will, I am sure, agree that it is no credit to American scholarship and no credit to the great university that has sponsored its preparation and its publication [Columbia University]. It seems indeed incomprehensible how there could come from such sponsorship a work so replete with errors and so near to absolute zero in its contribution. One can imagine with chagrin the amazement—and the probable hilarity—of any foreign scholars in this field into whose hands the book might fall.¹²

One foreign scholar who found more substance than hilarity in Cargill’s thesis was Robert Stumpfl, then docent at the University of Berlin and briefly professor at Heidelberg.¹³ A protégé of Rudolf Much at the University of Vienna, Stumpfl was one of the foremost young scholars of German antiquity and folklore during the early Nazi era, and the focus of his research meshed well with the intellectual currents of the National Socialist movement.¹⁴ In 1936, Stumpfl published his Berlin *Habilitationsschrift* on the Germanic roots of medieval theater, where he took on yet again the liturgical theory for the origin of medieval drama.¹⁵ Stumpfl admitted the weakness of Cargill’s arguments on the whole, but he found merit with the thrust of Cargill’s approach: “But then the core of his thesis, the denial of a link between the liturgical drama and the mystery play, does lead to a not inconsequential weak point in the liturgical theory. For no one can deny that crucial links are missing here.”¹⁶

While Stumpff recognized the “significant contribution of Christianity and the Church in the development of medieval drama,” what mattered to him was “whether this was the ultimate source or only a secondary influence,” whether the ultimate source of medieval drama lay in the Christian liturgy or in pre-Christian traditions.¹⁷ For Stumpff, the answer was clear. Not only did the vernacular drama of the Middle Ages grow from earlier pagan roots, but even the so-called liturgical drama developed out of pre-Christian, and in particular Germanic, cultic traditions. The liturgical drama represented a Christianization of pagan cult activities, an infusion of Christian symbols and doctrine into rites that had existed for centuries prior to the nativity of the so-called liturgical plays.¹⁸

Stumpff’s stature as a rising star of German academe, not to mention his command of the primary and secondary sources of Germanic antiquity and folklore, was sufficient to induce his critics to tread more lightly than they had with the work of the fledgling Cargill six years earlier. In his review of Stumpff’s book, for example, F. E. Sandbach noted both the contentious nature of Stumpff’s argument and the scholarly depth of his presentation: “Only a specialist in comparative religion and folklore would, perhaps, be really competent to value authoritatively this undoubtedly important work, which will pretty certainly arouse much controversy both on the author’s main contention and on many points of detail.”¹⁹ However, while praising the intricacy of Stumpff’s argument, Sandbach remained troubled by Stumpff’s method. Stumpff’s arguments, he noted, “are intricate and (necessarily) consist mainly of conjecture; to a great extent, indeed, his conclusions rest on conjectures dependent on other conjectures, which are themselves again dependent on still other conjectures. At the same time it must be admitted that all these conjectures are ultimately based on a great mass of solid evidence here brought together for the first time.”²⁰ The conjectural nature of Stumpff’s approach was laid bare more succinctly the following year by Neil C. Brooks:

Truly remarkable is this assumption of early well-developed church plays of which not a trace has been preserved and of whose existence there is no real evidence. This assumption would seem to make easier Stumpff’s above-mentioned difficult task, which now becomes that of deriving unknown church plays from unknown cult plays and at the same time reconstructing the unknown cult plays from the unknown church plays.²¹

Two decades later, Benjamin Hunningher offered another challenge to the liturgical theory of medieval drama, arguing much as had Stumpfl that the origin of medieval drama should be sought in older pagan practices rather than in the recesses of the Latin liturgy. Near the end of his short study of *The Origin of the Theater* (1955), Hunningher concluded that “theater was not reborn in the Church, but was adopted and taken in by her.”²² Like Stumpfl before him, Hunningher saw what had come to be known as liturgical drama to have come into the church, not out of it. The *Quem quaeritis* trope, he argued, was transferred to the end of Easter matins “to make it coincide with those pagan rites performed on the eve and night of the spring festival, in order to Christianize those heathen vigils and exercises by means of holy dialogue.”²³ While holding firmly to his argument, Hunningher was well aware of its inherent weakness. “All this is conjecture, of course. The fact that all pieces seem to fit well now does not prove that we have succeeded in reconstructing the original sequence of events.”²⁴

Despite Hunningher’s stature as a senior scholar and critic, challenges to his offering came from all sides. After noting Hunningher’s post as the “Queen Wilhelmina Professor of the History, Language and Literature of the Netherlands at Columbia University,” William A. McDonald complained somewhat wryly that “The essay here reviewed is apparently in a field peripheral to his [Hunningher’s] main competence.”²⁵ Joseph H. Bunzel noted “It is a pity that the author’s erudite studies have not led him to develop a more basic and, sociologically or psychologically, more pertinent hypothesis. The illustrations, the index, the notes, the whole scholarly apparatus indicate the discrepancy between the aim and the deed.”²⁶ D. Mervyn Jones observed further, “But apart from points of detail, and even considered within its chosen limitations, the book gives an impression of incoherent exposition, in part due to its having been written before the author had fully assimilated his reading: and one cannot predict that it will be found very useful.”²⁷ Arnold Williams found much the same fault in Hunningher’s approach as others had seen earlier in the works of Cargill and Stumpfl: “There certainly is a danger in using a liturgical play known only in a thirteenth-century text as evidence for a step that must have taken place in the mid-eleventh century. But we have not made matters better when we substitute for such a document a folk-ritual drama, whose very existence is known only by conjecture, and the earliest extant report of any form of which may come from the eighteenth century.”²⁸

Of this first band of challengers to the theory of medieval drama’s liturgical origin, then, only Manly left intact the theory as a whole. His

objections were directed neither toward the liturgical theory directly nor toward the collection that supported it, but rather toward the processes and the lack of explanatory force that had supported earlier treatments of drama's emergence and development during the Middle Ages. That the notion "liturgical drama" should escape scrutiny here is not surprising, for the liturgical theory makes little sense without liturgical drama.

That the notion "liturgical drama" could survive the attacks by Cargill, Stumpfl, and Hunningher, on the other hand, is astonishing, for without the liturgical theory there was no need for liturgical drama. Nevertheless, these critics went to some lengths to justify the existence of liturgical drama within the theories that they were advancing. While Cargill saw the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue and the *Visitatio Sepulchri* as purely liturgical actions, the later liturgical dramas—the *Danielis Ludus* and the plays of Hilarius—he placed in the hands of medieval minstrels who then grafted them onto the liturgy. For Stumpfl and Hunningher, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and all of the liturgico-dramatic forms that would follow were imported into the liturgy, a result of the Christianization of pagan ceremonies of long standing. While the existence of liturgical drama was not a prerequisite for the theories advanced by these critics, the steadfastness with which the notion was held appears to have precluded any attempts to dislodge it.

This reluctance to carry the attacks on the liturgical theory through to its foundation was to some extent a product of the shallow understanding that these critics had of the collection of rites and plays that fell under the banner of liturgical drama. None appears to have seen any of the primary sources that they discussed, and none showed any concern for the liturgical contexts within which most of these were preserved or the melodies to which many had been set. Most cited modern editions of liturgical drama rather than the manuscripts in which these were preserved. The range of liturgical dramas considered was also constrained. All considered one or more of the trope versions of the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue along with the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the *Regularis Concordia*, and each brought a few additional examples into their discussions as well. The resulting sets, however, comprised but a handful of exemplars of what they had considered to be liturgical drama.²⁹

With regard to the secondary literature, only Stumpfl appears to have had a command of the full range of scholarship then available on liturgical drama, and he was careful not to extend himself too far into areas with which he was not conversant. Cargill was woefully ignorant of

much of the work that had been done since the turn of the century (see above, p. 57). Hunningher, while current at least up to Karl Young's 1933 study on the drama of the medieval church, ignored the more substantive issues presented there and in the many articles that Young had published over the twenty or so years prior.³⁰ He made no mention of the many studies of Neil C. Brooks,³¹ and he seemed unaware of any of the musicological studies that would have been available by the mid-1950s.³² While it is possible that Hunningher was more conversant with the sources and the literature than he let on, these omissions do not inspire confidence in the depth of his analysis or the validity of his conclusions.

Undermining Liturgical Drama

With the 1960s came new approaches to the study of liturgical drama, approaches that focused on how the notions of liturgy and drama themselves were understood during the Middle Ages and on how the so-called liturgical dramas might be seen given these new vantage points. In addition, a number of scholars sought a more comprehensive examination of the ceremonies and plays that had been brought together under the heading "liturgical drama," both as collections and as individual events. In 1975, C. Clifford Flanigan noted the significance of the new wave of scholarship, and he sounded a hopeful note for the potential that these new approaches might achieve:

Our understanding of the liturgical drama is today far different from the common understanding of these plays in 1965. A major reversal has taken place, and in this sense our decade has been quite literally a crucial one. . . . We can hope that the new directions . . . will be followed, that much more will be learned about the liturgy in which these plays lived, about their music, about their physical staging, and about their relationship to non-liturgical piety. Above all, we can hope that increasingly this information will be brought to bear on specific plays so that we can begin to develop a poetic or aesthetic of medieval drama, one which is based on genuine liturgical and dramatic assumptions rather than modern literary presuppositions. This is the great task of the decade that lies ahead.³³

From the mid-1960s onward, the study of liturgical drama shifted from examinations of dramatic texts to inquiries into the liturgical foundations and contexts of the liturgical rites in which most of these texts were embedded and the music to which many were set. To some extent,

the seeds for this liturgical focus had been sown already by Karl Young some thirty years earlier. Young was more sensitive to the liturgical contexts within which the so-called liturgical dramas flourished than most critics have acknowledged, a sensitivity that was evident already early in his studies. During a two-year break from graduate study at Harvard (1903–1905), Young undertook the study of liturgy with Fr. James Barron of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer in Annapolis, Maryland while teaching as a civilian instructor at the U.S. Naval Academy.³⁴ He also spent “more than one summer” during his Harvard years (1901–1903 and 1905–1907) with the monks of Solesmes on the Isle of Wight, participating in the daily round of liturgical observances and studying in the magnificent library that had been assembled there.³⁵ When it came time to put together his monumental edition of texts for the *Drama of the Medieval Church* in 1933, he devoted nearly a third of the first volume to exploring various aspects of the medieval liturgy.³⁶ Young was also an accomplished musician,³⁷ and he was careful in his edition to indicate which settings of the church drama contained musical notation and which did not.

Young’s liturgical efforts, though, were overshadowed by the acontextual readings that he provided throughout the rest of the volumes, and it took over thirty years for another scholar to treat seriously the liturgical contexts within which most of the so-called liturgical dramas were situated. In 1965, O. B. Hardison, Jr. single-handedly reframed the study of liturgical drama in a collection of essays that brought balance to what he saw as liturgical drama’s dual nature. While *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages* proved provocative in many ways, what gained the attention of most scholars were two seemingly radical assertions: first, that the schemes used to order the sources for medieval drama in the editions of his predecessors could not pass historical muster and second, that the liturgy of medieval Catholic Europe, and the Mass in particular, was itself a form of ritual drama. The impact of these essays was felt almost immediately. The following year, Arnold Williams described the collection as “the most important study of the liturgical origins of mediaeval drama since Karl Young’s *Drama of the Medieval Church*,”³⁸ and a year after that Glynne Wickham pronounced it “the most important recent work of scholarship concerning the origins of the drama.”³⁹ Two decades later, C. Clifford Flanigan observed that Hardison’s opening essay “in one brilliant swoop . . . changed the direction of much of the study of the medieval drama.”⁴⁰

Like Manly before him, Hardison took particular issue with what he saw as the Darwinian foundations that had supported the efforts of Young

and his predecessors to trace the transformation of drama from liturgical to secular (Essay I, “Darwin, Mutations, and the Origin of Medieval Drama”). Derived from the earlier schemes of Gustav Milchsack,⁴¹ Carl Lange,⁴² and Edmond K. Chambers,⁴³ Young’s arrangement of texts for the *Quem quaeritis* and *Visitatio Sepulchri* from simple to complex had served as both a logical device for ordering the collection of rites and plays that he had assembled and an historical guide to their probable development. In Young’s own words:

The general method employed throughout the treatise is primarily descriptive, rather than historical. . . . The dramatizations of the theme of Easter Day are treated first; but the distribution of the later chapters is governed merely by convenience of description. Within a single chapter the several versions of the same play are arranged in what may be called the *logical* order of development, from the simplest to the most complex and elaborate. Presumably this is, in general, also the *historical* order, but from the dates of the manuscripts a demonstration is usually impossible. [Young’s emphasis]⁴⁴

Young’s ambivalence notwithstanding, Hardison saw Young’s system as teleological in nature, as a system that demonstrated in its progression from simple to complex forms a clear but largely unconscious adherence to the ideas presented in Charles Darwin’s *On the Origin of Species* (1859). Extending Manly’s argument, Hardison proposed that it would be more fruitful to look at the texts chronologically rather than to see them in terms of their purported dramatic complexity. By viewing the texts according to chronology, scholars could avoid the artifice of developmental stages and thus engage the interplay that may have taken place between simple and complex liturgical rites as well as between liturgical and secular texts that were known to have existed contemporaneously.

Hardison’s second assertion—that the medieval liturgy could be seen as ritual drama (Essay II, “The Mass as Sacred Drama”)—also had historical precedent in the works of several nineteenth-century critics.⁴⁵ What Hardison brought to the discussion, and what has made the most lasting imprint, though, was the lyrical infrastructure that he built to support this assertion. Hardison’s essays describing the liturgical framework within which the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue and the *Visitatio Sepulchri* were cast, essays that traced the Lenten cycle from Septuagesima to Holy Week (Essay III, “The Lenten Agon: From Septuagesima to Good Friday”) and for Easter week itself (Essay IV, “*Christus Victor*: From Holy Saturday to

Low Sunday”), clarified in a way not evident in the works of his predecessors just how tightly integrated into the liturgy these ceremonies actually were, exposing as Arthur Heiserman put it “the deep beauties in the Christian rites.”⁴⁶ Whether or not one accepts Hardison’s assertion that the medieval liturgy was itself drama or his suggestion that the *Quem quaeritis* was originally associated with the Easter Vigil, his laying out of the liturgical framework for the Lenten liturgical cycle and his placement of the *Quem quaeritis* firmly within this framework made it *impossible* for those scholars coming after him to ignore the liturgical context(s) within which the *Quem quaeritis* was celebrated, or at least it should have done so. While this was surely not Hardison’s intent, his casting of the liturgy as ritual drama and his placement of the *Quem quaeritis* within it also made it possible to remove drama from the mix and to see the rite as a purely liturgical action.

Equally far-reaching in its implications for an understanding of liturgical drama was Helmut de Boor’s 1967 study of the textual history of the *Quem quaeritis* and *Visitatio Sepulchri*.⁴⁷ Like most German-speaking scholars, De Boor did not concern himself with the notion of liturgical drama writ large. His study aimed at a lower level of abstraction, at what he along with nearly every other German-speaking scholar since the 1840s called *Osterfeiern*. While this term can be used to describe the celebration of Easter generally, De Boor followed scholarly precedent in using the term to point specifically to the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue that preceded Easter Mass (whether trope or processional) and to the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter matins. Following distinctions made by earlier German-speaking scholars,⁴⁸ De Boor saw a clear division between *Osterfeiern* and *Osterspiele*:

The boundary [between “Feier” and “Spiel”], aside from a few anomalies, is clear. A “Feier” [ceremony or celebration] is something that was created for presentation in a church, whether it was used within or outside of it, something that has been handed down to us in liturgical books, in ordinals, tropers, graduals, breviaries, etc. A “Spiel” [play] no longer has a place in religious ceremonies, regardless of whether it was written in Latin or the vernacular, regardless of whether it was still performed on church grounds by the clergy or whether it involved the participation of the laity as performers and performed in public places.⁴⁹

For De Boor, an *Osterfeier* was a liturgical rite—and only a liturgical rite—which was “intended to be performed and to be presented as part of a liturgical action and thus committed to the strict rules of the sacred

rites and the sung sacred texts,"⁵⁰ and he excluded from his study any texts whose liturgical use could not be established.

Like Hardison two years earlier, De Boor rejected the developmental framework that he saw supporting the organizational schemes of Young and his predecessors, and he proposed an alternative scheme based on the accretion of new liturgical poetry. De Boor's system, though, while ostensibly historically neutral, differed but little from that of Young, which was based not so much on teleological principles as it was on dramatic complexity.⁵¹ De Boor's three types followed the outline of Young's three stages, although with some alterations in assignments between the first two types. Within a given type, moreover, De Boor applied a fine-grained analysis of textual variants that further subdivided the repertory into families, several of which could be associated with various monastic reform movements, such as those stemming from Lotharingia in the tenth and eleventh centuries and that from the monastery of Hirsau a century later.

This distinction between *Feier* and *Spiel*, along with the firm identification of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and other ceremonies as *Feiern*, was carried forward in the works of other German-speaking scholars in the years that followed, including those of Theo Stemmler,⁵² Hans-Jürgen Diller,⁵³ Anke Roeder,⁵⁴ and Jörg O. Fichte,⁵⁵ among others. All accepted the distinction between *Feier* and *Spiel*, although there was little agreement among these scholars as to which texts were *Feiern* and which were *Spiele*. Theo Stemmler, for one, extended the notion of *Feier* well beyond that which De Boor would have allowed, arguing that all settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* but one, even those included among the *Ludi Paschales* of Karl Young, should be seen as *Feiern*.⁵⁶

If most German-speaking scholars were content to bypass the notion of liturgical drama, Johann Drumbl rejected the notion outright in his 1981 study: *Quem Quaeritis: Teatro Sacro dell'Alto Medioevo*.⁵⁷ Drumbl saw the *Quem quaeritis* and its progeny as foreign to the liturgy. These were not liturgical in the same sense as the *Depositio Crucis* or other similar rites—they were in fact something altogether new:

The medieval drama began as a cultural event and as a foreign element to the cult. . . . The "sacred drama" was not born as an extension of the liturgy according to the liturgical trends of "normal" catechetical content, but in opposition to this "normality." If the *Quem quaeritis* was born a new "genre," it does not deserve the status of "liturgical" because the quality expressed by the noun "drama" occurs only in opposition to the liturgy itself and not in opposition

to other liturgical or secular poetic forms. There is therefore no such genre as “liturgical drama” for which either the noun or adjective is expressive.⁵⁸

The most potent attacks on the notion “liturgical drama” in the years following Hardison and De Boor were those of C. Clifford Flanigan, who directed his inquiries specifically toward the liturgical and theological contexts that gave rise to the so-called liturgical dramas and the liturgical milieu within which these rites flourished. In 1974, Flanigan argued that the earliest settings of the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue, seen by nearly all scholars as either the earliest form of—or the antecedent to—liturgical drama, were less an attempt to infuse drama into the liturgy than they were a product of a larger movement toward greater liturgical expressiveness during the ninth century, as Frankish liturgists attempted to adapt Gallican sensibilities to the newly Romanized liturgy:

Up to now . . . the Carolingian liturgical reform has seemed to have had inexplicably contradictory aims and results. On the one hand there was a demand for ‘pure’ liturgy. . . . At the same time, new non-Roman features appeared in the liturgy. These include tropes, sequences, the so-called dramatic ceremonies of the liturgy, the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, and other inventions of less historical significance. . . . All of these new devices should be understood as attempts to reassert the cultic nature of liturgical celebration which was lacking in the new Roman rite.⁵⁹

In Flanigan’s understanding, neither the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue nor the *Visitatio Sepulchri* should be seen as a representational play. These were rituals, and rituals functioned not to recreate past events, but rather to render past events present: “A ritual is a form of action that seeks to bring about the reality it proclaims. . . . The ritual act is thought to make the past action present so that those who are separated by historical time from it may nonetheless participate in it.”⁶⁰ With respect to the *Quem quaeritis* in particular, he argued that we should not see this as a representational play, but rather as an attempt to “make explicit the reality of the events which were believed to have been reactualized in the cult.”⁶¹ In subsequent essays and presentations, Flanigan continued to press his argument, insisting that the customary tagging of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* as “play,” an association that had held for over a century, was no longer viable. The *Visitatio Sepulchri* was a ritual, a dramatic ritual perhaps, but a ritual nonetheless:

The so-called “Drama of the Medieval Church” is almost always contained in service books. Thus its context is wholly liturgical; it is an inseparable part of the much larger annual ritual practice of specific religious communities. Usually it is impossible even to say with certainty where the “play” under discussion begins or ends.⁶²

This understanding of liturgical dramas as liturgical acts, as *Feiern* as opposed to *Spiele*, has, with a few notable exceptions, been carried forth in the studies of musicologists as well, although not always by design. With the exception of their entries in a few musical encyclopedias, not to mention the posthumous book by the late William Smoldon,⁶³ musicologists have tended to follow the lead of German-speaking literary scholars by avoiding the notion “liturgical drama” altogether, limiting their focus to the individual repertoires and to the individual musical texts that served as the objects of their study. The most ambitious project in this direction was Walther Lipphardt’s *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*, which provided textual editions for all known settings of the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue, *Visitatio Sepulchri*, and *Officium Peregrinorum*.⁶⁴ Lipphardt’s edition more than doubled the number of texts provided by Karl Young over forty years earlier, and while space restrictions did not allow him to publish the melodies, Lipphardt did carefully indicate which of the individual sung lines of text included musical notation along with information on the style of notation employed.⁶⁵ Lipphardt used an idiosyncratic blending of the organizational schemes of Karl Young and of Helmut De Boor, following De Boor’s scheme for the most part for the Type 1 and Type 2 texts, but dividing the Type 3 texts between *Feiern* and *Spiele* (Young’s *Ludi Paschales*). He made no such distinction among the sources for the *Officium Peregrinorum*, however. Despite its deficiencies, this work has become the definitive catalogue for the ceremonies and plays included. Unfortunately, few scholars besides musicologists have seen fit to make use of it.

With the contributions of Hardison, De Boor, and Flanigan, the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue along with the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and its liturgical siblings were set securely within the context of medieval European ritual practice. For Flanigan and De Boor especially these were purely liturgical actions, and to see them as drama in any sense of that word was, in their view, to impose modern sensibilities on medieval ritual actions. By the early 1990s, the notion of liturgical drama had become only marginally useful when applied to those representations called “liturgical drama,” and for many students of medieval liturgical drama the label “liturgical drama” became largely unusable, meaningless at best and oxymoronic at

worst. The notion of liturgical drama should have been abandoned two decades ago. This is not, however, what happened.

Sundering the Scholarly View

With the untimely deaths of O. B. Hardison, Jr.⁶⁶ and C. Clifford Flanigan⁶⁷ in the early 1990s, the momentum that had been building for reframing the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and its cousins as inherently liturgical actions and for maintaining the distinction between *Feier* and *Spiel*—between rite and play—dissipated, at least among English-speaking scholars. To be sure, resistance had existed all along. But with the deaths of its champions, the new approaches to the study of liturgical drama, along with the hopes that Flanigan had mustered for sustaining the new view, dissolved, its residues settling into a few disciplinary crags. The fragility of the multi-disciplinary approach to the study of the liturgical drama was laid bare, and the fragmentation of scholarly approaches to—and knowledge of—what we have long called “liturgical drama” reverted to the familiar patterns that Flanigan had hoped to rout:

When one attempts to . . . bring together the work of scholars in disparate academic disciplines on what might appear to be the same subject, new difficulties arise. . . . Literary scholars usually fail to consult the work of their musicological counterparts; similarly, few historians of music are known for their enthusiasm for literary scholarship. A more fundamental problem is that different disciplines operate by different and often incommensurate paradigms, so that the issues which engage the literary scholar in the study of the Latin music-drama are often of little interest to musicologists; of course the opposite is true as well. The professional student of the liturgy is usually somewhat informed about literary scholarship and generally aware of musicological studies relevant to his discipline, but . . . liturgical studies have generally had little impact on the way that either musicologist or literary scholar has thought about the music-drama, though, as we shall see, this situation is beginning to change.⁶⁸

Unfortunately, neither Flanigan’s optimism nor his enthusiasm could survive his passing, and while his arguments have continued to resonate among a few of his followers, they have made hardly a dent in much of the research that has followed. Indeed, many studies touching on liturgical drama since the turn of the twenty-first century have shown little awareness of Flanigan’s contributions or, for that matter, those of De Boor,

Drumbl, or Lipphardt, at least among Anglo-American scholars. Many if not most continue to cite Karl Young's 1933 edition when offering commentary on individual texts rather than the more recent edition of Lipphardt. As a result, studies into the history and nature of the liturgical drama have tended to flow along diverging, and largely autonomous, streams. A small cadre of liturgists, musicologists, and assorted others have continued to explore the tributaries that Hardison, De Boor, and Flanigan had probed, while others, apparently unaware of—or uninterested in—what might lie along those routes, have held course along the main passage navigated earlier by Chambers and Young. Over the past decade and some, moreover, a few scholars have re-entered the channels that Cargill, Stumpff, and Hunningher carved out, undaunted by—or perhaps oblivious to—the critical barriers that had been thrown up by their detractors. Neglect of Hardison's twentieth-century successors has become commonplace in this new millennium, and one need not look far afield to find examples. I offer three.

William Tydeman and *The Medieval European Stage*

The Medieval European Stage, edited by William Tydeman and published in 2001, presented English translations for a number of primary sources for the study of medieval drama.⁶⁹ The book was divided into a series of chapters, each prepared by a specialist in the respective chronological or geographical space. While the studies of Hardison, De Boor, and Flanigan were listed in the various bibliographies, their arguments had little impact on the collection itself. Lawrence Clopper noted the failure to engage recent critical studies in Tydeman's introduction to the volume:

The scholarship of the last thirty years and the challenges to what I will call the Chambers-Young thesis are not apparent in this narrative or most of the sections that follow. Although there is reference to O. B. Hardison, Jr.'s *Christian Rite and Christian Drama* (Baltimore, 1965), there is no acknowledgment, as far as I can determine, of his systematic demonstration of the inadequacies of Chambers's evolutionary argument, a position that I believed most scholars had accepted. Although C. Clifford Flanigan is cited several times, there is no indication that his objections to the treatment of liturgical tropes as dramas is [*sic*] taken into account.⁷⁰

The individual chapters of the collection, moreover, followed the same template. While Peter Meredith's chapter on "Latin liturgical drama"

(pp. 51–134) included translations for many liturgical ceremonies from the Easter season beyond those normally considered to be liturgical dramas, the choices were inspired as much by the liturgical references contained within Karl Young's *The Drama of the Medieval Church* from 1933 as by the liturgical focuses of Hardison, De Boor, and Flanigan.⁷¹ Lipphardt's edition was nowhere mentioned, and all references to particular settings of a liturgical drama were drawn from the editions of Karl Young and Fr. Donovan without manuscript citation.⁷² Moreover, Meredith made no distinction between ceremony and play, between *Feier* and *Spiel*. Some non-liturgical representations were given here while others were reserved for Lynette R. Muir's chapter on "Extra-liturgical Latin, and early vernacular drama" (pp. 135–201) that followed. The Fleury *Peregrinus* and *Ordo Rachelis* along with the Christmas play of the *Carmina Burana* and the *Danielis Ludus* of Beauvais, for example, were included in Meredith's essay while the remaining plays from the Fleury manuscript and *Carmina Burana* were treated in the chapter by Muir.

Eli Rozik and *The Roots of Theatre*

In 2002, Eli Rozik, in *The Roots of Theatre*, reengaged the search for the origin of theater.⁷³ Rozik's quest was more broadly conceived than the earlier studies of Cargill, Stumpfl, and Hunninger, and he sought to understand how theater could have come about at all, and not just during the Middle Ages. Through a close analysis of the nature of drama, of theater, and of ritual, Rozik approached the question of origins from the standpoint of a contemporary critic looking back, a critic well-versed in the theory and in the practice of contemporary theater.⁷⁴ For Rozik, theater as a medium of (re)presentation was ontologically real. Theater existed in the world whether there was anything that anyone might recognize as such or not—it depended neither on apprehension nor comprehension. Concerning claims current in the literature, he countered: "All these qualifications that contemporary people did or did not see their activities as drama and that it was an integral part of the liturgy are irrelevant. The point is that the theatre medium was employed in actual performance."⁷⁵ So while Rozik may have avoided the expression "liturgical drama" in his book, he recognized the presence of theater in the medieval liturgy nonetheless—as an adaptation within the liturgy of pre-existing dramatic impulses—and it mattered not to him whether anyone would have, or even could have, seen it as such.

Rozik did attempt to deal with liturgical matters, although his understanding was porous. He claimed, for example, that the *Quem quaeritis* of the *Regularis Concordia* was integrated into the Easter Mass, making use of “the natural morning light of the church,”⁷⁶ when in fact the ceremony was celebrated at the end of Easter matins *in media nocte*. He also employed theatrical terms and expressions in his description of the rite, including “theatrical scenario,” “stage performance,” “*mise-en-scène*,” “dialogue,” “face expressions,” “set design,” “costume,” “props,” and “special effects.”⁷⁷ He extended the anachronism yet further when he claimed that “the dialogue was probably sung throughout the performance in the manner of a cantata or opera, which is a genuine theatrical medium.”⁷⁸ The comparison is nonsensical of course, as neither cantatas (whether secular or sacred) nor oratorios were enacted. To compare medieval liturgical rites with early baroque musical forms, moreover, forces a comparison between forms born of fundamentally different religious, musical, and historical circumstances solely on the basis of an attribute that was both accidental and contextually inconsequential. Later in the same discussion, he labeled the individual items making up the ceremony as hymns rather than the more accurate antiphons or responsories.⁷⁹ While Rozik engaged a number of recent works in performance and critical theory that touched on the liturgical drama, in particular the studies of Victor Turner, Richard Schechner, and Michal Kobialka,⁸⁰ he failed even to mention the more fundamental studies of Helmut de Boor, Johann Drumbl, and C. Clifford Flanigan.⁸¹ Rozik apparently saw no need to consider any of the liturgical and musicological studies on the origins of *Quem quaeritis*, such as those of Gunilla Iversen⁸² and Susan Rankin,⁸³ or those on the exegetical intent of some Latin religious plays often grouped with the liturgical dramas, such as the studies of Margot Fassler⁸⁴ and Susan Boynton⁸⁵ and my own contribution in this regard,⁸⁶ or on the developmental categories according to which the *Visitatio Sepulchri* has normally been discussed.⁸⁷ Nor did he feel the need to draw attention to the earlier studies of Cargill, Stumpff, and Hunningher, even though his own approach to understanding the nature of medieval drama reflected in part what these earlier scholars had advanced.

Carol Symes on “Early Vernacular Plays” and Medieval Theatre

Similar issues were raised by Carol Symes in a series of articles published over the last decade and a half as well. Symes’ work is profound and multithreaded, and to focus on a few scattered strands of the many woven

throughout the arguments she advances is surely unfair. However, two themes have emerged from her several articles that bear on matters considered here. In her study of “The Appearance of Early Vernacular Plays” from 2002, for example, she took special note of the unconventional contexts within which many medieval dramatic texts were preserved:

Plays were recorded using techniques borrowed from sources musical, didactic, scholastic, and poetic. Many of them, as a result, do not look very much like plays. Conversely, many texts currently considered to be unlikely candidates for performance are either juxtaposed with plays or laid out and rubricated in similar ways. And because all of these texts—even those now designated and widely accepted as “plays”—do not conform to modern dramatic paradigms, they have always been subject to a high degree of scholarly intervention.⁸⁸

She went on to examine a series of texts now considered to be plays—all copied before the fourteenth century and all at least partly in the vernacular—focusing on the indeterminate quality of the presentations of these texts within the manuscripts that preserved them. In her discussion of the so-called *Sponsus* of Paris 1139, however, Symes focused less on the text’s placement within the manuscript—it was copied between a set of polyphonic *versae* and one of *Benedicamus* tropes—than on whether this text constituted a single play or the several that nineteenth-century scholars had identified.⁸⁹ That this *was* a drama, and in particular a liturgical drama, was never in question. She applied the term “liturgical drama” quite liberally in fact—to texts as far afield as the *Suscito Lazari* of Hilarius, the *Danielis Ludus* of Beauvais, and the Passion Play of the *Carmina Burana* in addition to the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139⁹⁰—even though the evidence for the liturgical use for any of these was scanty at best (see chapter 4). Like Rozik, Symes saw the notions of drama and/or theater as ontologically real, as existing apart from our ability to perceive it. While medieval plays may have survived in unconventional contexts and in unusual formats, it was only our inability to recognize them as dramatic acts that rendered them invisible. Once they were seen as plays, they became plays. She never considered that these contexts and/or formats might have led to different conclusions about the nature of these texts. As was true for Rozik also, it made no difference to her how these so-called plays might have been understood at the time of their copying. The difference between ceremony and play—between *Feier* and *Spiel*—was for her a non-issue. She rejected out of hand Drumb’s claim that there was no such thing as

liturgical drama, claiming: “If that is so, there is really no such thing as medieval drama *tout court*—at least, until the burgeoning records of the fourteenth century begin to provide a firm textual basis for its existence.”⁹¹ As to Young’s attempt to separate the liturgical from the dramatic, she was equally dismissive, equating any attempts to distinguish between such “spiritual and worldly impulses” as an exercise in hairsplitting.⁹²

More recently, Symes has revived the claims of Cargill, Stumpf, and Hunningher in her assertion that the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the tenth-century *Regularis Concordia*, seen by most critics as the earliest recognizable liturgical drama, was created to replace what was apparently an earlier, less liturgically-proper spectacle of some sort. In a curiously inverse argument, Symes suggested that the evidence for liturgical drama that most have seen in the *Regularis Concordia* was actually evidence for something altogether different. After noting the “static and turgid” character of the *Quem quaeritis* of the *Regularis*, she argued that the long rubric describing the rite was, in fact, “likely to be a reaction against a more rambunctious style of performance.” It was “not the beginning of drama,” she argued, but “an attempt to curtail it.”⁹³ In support of this assertion, she compared this rambunctious, albeit hypothetical, predecessor for the *Quem quaeritis* with later theatrical events that were enacted in churchyards or other public spaces. This proposal, however, suffered from the same flaw that Sandbach, Brooks, and Williams observed in the claims of Cargill, Stumpf, and Hunningher over a half-century earlier. While both imaginative and bold, the proposal had no foundation. As Neil C. Brooks complained of Stumpf’s argument: “Truly remarkable is this assumption of early well-developed church plays of which not a trace has been preserved and of whose existence there is no real evidence.”⁹⁴ As Michal Kobialka and others have shown, moreover, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the *Regularis Concordia* was more similar to other ceremonies introduced by the *Regularis Concordia* into English practice than it was to the later resurrection and prophet plays to which Symes alluded.⁹⁵

Given her command of the broad range of research that has touched on the liturgical drama, it is difficult to understand why Symes chose not to acknowledge the arguments that Cargill, Stumpf, and Hunningher had advanced over a half-century earlier. She did cite three of Flanagan’s articles,⁹⁶ but she ignored De Boor’s study altogether. Moreover, she made no attempt to consider, much less to refute, the stance that these scholars had taken on the nature of liturgical drama and on the nature of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in particular as a primarily—if not strictly—liturgical phenom-

enon. Indeed, she proceeded as if the arguments had never been made, just as she left untouched the substantive censures leveled against the theories of Cargill, Stumpf, and Hunnigher that she in part revived.

* * *

If the arguments that have gathered in the wake of Hardison's *Christian Rite and Christian Drama* have proven unconvincing to some and unworthy of consideration by others, challenges to the notion "liturgical drama" have also endured, particularly among students of chant and liturgy. M. Bradford Bedingfield, for one, internalized Flanigan's contributions in his study of what he called the "dramatic liturgy of medieval England," treating the *Visitatio Sepulchri* as a ritual act and discussing it in terms of the rites that surrounded it.⁹⁷ "The problem with this perspective," he observed with respect to seeing the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in developmental terms, "is that it examines these rituals as if they were proto-plays, rather than liturgy, giving more weight to dramaturgical tricks such as designation of roles, costuming, and scenic elaborations, than their individual liturgical contexts warrant."⁹⁸

Nils Holger Petersen, who hosted Flanigan at the University of Copenhagen during Flanigan's final year, has continued to carry Flanigan's insights into new directions as well.⁹⁹ In his "*Danielis Ludus* and the Latin Music Dramatic Tradition of the Middle Ages," for example, Petersen noted the gulf between the *Quem quaeritis* (or *Visitatio Sepulchri*) and the ways that scholars have tended to regard it:

The question of how to define drama in relation to the medieval liturgy haunted scholarship for a long time until it learned to avoid the question. The earliest preserved ceremonies concerning the "visit to the sepulchre" with the *quem quaeritis* dialogue were most likely not at all thought of by contemporary observers in a way similar to what in modern times would be understood by the notion of a dramatic performance. . . . In all early documentation, these texts . . . do not distinguish themselves significantly from their surroundings in a way that would make it appropriate to read them as signs of a new art form.¹⁰⁰

In her recent dissertation on the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of German-speaking Europe, musicologist Melanie Batoff explored the issue of liturgical drama anew. After having examined several hundred liturgical manuscripts, she came to an understanding of the difficulties inherent in the expression that agreed largely with the earlier views of Flanigan, Bedingfield, and Petersen:

Before one can appreciate the degrees to which different sung reenactments tend towards ritual or theater, one must abandon the term liturgical drama. This nomenclature not only predetermines that a given performance is drama, it obscures more than it clarifies. To employ the term is to impose the concept of drama on Latin sung reenactments when they were not identified as such in medieval manuscripts. Moreover, given that the meaning of the term liturgical drama has been ambiguous since it was coined in the nineteenth century, one gains nothing in adopting it.¹⁰¹

Building out from the foundation laid by Hardison, De Boor, and Flanigan, scholars from literature and theater have cast further doubt on the notion of liturgical drama as well, albeit indirectly. In his 1999 study on representational practices in the early Middle Ages, for example, Michal Kobialka stirred the shifting theological sands upon which the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue had settled. He demonstrated not only that the notion “representation” remained in flux for much of the Middle Ages, but that the shifting senses of that notion—illustrated in what he called four epistemological fragments—bore little resemblance to whatever understandings we might hold for that notion today. Kobialka juxtaposed his exploration of medieval notions of representation with the shifting medieval understanding of the Eucharist as expressed by its central tenet: “This is my body” (*Hoc est corpus meum*). Beginning with the tenth-century *Regularis Concordia*—a “dynamic site where new monastic practices delimited how representation was defined in England at that time”¹⁰²—Kobialka reminded students of medieval drama that the *Regularis Concordia* offered more than a brief description of an unconventional rite for Easter morning. The *Regularis Concordia* was a monastic constitution, assembled to supplement the Rule of St. Benedict in guiding the life of Benedictine communities in Anglo-Saxon England. He examined closely the sections on the proper celebration of the Divine Office and of the Mass, the observance of the daily chapter, the rights and responsibilities of monastic officials, and the performance of the liturgy for special feasts. Among a number of other insights, he showed that the language describing the *Visitatio Sepulchri* did not differ substantively from language used elsewhere in that document, particularly that associated with some of the other novel rites of Holy Week.¹⁰³ Over the next few centuries, the understanding of this rite changed in the wake of new theological speculations, and by the time of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, the doctrine of transubstantiation redirected attention away from the modes of touch and hearing that dom-

inated earlier representations to the mode of sight.¹⁰⁴ This mode of seeing was manifested not only in the appearance of the risen Christ to Mary Magdalene in several thirteenth-century settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, but in the new feast of Corpus Christi, and with the introduction of visual perspective in the centuries that followed.

Two years later, Lawrence Clopper examined the medieval usage and understanding of various terms of theatrical art, including “drama” and “theater” as well as “tragedy,” “comedy,” and “play” (*ludus*) in *Drama, Play, and Game*. He showed that these terms were understood quite differently during the Middle Ages than we might understand them today: “We have applied modern senses of theatrical terms to medieval texts and documents with the result that we have ‘theatricalized’—made into theater—activities that do not properly belong in that category as we understand it.”¹⁰⁵ Indeed, the notions of drama, tragedy, and comedy “refer to literary products of the ancient pagan world. . . . When medieval writers refer to enacted scripts or liturgical *representations*, they are much more likely to call them ‘pleys,’ ‘jeux,’ or *ludi*.”¹⁰⁶ The word “*ludus*,” moreover, had manifold meanings that only sometimes pointed to what we might today think of as a play. Building on John Coldeway’s study on the words “play” and “plays” in early English drama,¹⁰⁷ Clopper observed that the terms “*ludus*” and “play” were applied to various games and sports, to musicians and even to card and dice players.¹⁰⁸ A reference to a “*ludus*” within a medieval text, in other words, does not necessarily suggest a theatrical work of some sort. It may well be something else altogether.

In 2004, Donnalee Dox, in her study of *The Idea of the Theater in Latin Christian Thought*, further probed the notion of “*theatrum*” as it was reflected in Christian writing from late Antiquity through the Middle Ages, demonstrating that this word was reserved specifically for discussions of the theatrical traditions of antiquity. While writers of late Antiquity through the Carolingian era had seen the theater as bound to ancient pagan practice, writers in the twelfth century began to adapt the idea of ancient theater “without the stigma of Roman or barbarian paganism.”¹⁰⁹ The practice of theater, however, while of potential value as a vehicle for Christian understanding, did not enter Christian theories of knowledge in any substantive way:

Classical poetry remained a division of the trivium, and its connection to physical realization in theatrical performance went unnoticed. Ancient theater, with the display of counterfeit emotions and contrived actions that characterized its mode of representation, did

not find intellectual ground in which to take root. Nor would the idea of a connection between ancient theater, classical poetry, and performative mimesis take root in the fertile inquiries of the thirteenth-century Scholastics.¹¹⁰

We are left with a quandary. While many critics remain wed to the notion of liturgical drama, the bonds that have secured this notion to the words used to describe it have come undone. Indeed, if our understanding of “drama,” “representation,” and “theater” have no medieval cognates, then what can the objects of our study possibly be? How do we understand the musical texts that we have for so long considered to be liturgical dramas? To gain a better perspective on these issues, we might consider how the rites and plays we now call “liturgical drama” were understood before the revelations of Magnin. This is the story of the chapter that follows.

NOTES

¹ Manly, “Literary Forms.”

² De Vries, *Die Mutationstheorie* (1901–1903).

³ Manly, “Literary Forms,” 581.

⁴ Manly, “Literary Forms,” 586.

⁵ Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, 1. This was one of Cargill’s rare ventures into medieval studies. After a few early articles on medieval topics—including “The Authorship of the *Secunda Pastorum*” (1926), “The Date of the A-Text of Piers Ploughman” (1932), and “The Langland Myth” (1935)—his scholarly output focused on nineteenth- and twentieth-century American authors. Among Cargill’s studies on American authors are “Carl Sandburg, Crusader and Mystic” (1950), *The Novels of Henry James* (1961), *O’Neill and his Plays* (1961), and *Thomas Wolfe: Three Decades of Criticism* (1968). He also edited Walt Whitman’s *Leaves of Grass* (1950) and published several works on literary criticism, including among others: Cargill, *The Social Revolt* (1933), *Intellectual America, Ideas on the March* (1941), and *Towards a Pluralistic Criticism* (1965).

⁶ Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, 31.

⁷ Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, 33.

⁸ Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, 37 and 43.

⁹ Coffman, Review of *Drama and Liturgy*, 612–13.

¹⁰ Frank, Review of *Drama and Liturgy*, 64.

¹¹ Brooks, Review of *Drama and Liturgy*, 433.

¹² Brooks, Review of *Drama and Liturgy*, 439. A decade later, Mary Marshall dismissed Cargill’s works as “too insubstantial to be at all convincing.” Marshall, “The Dramatic Tradition,” 962.

¹³ Stumpff died 13 August 1937 in an automobile accident shortly after having taken on the appointment at Heidelberg. "Personalnotizen," 146. See also Brandt, "Literary Landmarks of 1937," 31 and Brooks, Review of *Kultspiele der Germanen*, 305.

¹⁴ During his years as docent at the University of Berlin (1934–1937), Stumpff was active also as a lecturer in the *Amt Rosenberg*. It was during this period that he published the provocatively titled *Unsere Kampf um ein deutsches Nationaltheater* (1935). On the Rosenberg connection, see Dainat and Dannenberg, *Literaturwissenschaft und Nationalsozialismus*, 92.

¹⁵ Stumpff, *Kultspiele der Germanen als Ursprung*. Stumpff completed his *Habilitationsschrift* in 1934. See Kühlmann, "Germanistik und Deutsche Volkskunde, 364.

¹⁶ "Aber der Kern seiner These, die Leugnung eines genetischen Zusammenhangs zwischen dem liturgischen Drama und den Mysterienspielen, trifft doch einen nicht unwesentlichen schwachen Punkt der liturgischen Theorie. Denn niemand kann bestreiten, daß hier die entscheidenden Verbindungsglieder fehlen." Stumpff, *Kultspiele der Germanen*, 46.

¹⁷ Stumpff, *Kultspiele der Germanen*, 38.

¹⁸ Stumpff, *Kultspiele der Germanen*, esp. 60–90.

¹⁹ Sandbach, Review of *Kultspiele der Germanen*, 317.

²⁰ Sandbach, Review of *Kultspiele der Germanen*, 318.

²¹ Brooks, Review of *Kultspiele der Germanen*, 302. For a sympathetic treatment of Stumpff's book, see Pascal, "On the Origins of the Liturgical Drama" (1941).

²² Hunningher, *Origin of the Theater*, 105.

²³ Hunningher, *Origin of the Theater*, 105.

²⁴ Hunningher, *Origin of the Theater*, 106–7. On the studies of Léon Gautier, see chapter 1, p. 36.

²⁵ McDonald, Review of *The Origin of the Theater*, 95.

²⁶ Bunzel, Review of *The Origin of the Theater*, 86.

²⁷ Jones, Review of *The Origin of the Theater*, 316.

²⁸ Williams, Review of *The Origin of the Theater*, 564.

²⁹ For a more comprehensive look at the repertory of liturgical drama, see chapter 4.

³⁰ Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church* (1933). Among Young's many studies on aspects of the liturgical drama of the Middle Ages published prior to *Drama of the Medieval Church* are: "A Contribution to the History of Liturgical Drama at Rouen" (1908), *The Harrowing of Hell in Liturgical Drama* (1909), "Some Texts of Liturgical Plays" (1909), "Observations on the Origin of the Mediaeval Passion Play" (1910), "A Liturgical Play of Joseph and his Brethren" (1911), "Philippe de Mézières' Dramatic Office for the Presentation of the Virgin" (1911), "A New Text of the *Officium Stellae*" (1912), "*Officium Pastorum*: A Study in the Dramatic Developments within the Liturgy at Christmas" (1912),

“La Procession des *Trois Rois* at Besançon” (1913), “On the Origin of the Easter Play” (1914), “The *Poema Biblicum* of Onulphus” (1915), “A New Version of the *Peregrinus*” (1919), *Ordo Rachelis* (1919), *The Dramatic Associations of the Easter Sepulchre* (1920), “*Ordo Prophetarum*” (1921), “Concerning the Origin of the Miracle Play” (1923), “The Home of the Easter Play” (1926), “Dramatic Ceremonies of the Feast of the Purification” (1930), and, with Gustav Cohen, “The *Officium Stellae* from Bilsen” (1916–1917).

³¹ While he mentions Brooks’s review of Cargill (p. 6), Hunningher neglects the major part of Brooks’s output, including “The Lamentation of Mary in the Frankfort Group of Passion Plays” (1900–1901), “Neue lateinische Osterfeiern” (1908), “Some New Texts of Liturgical Easter Plays” (1909), “German Hymns Before the Reformation” (1910), “Liturgical Easter Plays from Rheinau Manuscripts” (1911), “Osterfeiern aus Bamberger und Wolfenbüttler Handschriften” (1914), *The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy* (1921), “Eine liturgisch-dramatische Himmelfahrtsfeier” (1925), “The *Sepulchrum Christi* and its Ceremonies” (1926), and “A Rheinau Easter Play” (1927).

³² Excluding the studies treated in chapter 1, the following were published prior to the close of 1955: Wagner, “Rheinisches Osterspiel” (1918–1919); Meyer, “Über die Melodiebildung” (1927); Albrecht, *Four Latin Plays of St. Nicholas* (1935); Sievers, *Die lateinischen liturgischen Osterspiele der Stiftskirche St. Blasien* (1936); Lipphardt, *Die Weisen der lateinischen Osterspiele* (1948); Joseph Poll, “Ein Osterspiel enthalten in einem Prozessionale” (1950); Rokseth, “La liturgie de la passion” (1950); Smits van Waesberghe, “Das Maastrichter Osterspiel” (1950); Schuler, *Die Musik der Osterfeiern* (1951); Schmid, “Das Osterspiel in Schweden” (1952); Smits van Waesberghe, “Die niederländische Osterspiel” (1952); Smits van Waesberghe, “A Dutch Easter Play” (1953); Vecchi, *Uffici drammatici padovani* (1954); Chailley, “Le drame liturgique medieval à Saint-Martial de Limoges” (1955); and the studies by Smoldon, including “The Easter Sepulchre Music-Drama” (1946), “Mediaeval Music-Drama” (1953), and “Liturgical Drama” (1954).

³³ Flanigan, “Liturgical Drama and its Tradition,” 19:36.

³⁴ F. B. Young, “The Drama of the Medieval Church,” 17–18. See also K. Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:xv.

³⁵ F. B. Young, “The Drama of the Medieval Church,” 20–21. See also K. Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:xv.

³⁶ Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:13–197. In these chapters he treats aspects of the medieval Mass and Divine Office, dramatic elements evident in the medieval liturgy, the sepulcher ceremonies (*Depositio Crucis* and *Elevatio Crucis*), as well as tropes.

³⁷ Coffman et al., “Memoir of Karl Young” (1945), 382. Witter Bynner notes that Young had intended to be a concert pianist, but having lost the third finger on one of his hands, he was forced to set that dream aside. Bynner, “Karl Young,” 145–46. On his passion for music, see also Campbell, “Karl Young.”

³⁸ Williams, Review of *Christian Rite and Christian Drama*, 539.

³⁹ Wickham, Review of *Christian Rite and Christian Drama*, 300.

⁴⁰ Flanigan, "Karl Young and *The Drama of the Medieval Church*," 158.

⁴¹ Milchsack, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern* (1880).

⁴² Lange, *Die lateinische Osterfeiern* (1887).

⁴³ Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage* (1903).

⁴⁴ Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:xiii–ix.

⁴⁵ See chapter 1, especially the discussions on Charles Magnin (pp. 19–25) and Félix Clément (pp. 27–31).

⁴⁶ Heiserman, Review of *Christian Rite and Christian Drama*, 242.

⁴⁷ De Boor, *Die Textgeschichte*. De Boor's activities as a member of the Nazi party while serving as professor at the University of Bern is treated in Edwards, "Censoring Sigfried's Love Life," 91–95. His expulsion from Switzerland after the Second World War is treated in Schoch, "Ein Nazi auf dem Germanistik-Lehrstuhl."

⁴⁸ On Mone, see p. 26–27 and on Milchsack and Lange p. 37 in chapter 1 above. This distinction is also close to that made by Coussemaker in 1860 (see chapter 1, p. 34).

⁴⁹ "Die Grenzlinie ist trotz einzelner Überschreitungen klar zu ziehen. Als "Feier" bezeichne ich alles das, was für die Darbietung im Rahmen des kirchlichen Zeremoniells geschaffen worden ist und darin verwendet wurde, oder ganz äußerlich: das, was in liturgischen Büchern, in Ordinarien, Troparen, Gradualen, Breviarien u. ä. aufgezeichnet und uns darin überliefert ist. Als "Spiel" gilt mir alles, was im liturgischen Bereich keinen Platz mehr findet, gleichgültig, ob es lateinisch oder volkssprachig gedichtet ist, ob es noch von Geistlichen und im kirchlichen Raum dargestellt wird, oder ob es unter Teilnahme von Laien als Darstellern und auf öffentlichen Plätzen aufgeführt wird." De Boor, *Die Textgeschichte*, 5.

⁵⁰ "Es sind liturgische Kompositionen, dazu bestimmt, im Rahmen eines gottesdienstlichen Vorgangs vorgetragen und dargeboten zu werden und also den strengen Gesetzen des heiligen Vorgangs und des darin erklingenden heiligen Wortes verpflichtet. Nur in diesem Zusammenhang, nur aus dieser Umwelt heraus wird die Feier in ihrer ganzen Existenz verständlich; sie muß als liturgische Komposition begriffen werden." De Boor, *Die Textgeschichte*, 2–3.

⁵¹ On the classification systems used to organize the repertory of the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue and *Visitatio Sepulchri*, see Norton, "Of 'Stages' and 'Types'" (1987).

⁵² Stemmler, *Liturgische Feiern* (1970).

⁵³ Diller, *Redeformen des englischen Misterienspiels* (1973).

⁵⁴ Roeder, *Die Gebärde im Drama* (1974).

⁵⁵ Fichte, *Expository Voices in Medieval Drama* (1975).

⁵⁶ Stemmler, *Liturgische Feiern*, 69–70. He excluded the *Ludus Paschalis* of the *Carmina Burana*. See also the brief analysis by Flanigan, "Liturgical Drama and its Tradition," 98–100.

⁵⁷ Drumbl, *Quem Quaeritis* (1981). Carol Symes' critique of Drumbl's work is given in her article, "The Appearance," 793–94. See also the review by Henig, Review of *Quem Quaeritis* and the critiques by Davril, "Johann Drumbl and the Origins of the *Quem Quaeritis*" and Flanigan, "Medieval Latin music-drama," 27–30.

⁵⁸ "La drammaturgia medievale nasce come fatto culturale e come elemento estraneo al culto. . . . Il 'dramma sacro' non è nato come ampliamento della liturgia conformemente alle tendenze catechetiche dei contenuti liturgici 'normali', ma in opposizione a questa 'normalità'. Qualora con il *Quem quaeritis* fosse nato un nuovo 'genere', tale genere non meriterebbe la qualifica di 'liturgico', perché la qualità espressa dal sostantivo dramma si realizza solo in opposizione alla liturgia stessa e non in opposizione ad altre forme poetiche liturgiche o secolari. Non esiste dunque un genere 'dramma liturgico' al quale verrebbe a mancare o il contenuto del sostantivo o quello espresso dall'aggettivo." Drumbl, *Quem Quaeritis*, 365.

⁵⁹ Flanigan, "The Roman Rite," 280.

⁶⁰ Flanigan, "The Liturgical Context," 49.

⁶¹ Flanigan, "The Roman Rite," 281.

⁶² Flanigan, "The Fleury Playbook," 350.

⁶³ Smoldon, *The Music of the Mediaeval Church Music Dramas*. Smoldon was the first musicologist to offer a systematic study of the music of the liturgical drama. However, he followed Young in his approach to the subject, and did not distinguish among those settings that were liturgical in intent and those for which such evidence was missing.

⁶⁴ Published between 1975 and 1981, the first six volumes were prepared before Lipphardt's death in January of 1981. Volumes 7 through 9, which include commentary along with numerous corrections to the earlier volumes, were published posthumously in 1990.

⁶⁵ A new edition of the melodies for the *Quem quaeritis* tropes and liturgical *Visitaciones* published in LOO along with those for several recently discovered settings is given with a new commentary in Evers/Janota. This edition does not provide musical settings for the ancillary rites given by Lipphardt (*Depositio*, *Elevatio*, etc.). Nor does it offer musical settings for any of the *Ludus Paschalis* or *Peregrinus* texts that conclude the fifth volume of LOO. Two volumes in the *Corpus Troporum* series offer deeper looks into the "Quem quaeritis" dialogues that prefaced the Mass for both Christmas and Easter as well. While not musicologists themselves, the editors of the volumes were deeply informed on the musical aspects of their studies. On the "Quem quaeritis" tropes of Easter, see Iversen, Björkvall, and Jonnson, *Cycles de Pâques*. On the "Quem quaeritis" tropes of Christmas, see Jonnson, *Cycle de Noël*, which includes analyses of the musical settings for the Christmas tropes by Nicole Sevestre as well.

⁶⁶ O. B. Hardison, Jr. died on 5 August 5, 1990 at the age of 61. Hardison's daughter, Sarah O'Connor, offered a poignant and personal essay describing

Hardison's life, his last days, and the effect that his premature death had on her and her family. O'Connor, "Exiled: A Memoir of O. B. Hardison, Jr."

⁶⁷ C. Clifford Flanigan died 27 October 27, 1993 at the age of 53. Lawrence Clopper and Claus Clüver offered a "Memorial Resolution" honoring his life and work that was entered into the minutes of the Faculty Council of Indiana University, Bloomington Campus held on 4 October 1994. Essays on Flanigan's life, work, and impact are given in Clark, ed., *Papers by and for C. Clifford Flanigan*, including those of Robert L. A. Clark, "From Cultic to Cultural Practice," 5–16; Claus Clüver, "In Memoriam C. Clifford Flanigan," 23–26; and Claire Sponsler, "Cliffnotes," 27–32.

⁶⁸ Flanigan, "Medieval Latin music-drama," 21.

⁶⁹ Tydeman, ed., *The Medieval European Stage*.

⁷⁰ Clopper, Review of *The Medieval European Stage*, 848.

⁷¹ See especially the chapter "Dramatic and Other Literary Aspects of the Roman Liturgy" in Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:79–177.

⁷² Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church* and Donovan, *The Liturgical Drama in Medieval Spain* (1958).

⁷³ Rozik, *The Roots of Theatre*.

⁷⁴ For a critical appraisal, see Bassi, Review of *The Roots of Theatre*.

⁷⁵ Rozik, *The Roots of Theatre*, 104.

⁷⁶ Rozik, *The Roots of Theatre*, 103.

⁷⁷ Rozik, *The Roots of Theatre*, 102–3.

⁷⁸ Rozik, *The Roots of Theatre*, 103.

⁷⁹ Rozik, *The Roots of Theatre*, 103.

⁸⁰ Turner, *From Ritual to Theatre*; Schechner, *Performance Theory*—although not *Between Theater and Anthropology*; and Kobialka, "Holy Space and Representational Space"—although not *This Is My Body*.

⁸¹ De Boor, *Die Textgeschichte*; Drumbl, *Quem Quaeritis*; and Flanigan, "The Roman Rite," "The Fleury Playbook," and "Medieval Latin Music-Drama," among others. See "Undermining Liturgical Drama" in the current chapter.

⁸² Iversen, "Aspects of the Transmission."

⁸³ Rankin, "Liturgical Drama," and "Musical and Ritual Aspects."

⁸⁴ Fassler, "The Feast of Fools."

⁸⁵ Boynton, "Performative Exegesis."

⁸⁶ Norton, "*Sermo in Cantilena*."

⁸⁷ Norton, "Of 'Stages' and 'Types.'"

⁸⁸ Symes, "The Appearance," 778–79.

⁸⁹ Symes' critique of the earlier view centered on the division given by Coussemaker in his *Drames liturgiques*, 1–20 (musical edition), 311–19 (commentary). The division of the *Sponsus* into multiple plays was originally proposed by Magnin in his Sorbonne lectures of 1834–1835 (see chapter 1, p. 23), and this division was accepted by nearly all subsequent scholars. Coussemaker's earliest treatment of *Sponsus* appeared in his article, "Drame liturgique," (1851). This was

reprinted the following year as chapter 8 of part 1, section 2 (“Drame liturgique”) in his *Histoire de l’Harmonie*, 124–39, facsimiles pl. xiii–xxiii. Coussemaker published a musical transcription of the text (or texts) along with a facsimile of the second page of the *Sponsus* preceded by the last line of the first page in *Drames liturgique*. Coussemaker omitted in his various treatments the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue that Magnin had identified preceding the *Sponsus*, and it was this omission in part that prompted Symes’ criticism of Coussemaker’s treatment. Symes discussion of Paris 1139 along with her criticism of Coussemaker’s treatment is found in “The Appearance,” 794–801. Symes repeated much of her argument on Paris 1139 in Symes, “A Few Odd Visits,” 301–12.

⁹⁰ Symes, “The Appearance,” 781.

⁹¹ Symes, “The Appearance,” 793.

⁹² Symes, “The Appearance,” 794.

⁹³ Symes, “The History of Medieval Theatre,” 1039–40. She makes the same claim in Symes, “The Medieval Archive,” 30: “Aethelwold’s effort to regulate the decorous and pious conduct of performers is likely to be a reaction *against* more lively treatments of a familiar episode—so familiar that he didn’t bother to script it fully. It was not the beginning of a performance practice; it is an attempt to put an end to one” [Symes’s emphasis].

⁹⁴ Brooks, Review of *Kultspiele der Germanen*, 302.

⁹⁵ On the relationship between the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the *Regularis Concordia* and the other representational rites of Holy Week and on the similarities between the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and other rites introduced in the *Regularis Concordia*, see the discussion in chapter 4, pp. 114–15. This is treated most thoroughly in Kobialka, *This Is My Body*, 35–99; Bedingfield, *The Dramatic Liturgy*, 114–170; and Petersen, “The Representational Liturgy,” 111–14. See also the brief discussion on p. 75.

⁹⁶ Flanigan, “Karl Young and the *Drama of the Medieval Church*,” Flanigan, “Medieval Latin music-drama;” and the posthumous article completed by Kathleen Ashley and Pamela Sheingorn, “The Liturgy as Social Performance.”

⁹⁷ Bedingfield, *The Dramatic Liturgy*, 256–70 and “Ritual and Drama.”

⁹⁸ Bedingfield, “Ritual and Drama,” 296.

⁹⁹ While Petersen has been quite prolific on a number of different subjects, the following are representative of his output regarding liturgical drama: Petersen, “*Danielis Ludus*,” Petersen, “The Representational Liturgy of the *Regularis Concordia*,” Petersen, “Liturgical Drama: New Approaches;” Petersen, “Representation in European Devotional Rituals;” and Petersen, “Biblical Reception.”

¹⁰⁰ Petersen, “*Danielis Ludus*,” 293–94.

¹⁰¹ Batoff, “Re-Envisioning the *Visitatio Sepulchri*,” 39–40.

¹⁰² Kobialka, *This Is My Body*, 30.

¹⁰³ Kobialka, *This Is My Body*, 80–86.

¹⁰⁴ Kobialka, *This Is My Body*, 198.

¹⁰⁵ Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, 4.

¹⁰⁶ Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, 11.

¹⁰⁷ Coldeway, "Plays' and 'Play'."

¹⁰⁸ Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, 12.

¹⁰⁹ Dox, *The Idea of Theater*, 73.

¹¹⁰ Dox, *The Idea of Theater*, 94.