



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 3

Past as Prologue: Preceding “Liturgical Drama”

THE NOTION THAT A continuum from ritual to drama could serve as gauge for the dramaticity of a sequence of medieval sung Latin texts was unknown, and very likely unfathomable, in the centuries that preceded the revelations of Magnin. Yet, the rites and plays that would form the category “liturgical drama” did not go unnoticed during that long span that preceded the category’s nativity. To be sure, earlier critics addressed these texts in different ways, but for nearly all a clear distinction between rite and play was assumed. The liturgical aggregators of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries published the texts for liturgical rites now included among the liturgical dramas alongside a great many other rites without considering these as anything other than ceremonies no longer in fashion. At the same time, eighteenth-century scholars published a handful of sung Latin plays for which they saw no liturgical intent. Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Protestant reformers included rites now identified as liturgical dramas among a wide array of ritual acts that they saw as idolatrous or overtly theatrical without ever singling these out for special consideration. Twelfth- and thirteenth-century exegetes similarly censured a handful of representations often identified as liturgical dramas that were more likely non-liturgical spectacles of some sort. Not only did the predecessors to Magnin fail to see a link between liturgy and drama in the texts they cited or censured, they saw these as distinct species: one liturgic and the other dramatic.

Capturing the Liturgical and Literary Past (Seventeenth to Early Nineteenth Century)

Well before Magnin delivered his Sorbonne lectures, many of the works that would gather under the rubric “liturgical drama” were already available in print. Multiple settings of the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* were included in the collections of monastic and liturgical documents compiled

by Augustine Baker (1626),¹ Jacques Eveillon (1641),² Antoine Bellotte (1662),³ Jean-Baptiste Le Brun des Marettes (1679 and 1718),⁴ Edmond Martène (1690–1738),⁵ Martin Gerbert (1776),⁶ Stefan Würdtwein (1784),⁷ and Antonio Francesco Frisi (1794).⁸ In addition, the Rouen *Officium Pastorum* and Tours *Officium Prophetarum* had been offered by Martène, and settings of the *Officium Stellae* had been given by both Le Brun des Marettes⁹ and Martène¹⁰ for Rouen, by Martène for Limoges,¹¹ and by Hermann Crombach for Besançon.¹² Charles de Fresnes du Cange in his *Glossarium* (1678) offered settings for all of these plus the *Officium Peregrinorum* as well,¹³ and François-Ignace Dunod de Charnage offered a transcription of an Annunciation *officium* from Besançon (1750).¹⁴ And yet, in the two centuries that separated the publication of Baker's *Apostolatus Benedictinorum* in 1626 and Magnin's lectures of 1834–1835, all were presented either within the larger context of their liturgical celebration or among other rites that were similarly configured.

In 1626, Augustine Baker published the text of the tenth-century *Regularis Concordia* as a whole, its *Visitatio Sepulchri* placed within the context of the celebration of Easter morning, which was itself one of several brief chapters on the rites of Holy Week.¹⁵ Fifteen years later, Jacques Eveillon included his account of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the cathedral at Angers in a chapter entitled “On the morning processions before lauds on Easter Sunday.”¹⁶ After describing a number of rites common to the Greek Church, he introduced the *Visitatio Sepulchri* as was still celebrated at the cathedral:

At the cathedral of Angers, the following mystery is celebrated at the end of the third responsory of matins in this way. The high altar is set up as the sepulcher of Christ, with a curtain placed before it. Positioned at the altar are two major chaplains wearing surplices and white copes, one at the right corner and the other at the left, representing the angels sitting at the sepulcher. Next, two canon prebendaries proceed from the sacristy, wearing albs and ornate white dalmatics, amices covered with a purple veil, showing as the women coming to the tomb, preceded by two acolytes with censers. Those standing in the doorway before the altar ask in song: *Quem quaeritis in sepulcro?* The others respond, likewise singing: *Iesum Nazarenum crucifixum.* Then the others: *Non est hic: surrexit, sicut praedixerat. Venite, & videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus.* Having heard this, the canon prebendaries enter the sepulcher, and to revere it they kiss the altar in the middle, as their Lord, kissing because of the sweetness of love: meanwhile the two acolytes enter

and cense the altar three times. Then the chaplains [sing]: *Ite, nuntiate discipulis eius, quia surrexit*. In response to this, the canon prebendaries continue to the choir, preceded by the two acolytes, singing in a loud voice: *Alleluia. Resurrexit Dominus hodie, resurrexit leo fortis, Christus filius Dei*. To this the entire choir responds in a single voice: *Deo gratias; dicite, eia*. In the meantime, the two canon prebendaries ascend to the bishop, and in an act of respect greet him with a kiss, saying in a soft voice: *Resurrexit Dominus, Alleluia*. And suddenly, with happiness bursting as thunder, [they] intone the hymn: *Te Deum laudamus*, while the two acolytes cense.¹⁷

It is noteworthy that the *Visitatio Sepulchri* was not only still being celebrated at Angers in 1641, but that it would survive there for at least another half-century (see the report of Le Brun des Marettes below, pp. 89–90). By the mid-seventeenth century, theatrical presentations had become commonplace in France. The *ballets de cour* had long been the rage in the courts of Paris, and the golden age of French theater and opera would soon be ushered in by the likes of Molière and Lully. Jacques Eveillon was no cloistered churchman with scant experience of the world. He had been educated at the University of Nantes and was the son of an alderman of Angers. It is highly unlikely that, even as canon and grand vicar at the cathedral in Angers, Eveillon would have been unaware of the many and varied theatrical performances then proliferating in the kingdom.¹⁸ Yet, he found nothing amiss, nothing at all theatrical, in this liturgical visit to the sepulcher by clerics in the person of the Marys. The focus on censing, the ritual kissing of the altar, the focus on clerical rank, the interaction with the bishop, all speak to the solemn, ritual nature of this observance. Had Eveillon recognized this as theater, as drama, he found no reason to make note of it.

Edmond Martène similarly presented his transcriptions of what would later be known as liturgical drama according to their liturgical contexts. In 1690, Martène introduced his transcription of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the *Regularis Concordia* with the following heading: “After the third responsory [of matins] a singular rite is prescribed in the [*Regularis*] *Concordia* of [St.] Dunstan.”¹⁹ In his *Tractatus de antiqua ecclesiae disciplinae* of 1706, Martène presented what we would come to know as liturgical dramas according to their placement within the liturgical *cur-sus*. In his chapter on the rites of Advent (chapter 10, *De adventu Domini*), for example, Martène describes an Annunciation *officium* observed at Besançon during the Ember Days.²⁰ In his chapter on the celebration of

Christmas (chapter 12, *De festo natalis Domini*), Martène offered a description for the celebration of Christmas matins that included transcriptions of the *Officium Pastorum* from the cathedral of Rouen and the monastery of Saint-Martial in Limoges.²¹ For the Christmas octave, Martène included an *Officium Prophetarum* from the monastery of Saint-Martin in Tours that was embedded within his description of the office of matins (chapter 13, *De octava natalis Domini*).²² He offered similarly placed treatments for the celebration of the *Officium Stellae* before the Mass of the Epiphany at Rouen²³ and during the Mass at Limoges²⁴ (chapter 14, *De festo Epiphania*), the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter matins at Laon and Narbonne²⁵ and the *Quem quaeritis* sung prior to Mass at Saint-Martin in Tours (chapter 25, *De Paschatis festo*).²⁶ Other settings of the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* were given within the broader context of the liturgical rites for Easter Sunday as celebrated at particular churches. Included among these were the rites of Soissons, Tours, Vienne, Strasbourg, Poitiers and Verdun.²⁷

In the additions provided by Jean-Baptist Le Brun des Marettes for the second edition of Jean Le Prévôt's transcription of the *Liber de Officiis Ecclesiasticis* of John of Avranches in 1679,²⁸ musical editions of the *Officium Stellae* and *Visitatio Sepulchri* (*Officium Sepulchri*) were placed among a number of extracts drawn from manuscripts from the cathedral of Rouen then in the Bigot collection.²⁹ The Appendix included, among other things, descriptions of the solemn processions for the cathedral, the expulsion and reconciliation of penitents, rites for the ordination of bishops, excommunication, and the blessing of abbots along with additional liturgical commentaries and sermons on the priesthood and a paschal table for the year 1678. The *Officium Stellae* and *Visitatio Sepulchri* were given in the midst of these in a section containing rites no longer observed at the cathedral, which included in addition to these an *Officium Infantem* (without musical notation) associated with the feast of St. John the Evangelist. If Le Brun des Marettes had any inkling that the *Officium Stellae* and *Visitatio Sepulchri* he offered could be seen as drama, he did nothing to indicate this. It was not the theatrical nature of these ceremonies that gained his attention, but rather their novelty.

Textual transcriptions for several representational rites from Rouen also found their way into Charles de Fresne du Cange's *Glossarium* of 1678.³⁰ While du Cange was not specifically interested in liturgical matters, he treated these ceremonies as strictly ritual actions. Each was labeled as "officium," and each was described according to its placement within

the liturgy of the Rouen cathedral. Included among his entries were the *Pastorum officium* of Christmas matins,³¹ the *Peregrinorum officium* of Easter Monday,³² the *Sepulchri Officium* of Easter matins,³³ and *Stella festum* from the Mass of the Epiphany.³⁴

The only scholar to consider any of these rites as drama during the seventeenth century was Hermann Crombach, who included an undated setting of the *Officium Stellae* from Besançon in his 1656 study of the three Magi, whose relics had been in the cathedral of Cologne since the twelfth century, and of all things that might be related to them. In his chapter on the rites of Epiphany (volume 3, book 3, chapter 14), he treated the “Vigil and feast of Epiphany, the Festive Joys and Unusual Rites, the *tripudio* of Cologne, Besançon, and Freiburg.”³⁵ Among the unusual rites, Crombach included a setting of the *Officium Stellae* from Besançon that included three clerics serving as attendants for the kings dressed as Persians with one in blackface. While the presentation may have been unusual, the ceremony itself drew from the liturgy of the day along with two independent sung poetic texts.³⁶ The ceremony began with a procession to the ambo for the Gospel reading, where the clerics portraying the three kings chanted the Gospel one after the other and then processed to the altar to offer their gifts. This was then followed by the creed and offertory sung as usual.³⁷ While Crombach recognized this as ritual, he described it in his brief commentary as “pious Burgundian drama.”³⁸

Crombach’s view, however, was anomalous. As late as 1718, Le Brun des Marettes (writing here under the pseudonym *Le Sieur de Moleon*) saw nothing odd in the liturgical celebration of the *Office du sépulcre* that he had observed at the cathedral of Angers more than two decades earlier (and that he had earlier chronicled from the former use of Rouen), adding some details not given by Eveillon in his description of 1641:

The third and last response of matins having finished, two seniors vested in copes proceed with the cantor to the altar where the gravecloth had been hidden. Two canon prebendaries in dalmatics wearing simple amices with embroidered caps on their heads and with gloves or mittens on their hands preceded the others to the altar. The seniors chant the question, *Quem quaeritis?* The canon prebendaries representing the Marys respond, *Jesum Nazarenum crucifixum*. The seniors, *Non est hic, surrexit sicut praedixerat; venite et videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus*. The canon prebendaries enter, and the seniors continue the chant, *Ite, nuntiate discipulis ejus quia surrexit*. Leaving the altar, the canon prebendaries carry

two ostrich eggs wrapped in silk and return to the choir, singing, *Alleluia, Resurrexit Dominus, resurrexit leo fortis, Christus filius Dei*. The choir responds, *Deo gratias, Alleluia*.³⁹

Even into the nineteenth century, scholars drawing from these collections continued to see these rites as liturgical acts, unusual liturgical acts perhaps, but liturgical acts nonetheless. In 1806, for example, Thomas Lingard, in *The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, observed that the tenth-century *Regularis Concordia* included several “fanciful practices of devotion.” To illustrate this, he offered in a footnote the following description of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*:

A curious ceremony was recommended for the feast of Easter. Towards the close of matins, a monk retired into a species of sepulchre prepared in the church, and three others with thuribles in their hands, and their eyes fixed on the ground, walked slowly along the choir. After some delay, a voice issued from the sepulchre chanting the anthem, “Whom do you seek?” They replied, “Jesus of Nazareth.” “He is not here,” resumed the voice, “he is risen as he said, Go and tell his disciples (Mat. xxviii, 6).” Turning towards the choir, they immediately sang the anthem, “The Lord is risen, &c.” when they were recalled by the voice to the sepulchre, with the words of the angel, “Come and see the place where the Lord lay (Mat. Ibid).” They entered, and returned bearing before them a winding sheet, and singing, “The Lord is risen from the grave.” The prior in thanksgiving intoned the *Te Deum*, and the office was continued in the usual manner.⁴⁰

Thomas Fosbroke, in his 1817 study of British monasticism, described the same ceremony from the *Regularis Concordia* in even more neutral terms and in the context of the liturgical events of the day:

On Easter-day the seven canonical hours were to be sung in the manner of the Canons; and in the night before Mattins [*sic*], the Sacrists (because our Lord rested in the tomb) were to put the Cross in its place. Then, during a religious service, four Monks robed themselves, one of whom in an alb, as if he had somewhat to do, came stealthily to the tomb, and there holding a palm branch, sat still, till the responsory was ended; when the three others, carrying censers in their hands, came up to him, step by step, as if looking for something. As soon as he saw them approach, he began singing in a soft voice (*dulcissime*), “Whom seek ye?” to which was replied by the three others in chorus, “Jesus of Nazareth.” This was answered

by the other,—“He is not here, he is risen.” At which words, the three last, turning to the choir, cried, “Alleluia, the Lord is risen.” The other then, as if calling them back, sung, “Come and see the place;” and then rising, raised the cloth, showed them the place without the Cross, and linen clothes in which it was wrapped. Upon this they laid down their censers, took the clothes, extended them to show that the Lord was risen, and singing an Antiphonar [*sic*], placed them upon the Altar. The whole was concluded with suitable offices. “On these seven days,” says Dunstan, “we do not sing.”⁴¹

For nearly two centuries, the chroniclers of the ritual practices of the early and medieval Church saw the ritual acts that would later be reclassified as liturgical drama as ceremonial rather than drama. Without exception, these writers associated the individual representational rites with particular monastic or ecclesiastical churches for use at particular times on particular dates of the liturgical year. Each was presented as it was placed within the manuscript from which it was drawn, and only one of the liturgical scholars gave particular notice that these ceremonies were at all different from any of the other liturgical rites they presented.

* * *

The seventeenth- and eighteenth-century chroniclers of drama’s past were also not wholly ignorant of what had gone before. In the first half of the eighteenth century, several texts now included among the liturgical dramas were brought to light, although these were regarded as plays with no particular reference to any intended liturgical use. In 1721, Bernhard Pez, in the second volume of his *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, became the first modern writer to use the word “ludus” to describe a medieval Latin text, applying the label “Ludus Paschalis, de Adventu et Interitu Antichristi” to the Tegernsee play of Antichrist⁴² and “Ludus Paschalis” to the Klosterneuburg Easter play.⁴³ In 1729, Jean Lebeuf described what would come to be known as the Fleury Playbook that he had discovered in the library of the monastery of Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire as containing “spectacles formerly given by ecclesiastic or religious figures to the public during the Office.”⁴⁴ In his description of the manuscript itself, he identified the text he intended to present (*Tres Clerici*, one of the four St. Nicholas “plays”) as a tragedy in very poor verse:

A thirteenth-century manuscript is preserved in the library of the monastery of Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire that contains a great number of these old representations. I doubt that one can find any others as

old in French: Tragedies like this are written in Latin verse; and in particular, the poor quality verse is set in plainchant-like old proses. I intend to offer at random one of these old productions to give you an idea of this grotesque and Gothic composition.⁴⁵

In the years that followed, a number of scholars in France published accounts of the history of French theater, although none took notice of the contributions of Pez or Lebeuf. In 1733, Louis-César de la Baume le Blanc published a listing of French plays and operas in his *Bibliothèque du théâtre François*, and the following year, the brothers Parfaict published their twelve-volume *Histoire du théâtre françois*. While the brothers Parfaict could point to the Feast of Fools and the *jeux partis* of the Troubadours as predecessors to the theater of France,⁴⁶ both they and de la Baume le Blanc saw the French theater beginning only with the performances of mysteries in the grand hall of the Hôpital de la Trinité in Paris in 1402 by the confrérie de la Passion.⁴⁷ The following year, Pierre-François Beauchamps offered much the same treatment, devoting the first chapter of his study of French drama to the Provençal poets and the second to the poets from Antiquity to the earliest French drama, which he situated in the performances by the confrérie in 1398 at Saint-Maur (near Paris).⁴⁸ Lebeuf took exception to these oversights, asking in 1735: “Is it possible that none of these compilers of theatrical materials have taken the trouble to consult this book [i.e., the Fleury manuscript]?”⁴⁹ and in 1741, he added to this neglected repertory of medieval Latin plays with a brief discussion of what he called the “tragédie en rimes latines” found within the twelfth-century *Sponsus* of Saint-Martial.⁵⁰ Despite the Lebeuf’s entreaties, these discoveries would remain in the shadows until illuminated by Magnin a century later. None of the early chroniclers of the theater in France took note of what appeared clearly to be spectacles performed within or about the church. Nor did any suspect that drama, however defined, had been long buried within the books of the Latin liturgy.

The lack of interest shown by French theatrical scholars to the discoveries of Pez and Lebeuf prevailed elsewhere in Europe as well. Students of English drama, for example, were largely indifferent to whatever may have come before. In 1742, Colley Cibber, actor, playwright, and Poet Laureate, declared: “The Drama did not grow into any Form in England, till the Reign of King Henry VIII.”⁵¹ A generation later, Thomas Hawkins, in a somewhat more thoughtful account, summarized the prevailing view among students of the English theater that the drama of their age was not a revival of the drama of the ancients but was something new altogether:

It will be sufficient for our purpose to contend, that it was a Distinct Species of itself, and not a Revival of the ANCIENT DRAMA, with which it cannot be compared and must never be confounded. If this point be clearly proved, we shall place our admirable SHAKESPEARE beyond the reach of Criticism; by considering him as the poet, who brought the drama of the Moderns to its highest perfection; and by dispensing with his obedience to the RULES of the ANCIENTS, which probably he did not know, but certainly did not mean to follow.⁵²

For the literary and liturgical scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there were two distinct kinds of events represented among the manuscripts known to them: one liturgical and one theatrical. Liturgical rites such as the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, no matter what dramatic qualities may have been perceived by later observers, were seen as ritual acts, while representations such as the Tegernsee play of Antichrist or those of the Fleury manuscript were regarded as dramatic events, to the extent they were regarded at all.

Protestant Protests (Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries)

A similar distinction is evident in the complaints of sixteenth-century Protestant critics, who included rites now identified as liturgical dramas among a wide array of ritual acts that they saw as idolatrous or overtly theatrical without ever singling these out for special consideration. Thomas Naogeorgus (Kirchmayer), in his *Regnum Papisticum* of 1553, roundly criticized the liturgical and popular devotional practices of the liturgical year from Advent through the post-Paschal feasts, including the feasts of the saints.⁵³ He outlined his approach to his treatment of the liturgical year in the opening of the fourth book. The following is from the somewhat garish translation provided by Barnabe Googe in 1570:

As Papistes doe believe and teach the vaynest things that bee,
So with their doctrine and their fayth, their life doth jump agree.
Their feasts and all their holidayes they kepe throughout the yeare
Are full of vile Idolatrie, and heathenlike appeare.⁵⁴

For Naogeorgus, Catholic liturgical practices were problematic in several respects. Some practices were superfluous and distracting, if not actually “heathenlike.” His description of the feast of St. Agnes (January 21), for example, focused not on the rite for the day, but on the wool gathered

from two lambs blessed during Mass at the church of St. Agnes in Rome, wool that would be woven into the pallium worn by the pope and later distributed to other bishops:

For in Saint Agnes Church upon this day while Masse they sing,
 Two Lambes as white as snowe, the Nonnes do yearely use to bring:
 And when the Agnus chaunted is, upon the aultar hie,
 (For in this thing there hidden is a solemne mysterie)
 They offer them. The servaunts of the Pope when this is done,
 Do put them into Pasture good till shearing time be come.
 Then other wooll they mingle with these holy fleeses twaine,
 Whereof being sponne and drest, are made the Pals of passing gaine:
 Three fingers commonly in bredth, and wrought in compasse so,
 As on the Bishops shoulders well they round about may go.⁵⁵

Ritual practices themselves, conversely, tended toward the idolatrous. The sepulcher rites of Good Friday and Easter morning were for him particularly troublesome with their pompous display of a wooden Christ wrapped in linens and silk that served as receptacle for the Host and ritually buried and resurrected in some representation of a sepulcher. He described what appears to have been a *Depositio Crucis et Hostiae* as follows:

An other Image doe they get, like one but newly deade,
 With legges stretcht out at length and handes, upon his body spreade:
 And him with pompe and sacred song, they beare unto his grave,
 His bodie all being wrapt in lawne, and silks and sarcenet brave,
 The boyes before with clappers go, and filthie noyses make,
 The Sexten beares the light, the people hearof knowledge take:
 And downe they kneele, or kisse the grounde, their handes helde up abroad
 And knocking on their breastes they make, this wooden blocke a God:
 And least in grave he shoulde remaine, without some companie,
 The singing bread is layde with him, for more idolatrie.⁵⁶

Other practices, particularly those that engaged non-clergy or clerics in non-clerical roles, tended toward the theatrical. He saw the Palm Sunday procession, for example, as a theatrical pageant, and he was equally put off by the “sundrie maskes and playes” of the Corpus Christi procession:

Christes passion here derided is, with sundrie maskes and playes,
 Faire Ursley with hir maydens all, doth pass amid the ways:
 And valiant George, with speare thou killest the dreadfull dragon here;
 The devils house is drawne about, wherein there doth appere
 A wondrous sort of damned sprites, with soule and fearefull looke;

Great Christopher doth wade and passe with Christ amid the brooke:
 Sebastian full of feathred shaftes, the dint of dart doth feele;
 There walketh Kathren with hir sworde in hande, and cruell wheele:
 The Challis and the singing Cake, with Barbara is led,
 And sundrie other Pageants playde in worship of this bred.⁵⁷

When he described what appears to be an Easter play or spectacle (and probably not a liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri*), his displeasure was similarly directed toward its theatrical presentation, particularly in its use what Barnabe Googe's fanciful translation described as "maskers brave, in straunge attire arrayd":

In some place solemne sightes and showes, and Pageants fayre are playd,
 With sundrie sortes of maskers brave, in straunge attire arayd,
 As where the Maries three doe meete, the sepulchre to see,
 And John with Peter swiftly runnes, before him there to bee,
 There things are done with iesture such, and with so pleasaunt game,
 That even the gravest men that live, woulde laugh to see the same.⁵⁸

For Naogeorgus, some popular practices, such as the wool gathering associated with the Feast of St. Agnes, were superfluous and a distraction from worship. Some ritual practices, such as the *Depositio Hostiae* of Good Friday and the *Elevatio Hostiae* of Easter morning, were idolatrous, distancing Christians further from the true source of their faith. Yet other practices, such as the procession of the ass on Palm Sunday, the procession of Saints on Corpus Christi, and the visit to the sepulcher on Easter morning were overtly theatrical: pageants and plays that involved masquers in costume rather than clergy in vestments. For Naogeorgus, a distinction between ritual and theater, while both were censured, was maintained. His understanding of "theater," moreover, went beyond anything that we might be comfortable calling "liturgical drama."

A few years later, Philipe van Marnix, in a Calvinist take on Catholic institutions and practice, offered much the same criticism.⁵⁹ His complaint about the theatrical nature of the Easter liturgy, though, was not directed at particular rites but toward what he regarded as the overtly representational similitude between liturgical actions and dress and the events of the Lenten and Easter seasons. He summarized his complaint thus (as translated by George Gilpin, the Elder): "In summe, Christ hath not done anie thing in his death and passion, but they do plaie and counterfeite the same after him, so trimlie and livelie, that no plaier nor juggler is able to do it better."⁶⁰

Among such “counterfeites,” Marnix included the reckoning of Lent according to the days Christ spent in the desert, the procession of Palm Sunday with its “wooden Asse round about, which the Pharisees & Priests following,” the papal crown in place of the crown of thorns, the pope’s bejeweled cross in place of the cross borne by Christ, the Cardinal’s red garments for the blood of Christ, the shape of the Host as the coins for which Christ was betrayed, the white garments worn by priests as the white garment with which Herod clothed Christ, the purple cope as the mantle that the Jews draped on Christ, the stoles, maniples, and surplices as the bindings of Christ, the priest’s outstretched arms during Mass as the outspread arms of Christ on the cross, the placement of the Host on a white cloth as the cloth used to bury Christ, and so on.⁶¹

Marnix’s account of the Good Friday and Easter rites themselves, though, appear somewhat fanciful, and it is unclear whether he had actually observed these rites himself or whether he was engaging in outraged hyperbole:

Yea, do we not see likewise, that upon good Friday they have a Crucifixe, either of wood, or of stone, which they laie downe softly upon the ground, that everie bodie may come creeping to it, upon handes and knees, & so kisse the feete of it, as men are accustomed to doe to the Pope of Rome: and then they put him in a grave, till Easter: at which time they take him upon againe, and sing, *Resurrexit, non est hic, Alleluia: He is risen, he is not here: God be thanked.* Yea and in some places, they make the grave in a hie place in the church where men must goe up manie steppes, which are decked with blacke cloth from above to beneath, and upon everie steppe standeth a silver candlesticke with a waxe candle burning in it, and there doe walke souldiours in harnesse, as bright as Saint George, which keepe the grave, till the Priests come & take him up: and then commeth sodenlie a flash of fire, wherewith they are all afraid and fall downe: and then upstartes the man, and they begin to sing *Alleluia*, on all handes, and then the clocke striketh eleven.⁶²

The complaints of Naogeorgus and Marnix were not specifically directed toward those liturgical rites now called liturgical drama. While both critics found much to condemn in Catholic ceremonial and practice over the course of the liturgical year, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and its related ceremonies (*Depositio Crucis* and *Elevatio Crucis*) were not pulled out for special consideration. These rites were certainly idolatrous, and even theatrical by sixteenth-century Protestant standards, but they were no more and no less

so than a great many other rites targeted by these critics. Both authors were well acquainted with theatrical presentations in their own time, and at least in the case of Naogeorgus, himself a playwright, drama did not necessarily elicit the negative connotations that had so engaged the fathers of the Church. The theatrical parallels seen by both authors were likely drawn more from their own experience of the stage than from the condemnations of early Christian and medieval exegetes. At the same time, the changes brought about by Humanism and the development of theater in the sixteenth century likely brought about a restructuring of the ways that the practice of liturgy was conceptualized and its rites celebrated. The experience of worship during the Renaissance varied widely from that of the High Middle Ages, and the similarities between Catholic rite and theater became for some Protestant observers both more obvious and more uncomfortable. For these critics, the two realms were incompatible. They may have found dramatic spectacle in the liturgy. However, they did not find liturgical drama.

* * *

Puritan polemics against stage-plays in England during the seventeenth century, conversely, included no complaints over theatrical activities occurring within the bounds of Christian worship. Most critics and defenders, in fact, focused their complaints and advocacy toward stage-plays, as they currently were known.⁶³ In one of the rare instances of a critic reaching back into history, Alexander Leighton, in his *A Short Treatise against Stage-Playes* from 1625, inveighed against the “sportes and playes” sponsored by several late-medieval and Renaissance popes in his discussion of drama’s entrance into the Christian church:

But when that great scarlet coloured whore of Babylon with her golden cup of abominations in her hand, which hath a name written in her forehead, a mysterie, great Babilon the mother of whoredomes, and which reigneth over the kings of the earth, was set in Peters chaire at Rome as the Papists say; and did the king of the Locusts, called *Abaddon* and *Apollyon*, having the key of the bottoemes pitt, with full power for such a purpose, sette the church doore wide open for sundrie sportes and playes to enter freely into the house of God, as . . . Paulus II. did. And that not onely in their great solemnities and festivals, which were spent commonly in bellie cheare and Playes, as . . . Urbanus III. much after the fashion of the Israelites, sitting downe to eate and drinke, and rising

up to play: but specially in their rich Iubilies, first begunne in the Christian church by Bonifacius VIII. in the yeare of Christ 1300, and afterward continued and hastened by his successors. Of which Sports and Playes Aventinus . . . speaking of Clemens VI. and Bale in the life of Iulius III. doe write. And thus much shall suffice for the beginning of Playes among the Lydians of Asia; and among the Grecians and Romans in Europe; as also for their entrance into the Christian church, first secretly by the malice of Satan stealing some Christians affections to such vanities; then openly by the power of that Abaddon of Rome, who besotted mens senses with such fooleries, that he might robbe their purses in his rich Iubilies.⁶⁴

Leighton's critique, like those of Naogeorgus and Marnix, was not directed toward anything we might recognize as liturgical drama, or even theater for that matter. His critique of the "playes" and Jubilees introduced by the various popes were directed toward sports and other entertainments rather than what might be seen within a church or on a stage (see the discussion of "Drama" in chapter 5, pp. 166–70).

Voices for Liturgical Reform (Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries)

Contemporaneous discussions of theatrical representations in the church, presented generally as complaints or prohibitions, also excluded from their targets the kinds of liturgical acts represented by the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, *Officium Pastorum*, and *Officium Stellae*. Gerhoh von Reichersberg (1093–1169), perhaps the most forceful critic during the twelfth century of theatrical spectacles in the church, directed his denunciations against those representations from Christmas and Epiphany in which he had taken part while *magister scholae* at the cathedral of Augsburg:

There was a virtuous enough cloister attached to that church, but it was completely lacking in claustral devotion, since the brothers neither slept in the dormitory nor ate in the refectory, except on very few feasts, especially on those when they represented Herod the persecutor of Christ, the murderer of the children, or by producing other plays or almost theatrical spectacles they made a token of having a banquet in the refectory that was empty at almost all other times.⁶⁵

However tempting it might be to claim otherwise, Gerhoh's complaint was not directed toward liturgical rites that we might now consider to be

liturgical dramas. Indeed, he offered no indication that the representations to which he objected were performed as a part of any liturgical observance at all. Rather as Lawrence Clopper noted, the representations to which Gerhoh objected were performed outside of the liturgy, and possibly in the refectory rather than in the church itself.⁶⁶ Such rites from Christmas and Epiphany, moreover, are altogether rare in the liturgical books of German-speaking Europe, making it unlikely that Gerhoch would have encountered these in any liturgical setting.⁶⁷ No such rites appear in the liturgical books of Augsburg, and of the churches with which Gerhoh had been associated, including the cathedrals at Hildesheim and Augsburg and the Augustinian monastery at Reichersberg am Inn, all observed the *Visitatio Sepulchri* as a part of their liturgical celebration for Easter.⁶⁸ And on these Gerhoh had nothing to say.

Herrad of Landsberg (ca. 1130–1195), abess of the Augustinian canonesses at the convent of Hohenburg in Alsace, complained in her *Hortus Deliciarum*⁶⁹ of a similar constellation of activities that took place during Epiphany and its octave:

The old Fathers of the Church, in order to strengthen the belief of the faithful and to attract the unbeliever by this manner of religious service, rightly instituted at the feast of the Epiphany or the Octave religious performances of such a kind as the star guiding the Magi to the new-born Christ, the cruelty of Herod, the dispatch of the soldiers, the lying-in of the Blessed Virgin, the angel warning the Magi not to return to Herod, and other events of the birth of Christ. But what nowadays happens in many churches? Not a customary ritual, not an act of reverence, but one of irreligion and extravagance conducted with all the license of youth. The priests having changed their clothes go forth as a troop of warriors; there is no distinction between priest and warrior to be marked. At an unfitting gathering of priests and laymen the church is desecrated by feasting and drinking, buffoonery, unbecoming jokes, play, the clang of weapons, the presence of shameless wenches, the vanities of the world, and all sorts of disorder. Rarely does such a gathering break up without quarreling.⁷⁰

Again, there is little in Herrad's words to suggest that her complaints were directed toward anything that we could characterize as liturgical drama, i.e., as drama occurring within the context of the sacred liturgy (however defined). While there were surely occasions of what some might consider excess in medieval liturgical practice—a thirteenth-century ordinal from

Padua, for example, directs a cleric in the person of Herod to throw a wooden spear toward the chorus before reading the ninth lesson of matins for the feast of Epiphany⁷¹—Herrad seems clearly to be complaining about something else altogether. Edmond Chambers, for one, saw her complaint as directed toward the Feast of Fools rather than toward any plays within the liturgy.⁷² It is also possible that she was responding to reports of such spectacles rather than to any experiences of her own, as Max Harris suggested in the case of Innocent III.⁷³ She was certainly unlikely to have encountered such travesties within her own convent. She distinguished between the customary rituals and the acts of reverence of her own religious experience, and contrasted these with the irreligious extravagances that elicited her complaints. As Clopper notes, “she is offended by the mixing together of laity and clergy,” and by “the inability to distinguish the clergy from the laity because clerics have abandoned their habits for knights’ armor.” Indeed, this very lack of liturgical vesting testifies to the differing realms in which liturgical representations and the spectacles in question were seen to reside. Clopper summarizes the issue:

Although it is true that liturgical texts may say that participants “signify” the angel or the *obstetrices* or the *Pastores*, they frequently indicate that the participants are wearing albs or amices. They are not costumed to represent a figure; rather, they are said to represent a figure in the liturgical responses. Herrad’s objection, by contrast, is to customs that misrepresent a clerical person.⁷⁴

In 1234, Pope Gregory IX, following the earlier injunctions by Innocent III, prohibited the performance of “*ludi teatrales, ludibria, larvae et spectacula*” within the church and/or by clerics, except, as the accompanying gloss notes: “This should not be construed as prohibiting representations of the Manger of our Lord, of Herod, the Magi, and Rachel crying for her sons, et cetera, that touch the feasts that we have already mentioned, that more effectively induce men to repent for their wantonness or pleasure, just as the sepulcher of the Lord and other representations excite devotion at Easter.”⁷⁵ As noted above, Max Harris has suggested that these strictures may have responded to unsubstantiated rumors rather than to any direct accounts. Even so, this gloss made two important distinctions: first, that there was a qualitative difference between the religious spectacles that were being prohibited and the liturgical representations and possibly plays of the Christmas season and second, that there was a further distinction between the representational rites of Easter, including presumably the

Visitatio Sepulchri, and their siblings from the Christmas season as well, the latter requiring special dispensation.⁷⁶

The critics of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries thus had nothing to say about those liturgical rites that we now include among the liturgical dramas. Their complaints were directed not toward an unwelcome intrusion of drama into the liturgy of the twelfth- and thirteenth-century Church, but rather toward the very existence of “theatrical” activities, spectacles, and possibly even plays, within the church precincts.⁷⁷ By invoking the rich associations of theater’s corrupting influence bequeathed by the fathers of the Church and later ecclesiastical writers,⁷⁸ Gerhoh, Herrad, and the two popes were able to convey the full extent of their dismay that such depraved practices could take place within the sacred spaces of a church. While it is quite likely that the representations that drew their ire can and could be seen as spectacle, these representations were by no measure liturgical drama.

* * *

The notion that theatrical spectacles had no place in Christian worship was firmly held from the earliest days of the Church through the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance and Reformation. The implications of this ban, moreover, carried through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and into the early nineteenth century. What may look like drama to an observer accustomed to theater both ubiquitous and broadly defined did not necessarily appear so to those during the eras when such events were commonplace. The *Visitatio Sepulchri* and other representational rites were ritual acts, and while their dramatic nature may seem obvious to us, there is little reason to suppose that any such notion would have been meaningful to those charged with celebrating these rites. The spectacles oft performed near or within churches, spectacles whose intent often still eludes us, conversely, were likely not confused for the liturgical rites that they might in some cases supplant. The critics of the Middle Ages were clear on this. Spectacles were condemned, while liturgical acts—no matter how dramatic they might one day appear—were left untouched. The critics of the Reformation, while spreading their condemnations further afield, still saw a distinction between spectacles—or pageants—and liturgical observance. And the scholars of the seventeenth through early-nineteenth centuries kept the distinction alive until it was dissolved by the followers of Magnin. This distinction between two very different sorts of things finds confirmation even among the so-called liturgical dramas

themselves. In a sixteenth-century ordinal from the Augustinian monastery of Herzogenburg, the rubric at the end of Easter matins directs: “Following the responsory [*Dum transisset*], the visit to the sepulcher takes place, and two young men preceding with luminaria. Having finished the responsory, if a *ludus* is not taking place, then sing the antiphon: *Maria Magdalena*.”⁷⁹ Even at this late date, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* was seen as a liturgical act, a liturgical act that was distinct from the *ludus* that might on some occasions supplant it. When the word “*ludus*” does appear among other texts since included among the liturgical dramas, moreover, and such appearances are rare, it appears in conjunction with texts for which no well-defined connection with the liturgy exists.⁸⁰

This distinction between rite and play, between liturgy and spectacle, is no mere artifact from some antiquarian’s cabinet of curiosities. The continuum between liturgy and drama recognized by contemporary scholars is a contemporary construct, a product of a frame of reference that has existed for only a century and three-quarters, and in its absence the distinctive nature of the rites and plays observed by Magnin’s predecessors can become tangible once again. This distinction remains worth considering and considering seriously. This becomes even more evident when we view the repertory of musical texts called “liturgical drama” according to the contexts of their presentation and preservation within the manuscripts and books that hold them.

NOTES

¹ Baker, *Apostolatus Benedictinorum*, “Appendix,” 89.

² Eveillon, *De processionalibus ecclesiasticis*, 177–79.

³ Bellotte, *Ritus ecclesiae Laudensis redivivi*, 1:215–17 and 2:819.

⁴ Le Prévôt/Le Brun des Marettes, *Joannis Abricensis Episcopi*, 206–15 and Le Brun des Marettes, *Voyages liturgiques de France*, 98.

⁵ Martène, *De antiquis monachorum ritibus* (1690), 446–47 and 450–51 and *Tractatus* (1706), 478–80, 481–82, 497–98, 501, 504, and 505. These were republished in his *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus* (1736–1738), 3:483–507 and 4:419–25 along with additional settings from Poitiers (3:484) and Saint-Vitus in Verdun (4:853). All are found in the posthumous editions of 1763, 1783, and 1788 as well. For Martène’s sources, see Martimort, *La documentation liturgique*, 127–29, 157–58, 224–27, 496, 519–20, 523, and 544–47.

⁶ Gerbert, *Vetus liturgia alemannica*, 2/3:864 and *Monumenta veteris liturgiae allemannicae*, 2:237.

⁷ Würdtwein, *Commentatio historico-liturgica*, 179–81 and 187–88.

⁸ Frisi, *Memorie storiche di Monza*, 3:195–97.

⁹ Le Prévôt/Le Brun des Marettes, *Joannis Abricensis Episcopi*, 206–10.

¹⁰ Martène, *Tractatus*, 111–12.

¹¹ Martène, *Tractatus*, 114.

¹² Crombach, *Primitiae Gentium*, 723–34.

¹³ Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 3:186–87 (*Pastorum officium*), 241 (*Peregrinorum officium*), 814–15 (*Sepulchrum officium*), and 956–57 (*Stella festum*).

¹⁴ Charnage, *Histoire de l’église*, 1:262–63.

¹⁵ Baker, *Apostolatus Benedictinorum*, Appendix, 77–94. The *Regularis Concordia* was given as *Scriptura* 55 in the appendix, which included the documents on which the text of the work as a whole was based and which was paginated independently of the main text. The *Visitatio Sepulchri* is given on p. 89.

¹⁶ Eveillon, *De processionalibus ecclesiasticis*, 171. “De Processione matutine ante Laudes, in die Paschae.”

¹⁷ “In Ecclesia Andegauensi celebratur hoc mysterium finito tertio Responso Matutini, hoc modo. Paratur Altare maius vice monumenti Christi, velis suprâ & ab anteriori parte obtentis, quasi tabernaculum extemporaneum. Adhaerent Altari duo maiores Capellani, superpellicio & cappa candida induti, alter ad cornu dextrum, alter ad sinistrum, qui repraesentent Angelos ad monumentum sedentes. Tum procedunt à Secretario duo Corbicularij, alba & dalmatica candida ornati, capit amictu circumtecto, sed amictu superinducta mitella purpurea, mulieres ad monumentum venientes exhibituri, praecedentibus duòbus pueris symphoniacis cum thuribulis. Hi, vbi in aditu Altaris constiterint, illicantes interrogant: *Quem quaeritis in sepulcro?* Respondent hi, similiter canentes: *Iesum Nazarenum crucifixum*. Tum illi: *Non est hic: surrexit, sicut praedixerat. Venite, & videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus*. Hoc audito, Corbicularii, introeunt in monumentum,

& illud venerantur, osculantes Altare in medio, quasi Dominum suum, cuius desiderio venerant, prae suavitate amoris basiantes: atque interea duo pueri Altare terno ductu incensant. Tunc Capellani: *Ite, nuntiate discipulis eius, quia surrexit.* Adhanc vocem Corbicularii pergunt in Chorum, praecentibus duobus pueris, cantantes elata voce: *Alleluia. Resurrexit Dominus hodie, resurrexit leo fortis, Christus filius Dei.* Quibus vna voce respondent omnis Chorus: *Deo gratias; dicite, eia.* Interea verò duo illi Corbicularii accedentes ad Episcopum, facta reuerentia, eum osculo salutant, submissa voce quasi in aurem dicentes: *Resurrexit Dominus, Alleluia.* Quibus respondet Episcopus osculum reddens: *Deo gratias, Alleluia.* Et statim prae laetitia in iubilum erumpens, intonat Hymnum, *Te Deum laudamus,* duobus pueris interea thus ei adolentibus.” Eveillon, *De processionalibus ecclesiasticis*, 177–79. Eveillon’s use of the term “mysterium” here follows his usage of this word elsewhere in his treatise, in its theological rather than its dramatic sense. For example, he refers to “the mystery of the fullness of Christ’s grace” (hoc mysterium plenitudinis gratiae Christi, p. 56), to the “mystery of the Ascension” (mysterium Ascensionis, p. 33) and the “mystery of the Passion” (mysterium passionis, p. 144). This is reprinted by Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:250–52 and LOO 1:106–8 (LOO 89). Both Young and Lipphardt quote from the 1655 edition.

¹⁸ On the life and work of Jacques Eveillon, see Nicéron *et al.*, *Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire des hommes* (1729–1745), 14:297–303.

¹⁹ Martène, *De antiquis monachorum ritibus*, 446. “Post tertium Responsorum singularem ritum praescribit in Concordia, his verbis.” This is given in the eleventh of thirty-six sections outlining various rites for Easter Sunday (chapter 16, *De Resurrectione Dominica*), where he offers also transcriptions of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Saint-Aper in Toul (446–47, LOO 168A), Saint-Denis (450, not in LOO: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 564, 57r), and Monte Cassino (450–51, LOO 14: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 364, 309v) and an *Elevatio Crucis* from Bursfeld (447, LOO 212C [as Fulda]: Fulda, Landesbibliothek, MS 8^o Aa.138, 73v). See n. 30 in chapter 1.

²⁰ Martène, *Tractatus*, 75 (*De feriis quatuor temporum*).

²¹ Martène, *Tractatus*, 87 (*Processio ad praesepe*).

²² Martène, *Tractatus*, 106–7 (no title given)

²³ Martène, *Tractatus*, 111–12 (*Officium trium Regum*)

²⁴ Martène, *Tractatus*, 114 (*Paschatis dies in Epiphania populo annuntiatus*).

²⁵ Martène, *Tractatus*, 478–79 (Laon, *Processio eiusdam SS. Sacramentii*, LOO 109) and 479–80 (Narbonne, *Processio ad Domini Sepulcrum*, LOO 116).

²⁶ Martène, *Tractatus*, 481–82 (*Processio post Tertiam*, LOO 63).

²⁷ Martène, *Tractatus*, 497–98 (Soissions, LOO 167: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 8898, 97v–100v), 501 (Tours, LOO 169), 504 (Vienne, LOO 73), 505 (Strasbourg, LOO 342: Sélestat, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 81, 82r–v) and *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus*, 3:484 (Poitiers, LOO 152) and 4:853 (Verdun, LOO 360).

²⁸ The 1679 edition included the text provided by Le Prévôt, *Joannis Abricen-*

sis *Episcopi* of 1642 plus the appendices added by Le Brun des Marettes.

²⁹ Le Prévôt/Le Brun, *Joannis Abricensis*, 206–10 (*Officium Stellae*), and 211–15 (*Visitatio Sepulchri*). Reprinted in PL 147:139–42. On the Bigot collection, see chapter 1, n. 53.

³⁰ Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 3:186–87 (*Pastorum officium*), 241 (*Peregrinorum officium*), 814–15 (*Sepulchri officium*), and 956–57 (*Stellum festum*).

³¹ Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 3:186.

³² Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 3:241.

³³ Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 3:814.

³⁴ Du Cange, *Glossarium*, 3:956–57.

³⁵ “Vigilia & festum Epiphaniae ubique; festivis gaudiis, & inusitatis ritibus peragitur, de tripudio Coloniensi, Vesontionensi [*sic*], et Friburgensi.” Crombach, *Primitiae Gentium*, 731.

³⁶ *Novae geniturae* is given in RH as no. 12329, and in AH 20:63. This *prosa* is sung as the kings process to the Marian altar. *Nos respectu gratiae* is given in RH as no. 12241 and is sung prior to ascending to the pulpit. See Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:38.

³⁷ A description of the service is provided by Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:41.

³⁸ “His piis dramatis Burgundia per multa secula memoriam recolit translationis per ipsorum terram factae: quam pietatem Deus innumeris & quotidianis miraculis ad fontem SS. trium Regum patris muneratur.” Crombach, *Primitiae Gentium*, 734.

³⁹ “Le troisième & dernier Répons de Matines étant fini, les deux Maires-Chapelains du Choeur qui sont chapez avec le Chantre vont à l’Autel, & y étant cachez derriere le drap, deux Corbeliers en dalmatique, ayant l’amit simple sur la tête, & pardessus cet amit une espece de calotte brodée appellée en latin *Mitella*, & des gants ou mitaines en leurs mains, se présentent à l’Autel. Les Maires-Chapelains chantent en les interrogeant, *Quem quaeritis?* Les Corbeliers representans les Maries répondent *Jesum Nazarenum crucifixum*. Les Maires Chapelains, *Non est hic, surrexit sicut praedixerat; venite, & videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus*. Le Corbeliers entrent, & les Maires-Chapelains continuent de chanter, *Ite, nuntiate discipulis ejus quia surrexit*. Les Corbeliers prennent en entrant deux oeufs d’Autruche enveloppez dans une toile de soye, & vont au Choeur en chantant *Alleluia, Resurrexit Dominus, resurrexit leo fortis, Christus filius Dei*. Le Choeur répond, *Deo gratias, Alleluia*.” Le Brun des Marettes, *Voyages liturgiques de France*, 98 (LOO 90). He notes that this *Office du sépulcre* with the same text was used also at Rouen, having been in use there as recently as a century or a century and a half earlier, but since abolished. Le Brun des Marettes was well aware of the medieval Rouen ceremonies, having published and contributed to the 1679 edition of Le Prévôt’s *Jean Abricensis Episcopi* (see n. 28). Le Brun des Marettes’s liturgical voyage was completed certainly before 1697 as witnessed by the *Approbation* offered that year by J. A. Auvray, canon and penitentiary at the cathedral church

in Rouen (p. xii). Magnin notes that the publication was delayed due to Le Brun des Marettes's imprisonment at the Bastille (1707–1711) over his role in the Jansenist controversy. See Magnin, Review of Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, 531–32.

⁴⁰ Lingard, *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, 420–21. The quotation is taken from the second edition of 1810. Lingard's knowledge of this ceremony was drawn from the transcription of the *Regularis Concordia* provided by Baker, *Apostolatus Benedictinorum*, "Appendix," 89.

⁴¹ Fosbroke, *British Monachism*, 65–66. This passage may well be in the first edition of 1802 as well, but I was unable to locate a copy of this prior to publication. In a later chapter (p. 94), Fosbroke outlined the *Visitatio Sepulchri* as celebrated at the cathedral of Rouen as given by du Cange. This was drawn from du Cange's article on "Sepulchri officium." Again, this was presented with not even a hint that the author saw this as a species of drama.

⁴² Pez, *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, 2/3:185. He provides a transcription of the text for the play, which has no music, on pages 185–96. The manuscript containing this untitled play, which was formerly held by the library of the monastery at Tegernsee, is now in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 19411 (the *ludus* is found on fols. 2v–7r).

⁴³ Pez provides a brief description of the Klosterneuburg *Ludus Paschalis* (entitled *Ordo Paschalis* in the manuscript) in the introduction to volume 2 of the *Thesaurus*, 2:liii. The Klosterneuburg play is preserved in Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, CCl. 574, 142v–144v (LOO 829). On the rediscovery of the Klosterneuburg manuscript, see chapter 1, n. 38.

⁴⁴ Lebeuf, "Remarques envoyée d'Auxerre," 2981.

⁴⁵ "On conserve dans la Bibliotheque de l'Abbaye de S. Benoît sur Loire, un Manuscrit du treizième siècle qui contient un grand number de ces anciennes representations. Je doute qu'on en trouve en France d'aussi anciennes en langage François: ces especes de Tragédies sont écrites en rimes latines; & ce qu'il y a de plus particulier, c'est que la rimaille est notée en Plain-Chant comme les anciennes Proses. Je voulois tirer au hazard une de ces anciennes productions pour vous donne une idée de cette grotesque & gothique composition." Lebeuf, "Remarques envoyée d'Auxerre," 2986.

⁴⁶ Parfaict, *Histoire du théâtre françois*, 1:1–13.

⁴⁷ Parfaict, *Histoire du théâtre françois*, 1:v and de la Baume le Blanc, *Bibliothèque du théâtre François*, 200–201.

⁴⁸ Beauchamps, *Researches sur les théâtres de France*, 1–70 (*Histoire des poètes provençaux*), 71–89 (*Discours sur l'origine des spectacles en France*), 90–101 (*Établissement des théâtres*).

⁴⁹ "Est-il possible qu'aucun de ces Compileurs des matieres Théatrales n'ait pris la peine d'aller consulter ce Livre." Jean Lebeuf, "Lettre d'un solitaire," 700.

⁵⁰ Lebeuf, *Dissertation sur l'histoire*, 2:65. The manuscript containing this play, which was formerly held by the library of the monastery at Saint-Martial

in Limoges, is now in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 1139 (the *Sponsus* is found on fols. 53v–58v).

⁵¹ Cibber, *History of the Stage*, 1.

⁵² Hawkins, *Origin of the English Drama*, 1:i.

⁵³ Naogeorgus (Kirchmayer), *Regnum Papisticum*, 129–74 (pagination from the revised edition of 1559), translated by Googe as *The Popish Kingdome*, 44r–60r. Among the feasts, rites, and popular devotions lampooned were those associated with Advent, Christmas, St. Stephen, St. John, Holy Innocents, Circumcision, Epiphany, St. Agnes, the Purification of Mary, St. Blaise, Shrovetide and Ash Wednesday, Lent, Palm Sunday and its procession, Holy Thursday, Good Friday, Holy Saturday, Easter Sunday, the Rogation days and their processions, Ascension, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, St. Urban, St. Vitus, John the Baptist, St. Ulrich, the Assumption of Mary, St. Martin, St. Nicholas, St. Andrew, the Dedication of the Church, and All Souls Day, along with funerals and other occasional rites. Naogeorgus was also the author of a number of religious plays, including the Latin drama *Pammachius*, which cast the pope as Antichrist. *Pammachius* was popular enough to warrant a translation into English by Thomas Bale (1495–1563), although the translation does not survive. See Harris, *John Bale*, 75.

⁵⁴ Googe/Naogeorgus, *The Popish Kingdome*, 44r.

⁵⁵ Googe/Naogeorgus, *The Popish Kingdome*, 46v.

⁵⁶ Googe/Naogeorgus, *The Popish Kingdome*, 51v.

⁵⁷ Googe/Naogeorgus, *The Popish Kingdome*, 53v.

⁵⁸ Googe/Naogeorgus, *The Popish Kingdome*, 52v. Naogeorgus's original is somewhat less garish: "Quod tamen haud credunt: id quod testantur ubique Cultibus ac studijs, dubio, factisque metuque. Est ubi continuo ludi et spectacula dantur. Ut tres convenient Mariae, visantque sepulchrum, Cumque Petro currat velox Zebedeia proles. Haec tam ridicule fiunt gestuque iocisque, ut Crassum possint aut exhilarare Catonem." Naogeorgus, *Regnum Papisticum*, 153.

⁵⁹ Marnix, *Biënkorf der H. Roomsche Kercke* (1569). The discussion of the rites for Lent, for Holy Week, and for the post-Paschal feasts is given in fols. 219v–226v. This work was translated into English by Gilpin as *Beehive of the Romish Church* (1579). The relevant section is found in fols. 197v–204v.

⁶⁰ Marnix/Gilpin, *Beehive of the Romish Church*, 200v.

⁶¹ Marnix/Gilpin, *Beehive of the Romish Church*, 198r–200v.

⁶² Marnix/Gilpin, *Beehive of the Romish Church*, 200v–201r. The reference to "St. George" is in the English translation only.

⁶³ See, for example, Gosson, *The Schoole of Abuse* (1579); Lodge, *Reply to Gosson's Schoole of Abuse* (1579 or 1580); Sydney, *An Apologie for Poetrie* (1595); Rainold, *The overthrow of Stage-Playes* (1599) and Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix* (1633). James Wright, *Historia Histrionica* (1699), offers one of the first accounts of medieval stage practices in England. See also C. Clifford Flanigan, "From Popular Performance Genre."

⁶⁴ Leighton, *A Shorte Treatise against Stage-Playes* (1625), 8–9.

⁶⁵ “Cohaerebat ipsi ecclesiae claustrum satis honestum, sed a claustrali religione omnino vacuum, cum neque in dormitorio fratres dormirent, neque in refectorio comederent, exceptis rarissimis festis, maxime, in quibus Herodem repraesentarent Christi persecutorem, parvulorum interfectorem seu ludis aliis aut spectaculis quasi theatralibus exhibendis comportaretur symbolum ad faciendum convivium in refectorio, alis pene omnibus temporibus vacuo.” Translation by Boynton, “Performative Exegesis,” 42. The relevant passage is from *Gerhoch Praepositi Reichersgergensis Commentarium in Psalmos*, PL 194:890–91. Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage*, 2:98, offered the following lively summary: “He scoffs at the monks of Augsburg who, when he was *magister scholae* there about 1122, could only be induced to sup in the refectory, when a representation of Herod or the Innocents or some other quasi-theatrical spectacle made an excuse for a feast.”

⁶⁶ Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, 46.

⁶⁷ While the majority of the early sources for the *Officium Stellae* are of German origin, only two show evidence of a liturgical association, and in neither case is the evidence conclusive. Rankin, “Ottonian Epiphanies.” I thank Dr. Rankin for allowing me access to a later version of this paper. See also the discussion in chapter 4, pp. 124–26 (“Ambiguously Situated Representations”). The two possibly liturgical settings of the *Officium Stellae* include Lambach, Stiftsbibliothek, Fragment I, 1r (Münsterschwarzach) and London, British Library, MS Additional 23922, 8v–11r (Strasbourg). On the Lambach fragment, see Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphony*, 119–21 and Morandi, *Officium Stellae*, 72–74.

⁶⁸ See LOO Nos. 217–22 (Hildesheim); 505–29 (Augsburg); and 602 (Reichersberg am Inn).

⁶⁹ The *Hortus Deliciarum* (Garden of Delights) was an illuminated encyclopedia of Christian knowledge compiled by Herrad for the edification of the canonesses under her charge, the novices in particular. This manuscript also included a number of poems and musical works, along with 336 illustrations. The manuscript, which had been preserved in the convent of Hohenburg for five centuries, passed into the municipal library in Strasbourg during the French revolution only to be destroyed during the Prussian siege of Strasbourg in 1870. Fortunately, much of the text had been copied by a number of scholars over the years along with copies and tracings of the illustrations. Tracings of many illustrations appeared in Engelhardt, *Herrad von Landsberg* (1818). The text of much of the manuscript was published by Straub and Keller, *Hortus deliciarum* (1879). More recently, a reconstruction of the manuscript along with a scholarly treatment of the surviving sources was provided by Green, *Hortus Deliciarum* (1979). See also Griffiths, *The Garden of Delights* (2006) for a compelling treatment of Herrad, the *Hortus Deliciarum*, and the intellectual and spiritual milieu within which the manuscript was created.

⁷⁰ “De sancta die vel octava Epiphaniae ab antiquis patribus religio quedam imaginaria de Magis stella duce Christum natum querentibus, de Herodis sevitia et eius malitia fraudulenta, de militibus parvulorum obruncationi deputa-

tis, de lectulo Virginis et angelo Magos ne redirent premonente et de ceteris die illius appendiciis prefinita est per quam fides credentium augetur gratia divina magis coleretur et in ipsa spiritali officio etiam incredulus ad culturam divinam excitaretur. Quid nunc? Quid nostris agitur in quibusdam ecclesiis temporibus? Non religionis formula non divine venerationis et cultus materia sed irriligiositatis dissolutionis exercetur iuvenilis lascivia. Mutatur habitus clericalis, incohatur ordo militaris, nulla in sacerdotis vel milite differentia, domus Dei permixtione laicorum et clericorum confunditur, commessiones, ebrietates, scurrilatates, ioci inimici ludi placesibiles armorum strepitus, ganeorum concursus omnium vanitatum indiciplanatus excursus. Huc accedit quod aliquo discordie genere semper turbatur hoc regnum et si alio modo pacifice incohatur vix sine dissidentium gravi tumultu terminator.” Translation by Pearson, *The Chances of Death* (1897), 2:285–86. The excerpt is taken from a brief treatise on the religious life found near the end of the *Hortus Deliciarum*, 314v–315v. See also Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:413–14.

⁷¹ Padua Biblioteca Capitolare. E.57, 58r–v. See Morandi, *Officium Stellae*, 97–99 and Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:99–100.

⁷² Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage*, 1:318–19

⁷³ Harris, *Sacred Folly*, 86–97.

⁷⁴ Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, 48.

⁷⁵ “Non tamen hoc prohibetur representare presepe Domini, Herodem, Magos et qualiter Rachel plorat filios suos, et cetera, que tagunt festiuitates illas de quibus hic fit mentio, cum talia portius inducant homines ad compunctionem quam ad lasciuam vel voluptatem, sicut in Pasca sepulchrum Domini et alia representantur ad deuotionem excitandam” [my translation]. Cited by Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:416–17.

⁷⁶ The distinction between approved and disapproved representations was first noted by D’Ancona, *Origini del Teatro italiano* (1891), 1:53–54 and later picked up by Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas* (1893), 1:94 and Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage*, 2:99–100. See Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:417.

⁷⁷ See especially Clopper’s critique of earlier views on these texts, Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, 43–49.

⁷⁸ The ways in which Christian writers understood and dealt with the notion of “theatrum” from the time of Augustine until the early fourteenth century is treated in Donnalee Dox’s comprehensive and engaging study, *The Idea of Theater*.

⁷⁹ Herzogenburg, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 173, 150v (LOO 589). “Et sub isto responsorio [Dum transisset] fit visitatio sepulchri, et duo iuvenes antecedant cum luminibus. Finito responsorio, cum non habetur ludus, tunc canitur antiphona: Maria Magdalena” [my translation]. The *Visitatio Sepulchri* associated with the monastery of Herzogenburg begins with the words: “Maria Magdalena et alia Maria.” For other settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Herzogenburg, see LOO 587–88). Given the array of possible meanings for the word “ludus,” I leave it untranslated here. See the discussion in chapter 5, pp. 166–70 (“Drama”).

⁸⁰ The use of the term “ludus” is found only occasionally and only in works that have no clear liturgical connection. Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:408, lists the following instances of the term in the texts that he treated: “Incipit Danielis Ludus” (Beauvais ‘Play of Daniel’), “Ludus super Iconia Sancti Nicolai” (Hilarius version), and “Incipit ludus, immo exemplum, Dominicae Resurrectionis” (from the *Carmina Burana*, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 4660a, 5r–6v). In addition, the Klosterneuburg Easter Play, while given the title “Ordo Paschalis” in the manuscript, is labeled “Ludus Paschalis” in an inventory of the Klosterneuburg library prepared in 1330. On the medieval library catalogues at Klosterneuburg, see Gottlieb, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge*, 1:83–120.