Liturgical Drama and the Reimagining of Medieval Theater

Michael Norton

MEDIEVAL INSTITUTE PUBLICATIONS

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

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
are available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: 9781580442626
eISBN: 9781580442633

Chapter 5

What's in a Name? Defining "Liturgical Drama"

THE EXPRESSION "LITURGICAL DRAMA" is problematic on its face, its origin and the complexion of its repertory notwithstanding. While both the words "liturgy" and "drama" were ancient in origin, neither entered common usage in the west before the early sixteenth century, thus limiting the utility of their union over most of the span during which the texts now called "liturgical drama" flourished. Over the past five centuries, moreover, both words have accrued meanings and associations that are both vast and nebulous, associations for which medieval equivalents remain elusive. Both the history and the usage of these terms demonstrate the improbability, if not the contradiction, of their combination. Seen against this backdrop of its terms, in fact, the expression "liturgical drama" turns out to be largely meaningless with no clear referents to which it can point.

Liturgy

The word "liturgy" (Latin: "liturgia") derives from the Greek "λειτουργία" (leitourgia), a composite word that referred in Hellenistic times to the public service expected of a citizen.[1] This sense of the word was retained in the Septuagint and in the New Testament, although the service was often ritual or cultic in function.[2] For the eastern Church, the word "leitourgia" came to refer specifically to the celebration of the Eucharist, a sense that it has maintained until the present day. Whether Greek or Latin, however, this word was unknown to the medieval west. For the medieval commentators on the Latin rites, some variation of the word "officium" had a more expansive reach. To be sure, "officium" had a sense similar to that of the Greek "leitourgia" during the Roman era. Cicero's *De officiis*, for example, is typically translated as "On Obligations" or "On Duties."[3] St. Ambrose (ca. 340–397) modeled his treatise of the same name on that of Cicero, and it treated the notions of duties or obligations from a Christian perspective.[4] By the late sixth century, the word "officium," now modified by "ecclesiasticus" or "divinus," came to represent the broader requirements for the administration of Christian rituals, the "ecclesiastical duties" as it were.[5] Among the many commentaries on the rites of the Church written over the course of the Middle Ages were *De ecclesiasticis officiis* of Isidore of Seville (ca. 600),[6] the *Liber officialis* of Amalarius of Metz (ca. 820),[7] the *Liber de officiis ecclesiasticis* of John of Avranches (before 1067),[8] the *Liber de divinis officiis* of Rupert of Deutz (d. 1129),[9] the *Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis* of John Beleth (1160–1164),[10] *De officiis ecclesiasticis* of Robert Paululus (ca. 1175–1185),[11] the *Mitralis, sive, De officiis ecclesiasticis summa* of Sicard of Cremona (ca. 1180),[12] *De officiis ecclesiasticis* of William of Auxerre (ca. 1215–1225),[13] and the *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum* of William Durand (late thirteenth century).[14]

For these authors, such *officia* extended beyond the Mass itself. Isidore, for example, discussed the types of chant (responsories, antiphons, psalms, canticles, hymns, etc.) and readings used during Mass and Divine Office, the parts of the Mass, the daily round of services making up the Divine Office, the order of the liturgical year, the ranks of clerics, along with discussions on virgins, widows, married persons, and the rites of Christian initiation. Two centuries later, Amalarius of Metz offered an expanded range of topics in four books, including the liturgical *cursus* from Septuagesima through Pentecost and from Advent and Christmas, the clerical ranks from doorkeeper to bishop, clerical vestments, the Rogation and Ember Days, and extended discussions of both Mass and Divine Office. By the late thirteenth century, the scope of coverage had so expanded that William Durand, in what would become the semi-official manual for matters liturgical until the Renaissance, could extend his commentary over eight books, including treatments on the church building and its parts, the clergy, clerical vestments, the structure of the Mass, the structure of the Divine Office, the proper of the time, the proper of the saints, and the organization of time.

In addition to providing discussions of and explanations for the many aspects of Christian ritual celebration, commentators from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries offered treatments for a number of popular devotions from the Christmas and Easter seasons as well. John Beleth, for example, was the first to discuss the so-called Feast of Fools in his *Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis*, written between 1160 and 1164:

> The feast of the subdeacon, which we call *of fools*, by some is executed on the Circumcision, but by others on Epiphany or its octave.

> And four "tripudia" are made in the church after the Nativity of the Lord: to wit, of deacons, of priests, of boys, that is, of those of the least age and rank, and of the subdeacons, whose ordo is unspecified. It is so made because sometimes it has been counted among the sacred orders, sometimes not, thus expressly from this is understood that it might not have a special time and might be celebrated with a confused office.[15]

William of Auxerre, writing in the early thirteenth century, offered an explanation for the feast as a substitute for the pagan *Parentalia* and saw the *ordo* as one way that activities (*ludi*) against the faith could be replaced by activities (*ludi*) that were not against the faith.[16] William Durand drew from both Beleth and William of Auxerre in his treatment, which he divided between his descriptions of the feast of the Circumcision in book VI and the feasts of Stephen, John, and Holy Innocents in book VII.[17]

Drawing on both John Beleth and Honorius Augustodiensis, Sicard of Cremona, writing in the early part of the thirteenth century, described the game of *pila* played in many churches at Easter as a holdover from the pagan December Freedom, and he invoked biblical parallels in a half-hearted effort to justify its continuation:

> Thus it is that in the cloisters of certain churches even bishops enjoy the December freedom with their clerics, even to descending to the game of the circular dance or ball (*ludum choreae vel pilae*)—although it seems more praiseworthy not to play; this "December freedom" is so called in that in the month of December, shepherds, servants, and maidservants were governed among the gentiles with a kind of freedom by their masters, so that they could celebrate with them after the harvest was collected. . . . But what those people showed to their idols, the worshipers of the one God converted to his praise. For the people who crossed from the Red Sea are said to have led a circular dance, Mary is reported to have sung with the tambourine; and David danced before the ark with all his strength and composed psalms with his harp, and Solomon placed singers around the altar, who are said to have created sound with voice, trumpet, cymbals, organs, and other musical instruments.[18]

The commentators described also a practice known in German as *Schmackostern* or *Stiepern*, where women flogged their husbands with a switch on the day after Easter and their husbands returned the favor two days later, a practice that Beleth saw as particularly effective in warding off carnal lust during the days following Easter:

> And, moreover, it should be noted therefore that in many places on the second day after Easter, women beat their husbands, and the men vice versa on the third day, just as the slaves were allowed in December to charge their own masters with impunity. They do this to show that they should correct one another and not make demands during that time should demands come from the other bed.[19]

Aside from the Feast of Fools, these customs were tied to specific churches or regions and were likely not practiced in the western Church at large. These were local and particularized customs, found "in many places" (Beleth on *Schmackostern*) or "in the cloisters of certain churches" (Sicard on *pila*). These were ritual actions certainly in that they were an integral part of the religious customs for those communities. However, these were not specified within any liturgical books that have come down to us.

* * *

Excursus. Other particularized customs were both more widespread and widely documented in liturgical manuals. Beleth, Sicard, and Durand, for example, offered descriptions for what appears to be a *Visitatio Sepulchri* celebrated at the end of matins on Easter morning. None, however, appears to have had personal knowledge of the rites they described. John Beleth, who was likely teaching in Paris when his *Summa* was written, describes a *Visitatio Sepulchri* that was more in line with ceremonies east of the Rhine than any surviving from Paris and its environs:[20]

> In some churches we sing the last responsory with lit candles and make a solemn procession from the choir to a certain place where a representation of a sepulcher has been placed, and here are introduced persons in the persona of the women and the disciples, namely Peter and John who came to the tomb, and others as the angels who told that Christ was risen from the dead. And one returns more rapidly than the other, as John *ran faster than Peter*. Then they return to the choir, bringing back what they have seen and heard. Then the chorus, having heard of the resurrection of Christ, breaks out in a loud voice, singing *Te Deum laudamus*.[21]

In his vague and imprecise treatment, Beleth described what appears to be a German Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri*. According to Beleth, the clerics who stood in place of the angel(s), women, and disciples left the choir and processed to a place where a temporary structure representing the sepulcher had been built, corresponding to the German practice of celebrating the rite in the nave. In Parisian settings of this rite, the clerics advanced only as far as the cross that hung above the choir's west door.[22] Beleth's description focused not on the Marys, moreover, but on the apostles Peter and John, who were integral to the German Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri* but who are not present in Parisian settings of this rite. The earliest settings of the Parisian *Visitatio Sepulchri* date only from the early thirteenth century, a half-century after Beleth wrote his *Summa*, and there is little reason to suspect that the rite could have changed so radically over so short a time or that an earlier form would have been modeled on that of German exemplars.[23] In failing even to mention the exchange between the Marys and the angel, Beleth appears to be describing a rite with which he was unfamiliar, a second-hand account perhaps from one of the many German students then resident in Paris.

Both Sicard and Durand built on Beleth's description, and both attempted to clarify the ambiguities of Beleth's text. Neither, however, came any closer to describing an actual *Visitatio Sepulchri*. While the descriptions by Sicard and Durand provided more detail, the particulars of Beleth's description remained: clerics were assigned to represent the women, the apostles Peter and John, and the angels; these clerics processed from the choir to the place of a temporary sepulcher; and the angels announced the resurrection to the clerics who then returned to pass the news to the chorus. What was new, aside from some variations in wording, was the specification of two responsories that were to be sung without their verses. *Nolite timere* [*scio enim*] was sung by the angel to announce the resurrection, thus serving in place of the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue that would normally appear at this point. This responsory, drawn from the first nocturn for Easter matins (*Angelus domini descendit de* caelo, CAO 6093), is not otherwise found among the surviving settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*. *Congratulamini* [*mihi omnes*] (CAO 6322) was sung by the clerics upon their return to the choir, serving as the announcement to the chorus that Christ had risen. This responsory was drawn from the first nocturn of matins on Easter Monday and appears also in the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the convent of Sainte-Croix in Poiters (LOO 151) and in the *Ludus Paschalis* of Fleury (LOO 779). Durand added also the singing of *Victimae paschali laudes* following the *Te Deum*, a placement not otherwise evident among the surviving sources of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*.[24]

* * *

The Latin form of the word, "liturgia," entered the vocabulary of the west in the early sixteenth century, and among Roman Catholic writers at least, it retained the sense of the Greek "leitourgia" in referring to the Mass alone, whether Latin or Greek. In 1523, for example, Desiderius Erasmus published his Mass for Our Lady of Loreto as *Virginis Matris apud Laurentum cultae Liturgia*. In 1540, Georg Witzel offered a German translation of the *Leitourgia* (Mass) of John Chrysostom, and he used the germanicized version of the Latin equivalent "Liturgy" (for "Liturgie"), when referring to this and the Mass of other eastern rites in his discussion.[25] Later Catholic authors, particularly those writing in the wake of the Council of Trent, held to this sense of the word as well, and for the next century and a half the word "liturgia," in all of its variations, remained focused on the celebration of this most sacred mystery of the Church. Among the new treatments on the Mass were the the *Liturgica de ritu et ordine dominicae* of Georg Cassander (1558), the *Liturgica latinorum* of Jacques de Joigny [Pamelius] (1571), *De ritibus ecclesiae catholicae* of Jean Étienne Duranti (1591),[26] and the *Traicté de la liturgie* of Gilbert Génébrard (1594). This focus on the Mass continued into the following century as well, as, for example, the *Rerum liturgicarum libri duo* of Giovanni Cardinal Bona in 1671 and the *De liturgia Gallicana* of Jean Mabillon in 1685.

Among Protestants, the word "liturgia" and its vernacular equivalents had a more wide-ranging compass that was more akin to the *officia* of the medieval commentators than to the *liturgia* of Catholic Renaissance writers. This new approach to the word was signaled by Philipp Melanchthon in his *Apologia* to the Augsburg Confession of 1531, who saw the word "liturgy" according to its original Greek sense and thus extended its significance beyond the celebration of the Mass:

> But let us talk of the term "liturgy." It does not really mean a sacrifice but a public service. Thus it squares with our position that a minister who consecrates shows forth the body and blood of the Lord to the people, just as a minister who preaches shows forth the gospel to the people. . . . Thus the term "liturgy" squares well with the ministry. It is an old word, ordinarily used in public law. To the Greeks it meant "public duties," like taxes collected for equipping a fleet. . . . In II Cor. 9:12, Paul uses this word for a collection. Taking this collection not only supplies what the saints need but also causes many to thank God more abundantly. . . . But further proofs are unnecessary since anyone who reads the Greek authors can find examples everywhere of their use of "liturgy" to mean public duties or ministrations."[27]

This reclaimed sense of the word made its way early into Reformed discussions. In 1551, a group of continental Protestants exiled in London produced a service book based on the Reformed rite developed at Strasbourg by Martin Bucer, giving it the title *Liturgia sacra*.[28] Three years later, a group of Englishmen now exiled in Frankfurt am Main following the accession of Queen Mary produced a second version of the rite similarly entitled.[29] These books included a number of rites beyond the celebration of the Eucharist, including rites for baptism, the election of ministers, marriage, and excommunication, as well as midday and evening prayer. Over the next century, this expansive sense of the word found its way into Anglican usage as well. In 1574, elements of the Anglican rites were described in a book entitled *Liturgia Anglicana*. In 1609, the Rev. Dr. John Boys, later dean of the Canterbury cathedral, published *An Exposition of Al the Principall Scriptures Used in our English Liturgie,* where he discussed the uses of scripture within the Eucharist and within Morning and Evening Prayer. Following the return of Charles II to the English throne, the 1662 edition of the *Book of Common Prayer* incorporated the word "liturgy" within its Preface as follows: "It has been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her publick Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it." The sense here and throughout the Preface was the totality of the rites and sacraments that were specified for Church of England.[30]

Definitions for the word "liturgy" (in whatever form) before the twentieth century are rare, and depend for the most part on the religious tradition from which its author was drawn. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Anglican authors preferred a definition that was at once comprehensive—including an array of rites beyond the celebration of the Eucharist—and restrictive—requiring that any such rites be committed to paper. A definition attributed to John Selden in 1689, some thirty-five years after his death, saw liturgy as something that was both fixed and written down: "To know what was generally believed in all Ages, the way is to consult the Liturgies, not any private Man's writing. As if you would know how the Church of England serves God, go to the Common-Prayer Book, consult not this or that Man."[31] The article on "Liturgy" in the third edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1797) offered a similar sense. After noting that "liturgy is used among the Romanists to signify the mass; and among us the common-prayer," the entry goes on to specify that, as a result of complexities introduced over time, "a regulation became necessary; and it was found proper to put the service, and the manner of performing it, into writing; and this was what they called a liturgy."[32]

Catholic authors, meanwhile, retained their focus on the Mass. In his article on "Liturgie," in the *Dictionnaire historique des cultes religieux* of 1770, Jean François de la Croix kept to the Eucharistic sense that had dominated earlier Catholic discussions:

> LITURGY. This word, which signifies *sacrifice* in Greek, is used, in a most strict sense, to designate the exterior sacrifice practiced in the Christian Religion, the prayers and the rules prescribed for the celebration of the sacrifice. In the Latin Church, it is commonly known as the *Mass*, instead of the *Liturgy*, which is more particular to the Greek Church.[33]

In recent years, Catholic approaches to the word, while expanding to include the rites of the Church as a whole,[34] have tended toward more theological concerns, an approach encouraged by the encyclical *Mediator Dei* of Pope Pius XII (20 November 1947).[35] In the words of Aimé-Georges Martimort, the encyclical viewed the sacred liturgy as not "merely the outward or visible part of divine worship or as an ornamental ceremonial," nor as "a list of laws and prescriptions according to which ecclesiastical hierarchy orders the sacred rites to be performed." Instead, Pope Pius both "emphasized the supernatural reality contained in the liturgy and urged theologians to follow the pioneers of the liturgical movement and base their understanding of the liturgy on the priesthood of Christ and on a correct idea of the Church as mystical body of Christ."[36] Anscar J. Chupungco, in the introduction to his *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, similarly observed: "In the past the liturgy was often regarded rather restrictively as a composite of rubrics and ceremonials. Today the liturgy is studied as a theological reality insofar as it is a cultic encounter with God, possesses elements that have a theological bearing, and hence can become the object of a systematic theological examination."[37]

Most recent Protestant writers, conversely, have maintained the sense that governed earlier discussions, taking a decidedly more concrete approach to their understanding of the word. In his *Shape of the Liturgy*, for example, Gregory Dix attempted to integrate both the older Anglican and Catholic understandings of the word "liturgy":

> "The Liturgy" is the term which covers generally all that worship which is officially organised by the church, and which is open to and offered by, or in the name of, all who are members of the church. . . .

> In the course of time the term "The Liturgy" has come to be particularly applied to the performance of that rite which was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself to be the peculiar and distinctive worship of those who should be "His own" and which has ever since been the heart and core of christian worship and christian living—the Eucharist or Breaking of Bread.[38]

Authors looking at liturgy from other perspectives—authors not charged with liturgy's day-to-day observance—can see the problem of definition quite differently. Richard Crocker, for example, approaching the notion from both a musical and a musicological perspective in his *Introduction to Gregorian Chant*, offered definitions for the words "cult," "rite," and "liturgy" that were both logical and pragmatic, progressing from general to specific:

> Cult is public devotion (which may or may not involve worship). Rite, or ritual cult, is formalized cult, in which public devotion is expressed according to pre-arranged procedures, usually but not necessarily invariant. Liturgy, or liturgical rite, is assigned rite, in which the various procedures are assigned to specific individuals, to be performed at certain times in certain ways.[39]

Drawing from the work of anthropologists, Victor Turner in particular,[40] students of medieval drama and literature have sought to broaden the application of the word "liturgy" to include ritual acts not normally seen as liturgical under the definitions given above. In an essay extending the later work of C. Clifford Flanigan, for example, Kathleen Ashley and Pamela Sheingorn expanded the meaning of liturgy to include a number of popular devotions practiced in conjunction with the feast of St. Foy. Nils Holger Petersen offered a similar perspective on the wine drinking customs associated with Easter in the *Vita Oudalrici* and the *Pontifical Romano-Germanicum*.[41] While these acts may not have been preserved in a liturgical *ordo*, they were a part of the ritual observance for the respective feasts nonetheless, and thus, one could argue, of a kind with the popular devotions that were included in the medieval commentaries of Beleth, Sicard, and Durand discussed above.[42]

The word "liturgy" thus carries a number of senses. It has been narrowly defined to refer to the Eucharist alone, and it has been extended to embrace other sacramental rites, processions, the Divine Office, and for some recent scholars, popular devotions as well. The word "liturgy" is also understood today both in a particular sense, as that specified in some authoritative book, and more generally in terms of its implementation, or practice: the spaces within which it takes place, its music and those charged with its realization, the clerics responsible for its observance, their vestments and implements, their movements and gestures, etc. "Liturgy" is also understood in an even more general sense as representing the ritual practice of a particular body of believers, whether it be a monastic community, a diocese, or a region, as in the liturgy of St. Gall, the liturgy of the diocese of Rouen, or the Mozarabic liturgy. In more recent years, it has been understood also in terms of the sacred mysteries for which it stands in place. Its meanings are manifold, so much so that it is difficult to find fault with Mark Searle's observation that "the problem is that the liturgy, like the Church itself, is always more than we can say, and it eludes any easy definition."[43]

Drama

The word "drama" is equally troublesome. In his discussion of terminology that opens *Drama, Play, and Game*, Lawrence Clopper observed that "whether we are talking about modern or medieval usage, there is [a] general slipperiness in terms such as 'drama' and 'theater'."[44] The word "drama," while derived from the Greek word for "act" or "deed" and used in something akin to its modern sense during Hellenistic and Roman times, was understood by medieval commentators in a way that was wholly different from that of our own. Instead, as Clopper observed, "dramatic" was for medieval commentators but one of three modes of narrative.[45] To illustrate, he cited Nicholas Trevet's early fourteenth-century commentary on the works of Seneca:

> The poets wrote in three modes (*modi*), either in the narrative mode, in which only the poet speaks, as in the *Georgics*; or the dramatic mode, wherein the poet nowhere speaks . . . but only the characters (*personae*) who have been introduced—and this mode is particularly well suited to tragic and comic writers—while the third mode is a mixture of the other two . . . [in which] sometimes the poet speaks in his own person, and sometimes the characters who have been introduced. This is Virgil's method in the *Aeneid*.[46]

Clopper went on to observe that, when we see the word "drama" in a medieval text, "we ought not to think of a script for enactment by persons assuming roles; rather, we should think of it as a formal and visual presentation of responding voices." The notion of drama as a theatrical genre or category, he concluded, was unknown to the medieval west.[47]

In her study of *The Idea of Theater*, Donnalee Dox demonstrated similarly that the word "theatrum" was used by medieval commentators to recall the performative traditions of Antiquity and not to denote theatrical activity in their own day. She observed that "as a relic of the past, . . . the theaters of the ancient world generally remained in a separate category from the rituals and *ludi* performed on temporary booth stages or pageant wagons and from the Roman plays read as literature and rhetoric."[48] Representing the space where drama took place, moreover, the word "theatrum" came to signify a variety of activities that included not only the plays of the ancients, but all manner of other entertainments, including the games and contests of the amphitheater as well as forensic oratory.[49]

The word "ludus" and its vernacular equivalents were also current in medieval discussions, and while the word might refer to a play, as we might call it, it could also refer to a game of chance, a martial tournament of some sort, a musical performance, or a festival.[50] In his study of the words "play" and "plays" in early English drama, John Coldeway offered a particularly enlightening example of how the word "play" could be easily misconstrued if its context were mislaid. In his description of how "plaies may bee divided," the seventeenth-century naturalist Francis Willoughby suggested athletic contests and games of chance rather than tragedy and comedy or any other potential forms of theater:

> Plaies may be divided Into those that exercise the Bodie as tennis Stowball &c or thoes that exercise the wit as chesse tables, cards &c, those that have nothing of chance as chess &c, those that altogether depend upon fortune as Inne & crosse & Pile or those that have art & skill both as most games at cards & tables.[51]

Like "liturgy," the word "drama," along with the sense of genre that we now associate with it, came into modern usage during the sixteenth century, a response in large part to the rediscovery of Aristotle's *Poetics* by Renaissance Humanists.[52] While Italian scholars were the first to consider the newly published editions of the *Poetics* with a critical eye, the use of the term "drama" as a descriptor for something beyond the plays of the ancients came from the pens of German authors. As early as 1513 Jacob Locher offered a play entitled *Libellus dramaticus novus sed not musteus*.[53] Over the next several decades, a number of Protestant schoolmasters based largely in Basel and Augsburg included such phrases as *drama comicotragicum* or *drama tragicum* as a part of the titles or subtitles for plays modeled on those of Roman playwrights and written for student performance.[54] Among these titles were Sixt Birck's *Iudith, drama comicotragicum* (1539) and the several titles of Hieronymus Ziegler, including *Protoplastus: Drama comicotragicum* (1543), *Cyrus maior, drama tragicum* (1547), *Ophiletis: Drama comicotragicum* (1549), and *Christi vina: Drama Sacrum* (1551). A collection of plays published by Johannes Operin in 1547 and including works by both Birck and Ziegler among others, moreover, appeared under the title *Dramata sacra*. As used here, the word "drama" represented a single text, a play, as well as carrying the sense of genre that subsumed both comedy and tragedy.

Over the next two centuries, the word gained a collective sense as well, "the drama," that incorporated all manner of individual plays. Following the restoration of the English monarchy in 1660, and particularly following the Glorious Revolution of 1688–1689, debates on the propriety of theater in England were rekindled, and the word "drama" was used in a collective sense to describe that over which the adversaries contended. These pamphlets continued a debate that had been ongoing at least since Stephen Gosson's *Schoole of Abuse* from 1579.[55] The argument was rekindled by Jeremy Collier in *A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage* (1698) which was then answered by William Congreve in *Amendments to Mr. Collier's False and Imperfect Citations* (1698) in defense of his own plays and by John Dennis in *The Usefulness of the Stage* (1698). In 1699, an anonymous pamphlet entitled *The Stage acquitted: being a full answer to Mr. Collier and the other enemies of the drama* (1699) took issue with the arguments advanced the year before in another anonymous pamphlet, now attributed to George Ridpath, entitled *The Stage Condemn'd, and The Encouragement given to the Immoralities and Profaneness of the Theatre* (1698). For these authors, "drama" was a collective noun that stood in place of any and all dramatic or theatrical activity. In answering the charge by John Dennis in *The Usefulness of the Stage* (1698) that while French manners were more corrupt their plays were more modest than the English, Ridpath, responded:

> The 2d Argument, *That the Corruption of Manners is greater in* France, *tho' their Theatres are less licentious than ours*, will stand him in little stead; for supposing it true that the Manners of the French are more corrupted than ours, which I am afraid will scarcely be granted: tho' their Theatres be less licentious, their Religion is more, which allows them to be as wicked as the Devil can make them, provided they have but Money enough to pay for a Pardon, or fury enough to persecute the Protestants. *That the Germans are*

> *greater Drinkers, and the Italians more inclinable to Unnatural Lust, tho' they have less of the Drama than we*: Perhaps they will charge the Cause upon Heaven as he does, and impute it to their Clime; but can he say that if they had more of the Drama, they would not be more addicted to those Crimes than at present they are.[56]

By the eighteenth century, the words "drama" and "theater" were used interchangeably to designate drama writ large, as, for example, the *Histoire du théâtre françois* of Claude and François Parfaict (1734–1749), the *Recherches sur les théâtre de France* of Pierre-François Godard de Beauchamps (1735–1740) and a generation later, the *Origin of the English Drama* of Thomas Hawkins (1775), all of which were largely collections of scripts.[57]

Difficulties in dealing with the word "drama" continue to ensue from the various and overlapping senses that the word can convey: a script, a play (which may or may not have a script), a style, a genre, a species of poetry, etc. Also problematic are the overlapping senses and the often-interchangeable uses of the words "drama," "play" (or "Spiel" or "jeu" or "ludus") and "theater." The words "drama" and "play," for example, are often used synonymously when referring to individual works. Both can refer to a script or text—as in "reading a play or drama"—and both can refer to an enacted event—as in "seeing or attending a play or drama." "Drama" also has a more broad sense not shared by the word "play." A play is an individual event, whereas "drama," and in particular "the drama," has become a broad category in literature and the performing arts that includes some events that we call "plays" and others that we might not.

Both words carry additional senses beyond those relating to theatrical events. "Drama" has a metaphorical potential not shared by the word "play." One can speak of a "dramatic conclusion" to events, or the "drama of family gatherings," and let us not forget, "drama queen." The word "play," conversely, has a performative connotation beyond that which might be enacted upon a stage: thus, to play cards, to play football, or a play on words, all of which are performative acts in one form or another. The words "drama" and "theater" are also used interchangeably when describing drama or theater as genre, drama in its larger sense: "the drama" and "the theater." Even here, though, the senses can vary, with "the drama" often drawing attention to the words on the page and "the theater" generally pointing to what takes place upon a stage. "Theater" has a number of senses that are unique to it as well. It is a location, the setting where drama takes place. From this the word has been extended to other similarly configured spaces, such as a theater of anatomy, or metaphorically transformed into abstract spaces within which action takes place, such as a theater of passions or a theater of war. Indeed, the word "theater" was used in this metaphorical sense in a number of publications during the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, including, for example, Thomas Beard's, *The theatre of God's judgment* (1579), John Parkinson's *The theater of plants* (1658), Edward Topsell *et al.*'s *The theater of insects* (1658), and David Jones's *A theatre of wars between England and France* (1698). In the English version of Nicolas Talon's *L'Histoire saint du Nouveau Testament* (1640, trans. 1653 by John Paulet Winchester as *The Holy History*), the author speaks of the various "theaters of passions" in his discussion of the creation of Adam: "In truth are you not ravished with the aspect of his Eyes, which are the Windows of the Soul, the Doors of Life, and the most faithfull Interpreters of our Minds? What say you to the disclosure of this living Theater of Choler, of vengeance, of pitty, of hate, of fury, and of Love?"[58]

Liturgical Drama

Both the words "liturgy" and "drama" thus have a sliding scale of meanings that can stretch in multiple dimensions, and isolating the sense for either word in any given context can be troublesome. With the expression "liturgical drama" this becomes particularly difficult due to the range of possible ways that each term both has been and can be understood, and this becomes exponentially more troublesome when the words are combined. To label something as "liturgical drama" is, at a minimum, to make two claims: first, that the object of the label is drama, ontologically speaking, and second, that this thing that is drama can be qualified as liturgical. To regard something as drama, however, is, as Clopper observed, a slippery proposition. There are a few instances where medieval texts now considered to be liturgical dramas were recognized at the time they were copied to be *ludi*, and there are a number of others, similarly configured and without an overtly liturgical connection, that might well have been considered by their contemporaries to be *ludi* as well.[59] But the vast majority of texts that now fall under the banner of liturgical drama were liturgical rites that appeared to be drama only because modern critics, or at least those since 1834, projected onto them a current understanding of what they saw drama to be. An ontological status was thus granted to these rites that would have been inappropriate, and even inconceivable, during the centuries of their use and for several centuries thereafter.

The adjective "liturgical" is equally difficult. Indeed, what are we claiming when we describe something as liturgical? Are we necessarily implying an association with the rites specified in service books and all that goes with them (their music, vestments, etc.)? This is the sense that we normally take when using expressions such as "liturgical music," "liturgical gestures," and "liturgical vestments." Or can our reach extend to include other kinds of activities that are routinely celebrated even though they may not be specifically called for—the sense of the *officia* of several medieval liturgical commentators? Even in this expansive sense, though, the word fails to encompass the full range of texts that have collected under the banner of "liturgical drama." The majority of texts now called "liturgical drama," as just noted, were clearly liturgical. Those that most closely fit our own experience of drama or theater, however, have no clear liturgical connections.

It is not necessary, however, to view the expression "liturgical drama" in this literal sense. If we redirect the adjective "liturgical" to denote activities that are not necessarily "of the liturgy" but that share attributes common to—or drawn from—the liturgy, the expression "liturgical drama" can take on an altogether different cast. Indeed, seen this way, the expression might more appropriately describe the religious plays of various European vernacular traditions than it does the texts to which it is normally applied. As early as 1916, Paul Kretzmann noted with regard to medieval German drama that "the plays were either based directly on the liturgy and taken from it, as were the early Latin plays, or the suggestion for their composition and their episodal structure was taken from the liturgy of some festival day or from some minor liturgical cycle clearly discernible in the breviaries."[60] More recently, Renate Amstutz has reinforced Kretzmann's point in her reconstruction of the liturgical structures that served as scaffold for the fourteenth-century Thuringian *Zehnjungfrauenspiel*.[61]

The expression "liturgical drama," in fact, is probably best suited for a small collection of Latin/vernacular Easter plays from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries than it is for the medieval ceremonies and plays to which it is normally applied. An antiphoner from the first half of the sixteenth century and now in Prague, for example, includes music for matins and vespers for the liturgical year along with music for several processions intended for use within a Bohemian Utraquist church.[62] Taking up nearly a fourth of the volume, the Easter portion of the manuscript includes a series of Easter plays intended for presentation throughout the day. The first in the series is a macaronic Latin/Bohemian *Visitatio Sepulchri*, entitled "ordo trium personarum in die resurectionis [*sic*] domini," in which the texts and melodies are given alternately in Latin and Bohemian and punctuated by spoken Bohemian verse.[63] This is extended by a second representation, entitled "ludus pasce ffoeliciter," that contains spoken Bohemian verse with occasional Latin liturgical items.[64] These are presented together at the end of matins. A third representation, entitled "ludus de resurectione [*sic*] domini," contains spoken Bohemian verse along with incipits for a number of Latin liturgical items and was likely performed in conjunction with the Mass.[65] Both the sixteenth-century Feldkircher *Osterspiel*, assigned by Lipphardt to Augsburg,[66] and the seventeenth-century Regensburger *Osterspiel*, from the Alten Kapelle in Regensburg,[67] which similarly blend the texts and melodies of the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* with both sung and spoken German, moreover, are preserved within liturgical manuscripts as well (processionals in both cases). If Lipphardt is correct in assigning the Feldkirch manuscript to the cathedral in Augsburg, this would place both *Osterspiele* along with the Bohemian presentations within Reformation milieux (or, in the case of the German *Osterspiele*, Catholic milieux within Lutheran towns), milieux that had also brought forth new ways of seeing the words "liturgy" and "drama," and thus in these few instances, "liturgical drama" as well.

The word "drama" need not be taken in its literal sense either. As originally formulated by Charles Magnin and later punctuated by Félix Clément, the expression "liturgical drama" was understood clearly as metaphor, offering a sense that might more accurately be captured by the inversion of its terms: "dramatic liturgy." Were it not for this metaphorical reading, in fact, it is unlikely that the category liturgical drama would have emerged as it did. The metaphor prompted a new way of seeing what had hitherto been regarded as liturgical or ritual activity. It allowed the consideration as drama of activities that were not strictly drama by the definitions then available but which could be considered to be "dramatic" as that word was then understood. This in turn, brought to light a number of both liturgical and non-liturgical phenomena that together formed the core of "liturgical drama" as that metaphor crystallized into category.

In the end, the expression "liturgical drama" lacks a clear referent, a problem that was recognized almost from the start. From Mone to du Méril to Coussemaker and beyond, the scholars of the mid- and late-nineteenth century saw the repertory that was gathering before them in much the same way as had the scholars of the centuries preceding, as divisible into two groups, one clearly liturgical and the other not. A century and three-quarters later, the expression "liturgical drama" continues to embrace a variety of texts whose relationships to one another are, at best, unclear. All are based on religious themes, all are set in Latin, and all are sung. Some are clearly liturgical—they are preserved in liturgical books—while others have no obvious liturgical connection. Those whose use is specified in liturgical books are liturgical ceremonies, and to regard them as drama is anachronistic at best, a form of conceptual "sort-crossing" (if not "sort-trespassing") as it were.[68] The others are likely plays or spectacles or games or homilies or some other type of as yet unnamed representation. They may be religious. They may include elements originating in the liturgy. They may even be performed within a church to commemorate a ritual moment. But they are not really liturgical in the same sense as those representational rites now included among the liturgical dramas, rites that were celebrated year after year and decade after decade for over eight centuries in churches throughout Europe, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in particular.

NOTES

[1] Chupungco, *What, Then Is Liturgy?*, 51–52. For general discussion of "liturgy" in the context of liturgical drama, see the discussion on "The Concept of Liturgy" in Petersen, "Representation in European Devotional Rituals," 332–36.

[2] Martimort notes its application to Jewish and early Christian cultic practices in Luke 1:23, Hebrews 9–10 and 26, and Acts 13:2 and its non-cultic use in Romans 13:6, 15:16, and 27:2, Corinthians 9:12, and Phillipians 2:18, 25, and 30. Martimort, *Principles of the Liturgy*, 9. Chupungco, *What, Then, Is Liturgy?*, 52, though, saw the emphasis more on service than ritual.

[3] Cicero. *De Officiis*. Translated into English as *On Duties* for the Loeb Classical Library (1913) and more recently as *On Obligations* (2000).

[4] Ambrosius, *De Officiis*. On Ambrose's debt to Cicero, see 1:6–19.

[5] The word "officium" had a far wider use in liturgical documents than the limited use on which I am focusing here. The word could also refer to the Mass, and in some cases specifically the Introit of the Mass, or it could refer to any number of rites celebrated over the course of the liturgical *cursus*. It is also used in some liturgical manuals to describe the duties for a particular clerical role, such as the office of deacon. The following is a representative sample from William of Auxerre's *De officiis eclesiasticis*: "officium nocturnale," "officium matitunale," "officium vero misse est," and "De ministris officiorum." See n. 13.

[6] Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*. See also the English translation by Knoebel under the same title.

[7] Amalarius of Metz, *Liturgica omnia*. English translation by Knibbs as *On the Liturgy (De ecclesiasticis officiis)*.

[8] John of Avranches, *De officiis ecclesiasticis*.

[9] Rupert of Deutz, *Liber de divinis officiis*.

[10] Beleth, *Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis*.

[11] Paululus, *De officiis ecclesiasticis*. This is printed among the works of Hugh of St. Victor, PL 177:381–456. See Macy, *Treasures from the Storeroom*, 164, n. 176.

[12] Sicard, *Mitralis*.

[13] William of Auxerre, *De officiis eclesiasticis*. An online critical edition is available at: http://guillelmus.uni-koeln.de/tcrit/tcrit_toc. This was prepared by Franz Fischer, "Wilhelm von Auxerre."

[14] Durand, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*. English translations of the prologue and books 1 through 5 are also available: Thibodeau, *A New Translation of the Prologue and Book 1*; Thibodeau, *A New Translation of Books 2–3*; Thibodeau, *Rationale IV. On the Mass and Each Action Pertaining to it*; and Thibodeau, *Rationale V. Commentary on the Divine Office.*

[15] "Festum subdiaconorum, quod uocamus *stultorum*, a quibusdam fit in circumcision, a quibusdam in Epiphania uel in octauis Epiphanie. Fiunt autem quatuor tripudia post natiuitatem Domini in ecclesia: leuitarum, sacerdotum, puerorum, id est minorum estate et ordine, et subdiaconorum, qui ordo incertus est. Vnde quandoque adnumeretur inter sacros ordines, quadoque non adnumeretur, quod exprimitur in eo, quod certum diem non habet et officio celebrator confuso." Beleth, *Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis*, CCCM 41a:133–34 (cap. 72, *De festo subiaconorum*). Translation by Fassler, "The Feast of Fools," 74. See also Harris, *Sacred Folly*, 66–67 and Arlt, *Ein Festoffizium des Mittelalters*, 1:39–43.

[16] William of Auxerre, *Summa* (from the online Fischer edition, book III, cap. 12: *De Circumcisione Domini*). See also Fassler, "The Feast of Fools," 77. William apparently confused *Parentalia*, which honored deceased relatives in mid-February, with the January *Kalends*. See Harris, *Sacred Folly*, 96.

[17] Durand, *Rationale*, CCCM 140A, 199 (book VI, cap. 15, *De circumcision* and Durand, *Rationale divinorum officiorum,* CCCM 140b, 29 (book VII, cap. 42, *De Sanctis Stephano, Iohanne Evangelista et Innocentibus*).

[18] "Inde est, quod in claustris quarundam ecclesiarum etiam episcopi cum suis clericis decembrica libertate utuntur, descendentes etiam ad ludum coreę uel pilę, quamuis non ludere laudabilius sit, et dicitur hęc decembrica libertas, eo quod mense decembris pastores, serui et ancillę quadam libertate apud gentiles a dominis dominarentur et collectis messibus cum eis conuiuarentur. . . . Sed quod illi suis idolis exhibuerunt, cultores unius Dei ad ipsius pręconia conuerterunt. Nam populus de mari Rubro egressus, choream duxisse, et Maria cum timpano legitur pręcinuisse et David ante archam totis uiribus saltauit et cum cithara psalmos cecinit et Salomon circa altare cantores instituit, qui uoce, tuba, cimbalis, organis et aliis musicis instrumentis cantica personuisse leguntur." Sicard, *Mitralis*, CCCM 228, 546 (book VI, cap. 15, *De Pascali Sollempnitate*). Translation by Mews, "Liturgists and Dance in the Twelfth Century," 513. On the game of *pila* and other popular practices during the Christmas and Easter seasons, see also Wright, *The*

Maze and the Warrior, 129–58 and Eisenberg, "Performing the Passion." A more comprehensive view of the ceremonies associated with Christmastide and Epiphany is given in Harris, *Sacred Folly*.

[19] "Illud quoque notandum est, quare in quibusdam regionibus mulieres secunda die post Pascha uerberant maritos suos et uiri illas die tertia, ut in Decembri licebat seruis dominos suos accusare impune. Hoc autem facient, ut per hoc notent, quoniam illi inuicem se corrigere debent, ne tempore illo alter ab altero exigat thori debitum." Beleth, *Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis*, CCCM 41a, 223–24 (cap. 120, *De quadam libertate Decembris*). Magnin discussed this latter practice in the seventh lecture of the second semester ("Magnin Cours" 4/91: 515 [NYPL, Magnin Papers, 262r]). On *Schmackostern*, see also Schröder, "Schmackostern" and Schmelzeisen, "Schmackostern."

[20] Speculation concerning the source of Beleth's description has been ongoing at least since Chambers, who saw this as evidence that the apostles Peter and John were integral to the early Parisian use (Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage*, 2:31). Lipphardt was probably the first to suggest that this description had more to do with Germanic influence, that of Salzburg specifically, than to what was going on in Paris and its environs. See LOO 7:96–99.

[21] "In quisbusdam ecclesiis cum cereis et sollempni procesione uadunt de choro ad quondam locum, ubi ymaginarium sepulchrum adaptatur, et ibi introducuntur persone sub personis mulierum et discipulorum, Ioannis scilicet et Petri, qui ad sepulchrum Domini uenerunt, et quedam alie persone in personis angelorum, qui Christum dixerunt a mortuis resurrexisse. Et redit unus citius alio, sicut Ioannes *cucurrit citius Petro*. Tunc redeunt persone ad chorum referentes, que uiderant et audierunt. Tunc chorus audita Christi resurrection prorumpit in uocem alte cantans *Te Deum laudamus*." Beleth, *Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis*, CCCM 41a:212 (cap. 113, *De officio huius temporis*). See also LOO 1:144 (LOO 120) for a slightly different version drawn from that given in PL 202:19.

[22] Wright, *Music and Ceremonial*, 112–13.

[23] The earliest Parisian setting of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, Charleville-Mézières, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 86, 96r–v (LOO 124), dates from before 1218. For early German settings of the Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri* see the twelfth-century settings from Augsburg (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS lat. 226, 10v–11r [LOO 505] and Salzburg (Salzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, MS II. 6, 67r [LOO 694].

[24] The sequence *Victimae paschali laudes* is sung in the settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Paris and elsewhere, although always prior to the singing of *Te Deum laudamus*. The Parisian sources for the *Visitatio Sepulchri* are given in LOO 1:146–86 (LOO 123–50).

[25] Witzel, *Typus Ecclesiae Prioris*. The liturgy of St. John Chysostom, which had been published separately the year prior, is attached as fols. 73r–90r under the title *Der heiligen Messen brauch wie er in der alten Kyrchen vor tausent jaren gewesen. Aus S. Joan. Chrysostomo verdeutscht*. For Witzel, "Liturgy" clearly refers

to the Mass. On fol. 25r, for example, he notes: "Aus S. Cypriani schrifften ist offenbar das dise [*sic*] heilige Liturgy oder Ampt all tage gehalten worden ist." (According to the writings of St. Cyprian, this holy liturgy, or Mass, was held every day.)

[26] Duranti offered a comprehensive treatment of the liturgy including both Mass and the Divine Office. He reserved his use of the word "liturgia," however, to settings of the Mass from early Christian and eastern rites.

[27] *Corpus Reformatorum*, 27:622–23. The English text is drawn from that given in "The Defense of the Augsburg Confession" drawn from the *Book of Concord*, 263–64.

[28] Pullain, *Liturgia sacra* (1551). See also Honders, *Valerandus Pollanus Liturgia Sacra*, which provides an introductory essay (in Dutch) and a transcription and translation (into French) of both the 1551 and 1554 editions. An overview of the circumstances surrounding these publications is provided by Morrison, *English Prayer Books*, 81–82.

[29] Pullain, *Liturgia sacra* (1554).

[30] Earlier editions of the *Book of Common Prayer* generally use the words "rites and practices" to describe what the 1662 edition embraces as liturgy.

[31] Selden, "Liturgy," *Table-Talk*, 32.

[32] "Liturgy," *Encyclopaedia Brittanica*, 10/1:103.

[33] "LITURGIE. Ce mot, qui signifie en grec *sacrifice*, est employé, dans un sens plus strict, pour désigner le sacrifice extérieur, pratiqué dans la Religion Chrétienne, les prières & les règles prescrites pour la célébration de ce sacrifice. Dans l'Eglise Latine, on se sert communément du nom de *Messe*, au lieu de celui de *Liturgie*, qui est plus particulier à l'Eglise Grèque." De la Croix, *Dictionnaire historique des cultes religieux*, 2:654.

[34] This shift among Catholic scholars is relatively recent. Martimort, *Principles of the Liturgy*, 7–8, notes that the word "liturgia" rarely occurs before the twentieth century in the official documents of the Church, and when it does it typically is used in the more inclusive sense, encompassing all of the rites of the Church.

[35] Encyclical *Mediator Dei*, no. 22, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 529.

[36] Martimort, *Principles of the Liturgy*, 10.

[37] Chupungco, *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vii.

[38] Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy* (1945), 1.

[39] Crocker, *Introduction to Gregorian Chant*, 13.

[40] See especially Turner, *From Ritual to Theatre*.

[41] Petersen, "Representation in European Devotional Rituals," 333–36.

[42] Flanigan et al., "Liturgy as Social Performance."

[43] Searle, *Liturgy Made Simple*, 12. This sense appears to be generally held among contemporary Catholic liturgists. Joseph Jungmann, for one, noted in a similar vein: "No complete agreement has been reached about the definition of the liturgy." Jungmann, "The Liturgies," 851.

[44] Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, 3.

[45] Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, 6.

[46] Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, 6. The quote is drawn from Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism*, 344.

[47] Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game,* 9.

[48] Dox, *The Idea of Theater*, 126–27. The thirteenth-century translators of the *Poetics* saw the work as a form of logic. See the chapter "From Poetics to Performance, 95–124. See also Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, 25–62.

[49] Dox, *The Idea of Theater*, 86.

[50] Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, 12–19. See also the discussion in chapter 2, p. 76.

[51] Coldeway, "'Plays' and 'Play,'" 187.

[52] On the reception of the *Poetics* in the Renaissance, see Carlson, *Theories of the Theatre*, 37–89. See also Tigerstedt, "Observations on the Reception," 7–24 and Halliwell, *Aristotle's Poetics*, especially the chapter on "Influence and Status: the *Nachleben* of the Poetics," 286–323.

[53] Locher's play survives in a single manuscript copy: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 11347, 66r–75v. See Deitl, *Die Dramen Jacob Locher*, 319–38 and 515–30. I thank Prof. Glenn Ehrstine for bringing this play to my attention.

[54] See Michael, *Das deutsche Drama der Reformationszeit*.

[55] This was followed by a number other works arguing both sides of the issue, including Thomas Lodge's *Reply to Gosson's Schoole of Abuse* (1579 or 1580), Sir Philip Sydney's *An Apologie for Poetrie* (1595), John Rainold's *Th'overthrow of Stage-Plays* (1599), Alexander Leighton's *A Short Treatise against Stage-Playes* (1625), and William Prynne's *Histrio-mastix* (1633).

[56] Ridpath, *The Stage Condemn'd*, 184.

[57] Parfaict, *Histoire du théâtre françois*; Beauchamps, *Recherches sur les théâtres de France*; and Hawkins, *Origin of the English Drama*.

[58] Talon/Winchester, *The Holy History*, 14.

[59] In his essay on "The Fleury Playbook and the Traditions of Medieval Latin Drama," for example, Flanigan noted that the only category that could encompass all ten texts of the Fleury manuscript was that of drama. Flanigan, "The Fleury Playbook," 361.

[60] Kretzmann, *The Liturgical Element*, 10.

[61] Amstutz, *Ludus de decem virginibus*.

[62] Prague, Národní Knihovna, MS XVII.E.1, 135v–220r.

[63] Prague, Národní Knihovna, MS XVII.E.1, 135v–179r. This was first described by Hanuš, *Die lateinisch-böhmischen Oster-Spiele*, 41–66, text edition pp. 46–66, as *Das dritte Drei-Marien-Osterspiel*, and edited again by Máchal, *Staročeské skladby dramaticke původu liturgického*, 149–75 as *Třetí hra tří Marii*. The texts and melodies were treated by Schuler, *Die Musik der Osterfeiern*, 59, 379, and *passim* (as Böhmen I *Osterspiel mit Thomasszene*). The *Visitatio Sepulchri* from this manuscript is also treated in Amstutz, *Ludus de decem virginibus*, *passim*, as BöhmO.I.

[64] Prague, Národní Knihovna, MS XVII.E.1, 179r–91r. This is given by Hanuš, *Die lateinisch-böhmischen Oster-Spiele*, 66–81 and by Máchal, *Staročeské skladby dramaticke původu liturgického*, 175–86. This text opens with the following rubric: "Ludus pasce ffoeliciter" and ends with the singing of the *Te Deum* followed by the word "Finis." This is likely a continuation of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* that precedes it, which concluded with Christ's encounter with Thomas.

[65] Prague, Národní Knihovna, MS XVII.E.1, 191r–220r. This is given by Hanuš, *Die lateinisch-böhmischen Oster-Spiele*, 81–104 and by Máchal, *Staročeské skladby dramaticke původu liturgického*, 186–215. This text is introduced by the rubric "Incipit ludus de resurectione domini et primo sermo" and concludes with "Deinde fiat sermo. Amen."

[66] Feldkirch, Bibliothek des Kapuzinerklosters, MS Liturg. 1 RTR.M, 74r–92r. This is given as Nr. 41 in Bergman, *Katalog*. An edition and facsimile of fols. 91r–v is given by Lipphardt, "Ein lateinisch-deutsches Osterspiel aus Augsburg." The manuscript likely dates from between 1560 and 1598.

[67] Regensburg, Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek, MS CH 1, 22r–29r. This is given as Nr. 127 in the Bergman *Katalog*. A textual edition is provided by Poll, "Ein Osterspiel enthalten in einem Prozessionale" along with some musical notation. The manuscript dates from the early seventeenth century.

[68] Turbayne, *Myth of Metaphor*, 12. Turbayne's notion of "sort-crossing" is developed from Gilbert Ryle's definition of "category mistake," presented in his *Concept of Mind*, 8, and denotes the taking of a metaphor literally. See the discussion in chapter 6, pp. 183–86.