



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Early Drama, Art, and Music

Medieval Institute Publications

8-31-2017

Liturgical Drama and the Reimagining of Medieval Theater

Michael Norton

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



Part of the Dramatic Literature, Criticism and Theory Commons, Liturgy and Worship Commons, and the Medieval Studies Commons

Recommended Citation

Norton, Michael, "Liturgical Drama and the Reimagining of Medieval Theater" (2017). *Early Drama, Art, and Music*. 5.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/mip_edam/5

This Monograph is brought to you for free and open access by the Medieval Institute Publications at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Early Drama, Art, and Music by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.





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.

Contents

List of Illustrations	vi
Acknowledgments	vii
Abbreviations	x
Introduction. The Illusion of Liturgical Drama	1
Chapter 1. A Prodigious Birth: Creating “Liturgical Drama”	19
Chapter 2. An Improbable Fiction: Confronting “Liturgical Drama”	55
Chapter 3. Past as Prologue: Preceding “Liturgical Drama”	85
Chapter 4. Strange Bedfellows: Unfolding “Liturgical Drama”	111
Chapter 5. What’s in a Name? Defining “Liturgical Drama”	157
Chapter 6. All that Glitters: Unravelling “Liturgical Drama”	179
Glossary	213
Bibliography of Works Cited	221
Indexes	253

List of Illustrations

Table 4.1A: Representational Rites: <i>Visitatio Sepulchri</i> , without Magdalene —Mass and Matins	129
Table 4.1B: Representational Rites: <i>Visitatio Sepulchri</i> , without Magdalene —Non-standard placements	130
Table 4.1C: Representational Rites: <i>Visitatio Sepulchri</i> , with Magdalene	132
Table 4.1D: Representational Rites: <i>Officium Pastorum</i> —Before Mass and end of Christmas Matins	134
Table 4.1E: Representational Rites: Other	138
Table 4.2: Religious Plays	140
Table 4.3: Ambiguously Situated Representations	144
Example 6.1: Type 1 <i>Visitatio Sepulchri</i> (Mass). Modena, Biblioteca e Archivio Capitolare, MS O.I.7, 104v (LOO 13). 11th/12th-century Forlimpopoli troper.	188
Example 6.2: Type 1 <i>Visitatio Sepulchri</i> (Matins). Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 12044, 100r–v (LOO 155). 12th-century Saint-Maur antiphoner.	189
Example 6.3: Type 2 <i>Visitatio Sepulchri</i> . Udine, Biblioteca arcivescovile, MS 94, 132v–133v (LOO 697). 14th-century Salzburg antiphoner.	197

Acknowledgments

AS ANDREW HUGHES OBSERVED a quarter-century ago, to study what we now call liturgical drama demands that disciplinary boundaries be crossed if not ignored altogether. While this is certainly liberating, it is also dangerous, and I fear that I have surely overstepped the bounds of what little I can claim to know well. To those whose areas I have invaded, I apologize. I did seek help, and I am thankful to those who took the time to consider and to correct what I had to say. In particular, I would like to express my gratitude to Donnalee Dox, who took great care with earlier drafts of this study and who offered a great many insights and suggestions; to Amelia Carr and to James Ward, whose perceptive and incisive commentaries helped to bring the later drafts to a more satisfying conclusion; to Nils Holger Petersen, whose insights guided more recent drafts and whose impressive body of work and many stimulating conversations served as a beacon as I wandered through the thickets that this study set in my way; to Linda and Jean-Louis Clément, *belle-soeur* and *beau-frère*, for assistance in rendering the many French quotations into passable English and for Linda's finely tuned editorial eye; and to Melanie Batoff, who not only offered a close reading of several chapters but also shared with me transcriptions, manuscript inventories, and other fruits of her research. Additionally I would like to thank Alison Alstatt for providing an advance copy of her study of the "re-membered" Wilton processional as well as details on the *Visitatio Sepulchri* preserved there, Jennifer Roth-Burnette for providing me a copy of her dissertation on Parisian *organa dupla* and *ars memoriae*, Hanna Zühlke for providing me with a copy of her unpublished paper on tenth-century processions, Ute Evers for allowing me access to her unpublished paper on the Venetian *Visitatio Sepulchri*, Elaine Stratton Hild for letting me read her unpublished paper on the challenges of editing collections of "liturgical drama," Susan Rankin for allowing me access to several of her unpublished papers, Nausica Morandi for allowing me early access to her book on the *Officium Stellae*, and the denizens of the

PERFORM Listserv who responded gracefully and quickly to my several queries. There are surely others that I have failed to mention, and I hope that you will not see my oversight as dismissive of your contributions. To all who have supported my journey, I pray that you can forgive me for having paid insufficient heed to your advice and warnings.

Completing this study would not have been possible without access to a large cache of manuscripts and printed books, many of which proved difficult to locate. The Hill Museum and Manuscript Library, known to most by its heavenly acronym, was especially accommodating on my many visits over the years, and I am deeply grateful for the wonderful collection of microfilms and images that they have assembled and for the librarians and staff that made working there such a joy. I am especially grateful to Matthew Heintzelman, curator of the Austria/Germany Study Center at Hill, for providing me access to several seventeenth-century compilations of liturgical documents from their rare books collection. Gaining access to many of the books printed between the sixteenth and early nineteenth centuries proved particularly challenging, and I am indebted to the librarians of the Interlibrary Loan office of the James Madison University Library for their heroic efforts on my behalf. Several of the works that I had particular trouble finding have since been made available online, and I would like to thank those responsible at the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich for making these rare books and manuscripts available on their respective websites (<http://gallica.bnf.fr> for Paris and <http://www.muenchener-digitalisierungszentrum.de> for Munich). For the early publications from the British Isles, I am grateful for the collection available at Early English Books Online (<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>). Several important sources that I was unable to locate through Interlibrary Loan or through any of the sites listed above I did manage to find in the recesses of Google Books (<http://books.google.com>) and the Internet Archive (<https://archive.org>), and I offer special thanks to those responsible for making these collections available.

This project was supported in large part by the Computer Science department of James Madison University, and I am indebted to Dr. Malcolm Lane and Dr. Sharon Simmons, department heads during my tenure here, for allowing me to continue my research into areas far removed from those for which I was hired to teach and for funding my travels for research and conferences as well as assisting in the acquisition of images and other materials in support of my work. Such beneficence, as I have come to understand, is not the norm in academe, and I am grateful

to be a part of an institution that values the pursuit of knowledge to such a degree that this sort of crossover would be possible.

In closing, I must thank Susan Boynton, who championed this project in its early stages and who arranged for me to present my thesis to gatherings of liturgical specialists, Nils Holger Petersen, who put together a seminar in Copenhagen that allowed me to test some of the ideas presented here on a small, but expert, group of musicological, liturgical, and literary specialists, and Andreas Haug and Elaine Stratton Hild, whose generous invitation to present my ideas at the University of Würzburg helped me to refine some of the more subtle issues that this study encountered. I would be remiss if I did not thank my wife, Janis Norton, for her love, her support, and especially her patience over the decade that I spent wandering both in body and in mind. Finally, I would like to acknowledge my great debt to the late C. Clifford Flanigan, who argued much of this before, and with greater style, whose voice was silenced much too early.

Abbreviations

- AH Guido Dreves, Clemens Blume, and Henry Bannister, eds., *Analecta hymnica medii aevi*, 55 vols. (Imprint varies, 1854–1919).
- CAO Dom René-Jean Hesbert, *Corpus Antiphonarium Officii*, 6 vols. (Rome: Herder, 1963–1969).
- CCCM *Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Medievalis* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1966–).
- Evers/Janota Ute Evers and Johannes Janota, *Die Melodien der lateinischen Osterfeiern. Editionen und Kommentare*. 2 vols. in 4 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013).
- LOO Walther Lipphardt, *Lateinischen Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*, 9 vols. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1975–1990).
- PL Jacques Paul Migne, ed. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina*, 221 vols. (Paris: Migne, 1841–1864).
- RH Ulysse Chevalier, *Repertorium Hymnologicum*, 2 vols. (Louvain: Polleunis & Ceuterick, 1892–1897).

Introduction

The Illusion of Liturgical Drama

SOME YEARS AGO, I was asked to put together an article on liturgical drama for an online encyclopedia of medieval studies. But as I set to work out the contours of the study, I discovered that I had no idea how to define the expression. I had spent more than two decades thinking and writing about the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, a liturgical rite that most considered the *sine qua non* of liturgical drama, but given the narrow focus of my own research, I had never been forced to confront the larger category to which these ceremonies had been consigned. While I had long been uncomfortable with both the label and the concept “liturgical drama,” I was content to ignore my discomfort so long as it did not hinder my own work. If others wished to see this curious liturgical ceremony as a species of drama, then so be it. I saw no reason to dissuade them.

I had come to see the label “liturgical drama” as attached to two different kinds of events. On the one hand were liturgical rites such as the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, rites that were celebrated within specific liturgical contexts at particular churches at particular moments in time, rites that were celebrated year after year and century after century. On the other hand were what appeared to be Latin religious plays that had at best a tangential association with the liturgy, plays that may have been performed one or more times at some unspecified location at some usually unspecified time, if they were performed at all. Any definition that I might suggest for liturgical drama that could encompass both of these activities would be chimeral at best. So far as I was concerned, the notion “liturgical drama” had been effectively neutered by C. Clifford Flanigan in any case. In a series of articles and conference presentations given over the two decades that preceded his untimely death in 1993, Flanigan had offered what I thought was a convincing case that what we saw as drama in the liturgy was largely a creature of our own making, an imposition of our own understanding of what drama and/or theater might be. As a student of the music and liturgy of the Middle Ages, I could see no reason to regard the *Visitatio Sepulchri*

and other similar ceremonies as anything other than liturgical acts that were best understood in liturgical and theological terms.

As I reengaged the more recent literature on liturgical drama and medieval drama in general, though, I was astounded by the degree to which some students of medieval drama had ignored Flanigan's brilliant analyses in the wake of his untimely death. I can well remember hearing a conference paper given by one prominent scholar who declared without reservation that the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the tenth-century *Regularis Concordia* not only *was* drama, but that it was likely created to replace an even more overtly theatrical, albeit no longer extant, spectacle of some sort. I was distressed to discover that Flanigan's insights had resonated so poorly, and I resolved to see what, if anything, I could do to reanimate Flanigan's voice. I was certainly not alone in this. Nils Holger Petersen, among others, had done much both to carry forth Flanigan's legacy and to move it in new directions. But even his incisive analyses seemed to have little impact among some scholars, particularly those whose focus tended toward the literary rather than the liturgical. In the meantime, the project to which I had been asked to contribute went defunct, and I began the odyssey that would become this book.

Problems of Definition

The expression "liturgical drama" has come to represent a genre of musical texts that were dramatic in nature: with characters portrayed by clerics costumed in vestments, in dialogue form, and staged within the confines of a monastic, ecclesiastical, or parish church as a part of the liturgical observance for a particular feast. Definitions for "liturgical drama," however, have proven elusive. In 1860, Edmond de Coussemaker offered the following:

The liturgical dramas are those bound in an intimate way to the ceremonies of worship, having developed from the liturgy of the time and of the saints; they were an outgrowth or a complement. . . . The liturgical dramas had only churches and monasteries for their stages, monastic and secular clerics for their actors. These dramatic plays were not composed for theatrical purposes. The spectators did not come there to engage worldly and mundane emotion, to applaud the talent of the actors; they were there to attend the feast being celebrated, to identify with the ceremony of the day for which the drama had been put into action.¹

That these were drama was taken for granted—Coussemaker offered no defense for this. That these were liturgical was also clearly implied, if not precisely stated. The words “liturgical” and “drama” came to entail their own referents, and any further understanding could be culled from the examples provided in the remainder of the volume. For Coussemaker, the expression “liturgical drama” embraced more than the few liturgical plays that he offered within his edition, moreover. Drawing on the work of Charles Magnin a generation earlier (see chapter 1), Coussemaker saw these so-called liturgical plays as but one aspect of a larger manifestation of representation in the religious art of the Middle Ages: “The liturgical drama was the mimetic representation not only of the liturgy of the time and of the saints,” he noted, “but of all religious stories that were figured on the windows, on the walls, in the stalls, in the niches, through painting and sculpture; which gave them a grandeur, a pomp, a sparkle that had to act powerfully on the imagination of the faithful.”² The expression was also overly broad. After distinguishing the liturgical dramas from the mysteries, Coussemaker observed that it was necessary also to distinguish among the liturgical dramas themselves:

These were of two types. The one was bound closely to the religious ceremonies and formed, to some extent, a unit with them by borrowing the liturgical texts that were paraphrased and put into dialogue that required action. The others, while having the same religious character, did not have such an intimate connection with the ritual. They were dramatic at their creation. They have as their subject the sacred text, but their development made them into special compositions whose extent made it impossible to be kept in the offices. These were represented sometimes in processions, sometimes during or after the ceremonies, either in the choir or at the rood screen.³

Coussemaker’s definition for “liturgical drama” was the most comprehensive of his era, and over the next century and a half, those who followed emulated Coussemaker by allowing their own definitions for “liturgical drama” to form in the minds of their readers rather than on the pages of their studies, the category generating spontaneously around one or more prototypical texts. In his 1954 article on “Liturgical Drama” in the *New Oxford History of Music*, for example, William Smoldon offered the following:

It will be useful here to define ‘liturgical drama’ in more detail. The first simple compositions to which this term could be applied were

closely connected with Divine Service, and arose from a brief dialogue sung before the Easter Mass, one of the free compositions known as “tropes” which in early medieval times had begun to invade many parts of the liturgy. By an evolution which will presently be described this became the “Easter Sepulchre” music-drama, the three Marys and the empty tomb receiving the news of this Resurrection from the angel.⁴

For Smoldon, the repertory defined the category, and no further details were needed. In the revised edition of the *New Oxford History of Music* thirty-six years later, Susan Rankin offered more description, but moved quickly to a discussion of the repertory:

The liturgical books of the medieval western church preserve a large repertory of dramatic representations intended for performance on the highest church festivals. Of widely varied form, these ‘dramatic ceremonies’ or ‘plays’ drew on the literary and musical as well as dramatic skills of their creators. Like the liturgical ritual itself, they were expressed in Latin words and were sung throughout. . . . Liturgical plays first appear in the tenth century, initially the product of a widespread interest in new liturgical composition of many kinds. The earliest examples are of two types, based on biblical stories relating to the Nativity and Resurrection of Christ.⁵

This reluctance to define the expression “liturgical drama” has carried across disciplines as well. Peter Meredith, in his chapter on “Latin liturgical drama” in *The Medieval European Stage*, offered the following: “Liturgical drama is the theatrical action growing out of and to an extent remaining within the annually recurring services of the church.” After a brief but engaging discussion of the difficulties of determining when “ritual action becomes theatrical action, and, in turn drama” as well as what it means for something to be liturgical, he ultimately allowed the texts themselves to give substance to the expression.⁶ In his chapter on premodern theater in *The Cambridge History of British Theatre*, John Coldeway introduced his discussion of liturgical drama by noting the tenth-century plays of Hrosvitha of Gandersheim modeled on those of Terence. Moving on to liturgical drama proper, he offered a brief overview of the genre’s purported origin, but quickly shifted focus to the repertory without having defined what the expression “liturgical drama” itself might actually mean:

At about the same time, another kind of dramatic performance was spreading in other monastic settings, based on musical

embellishments of the liturgy known as tropes, or significant phrases extended musically for emphasis. Liturgical dramas, in turn, extended the musical phrases one step further, enacting biblical stories referred to in the liturgy. Their purpose, clearly, was to heighten the religious experiences of the ritual practices. The best-known example of such liturgical embellishment is the *quem quaeritis* trope, which dramatises the Easter morning biblical episode in which the three Marys approach the sepulchre where Jesus was buried.⁷

Historians of the liturgy have similarly avoided explicit definitions. Fr. Richard Donovan, in his 1958 study of liturgical drama in Spain, attempted to define the expression by examining its terms. After accepting Young's claim that drama was characterized by the use of impersonation,⁸ Donovan went on to look at the term "liturgical," relying on the individual instances of liturgical drama that he would offer later to give substance to his definitions:

The word *liturgical* itself is not devoid of certain difficulties, inasmuch as it is not always easy to determine just which ceremonies fall into this category. In the Middle Ages the 'official liturgy' of the Church, if one may so speak, was limited to the essential part of Catholic worship, such as the Canon of the Mass, etc.; in the more secondary portions, usage varied considerably from diocese to diocese. The liturgical plays were one of these secondary items.⁹

In his discussion of liturgical performance in *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, Éric Palazzo offered a perspective that was markedly different, although he still came no closer to defining what he meant by the expression:

These "liturgical dramas" appear in the tenth/eleventh century primarily in monastic settings where they gave rise to new liturgical books. For many decades, historiography has tended to style these new ritual displays "liturgical dramas," an expression, which though doubtless convenient, seems to me to be ill-suited to designate what these productions of the life of Christ or of other biblical characters really were. For my part, I am convinced that these new kinds of rites are in no wise "dramatic" in the modern sense of the term, and that it would be out of place to dislocate them from monastic ritual in its entirety.¹⁰

While Palazzo admitted his misgivings about the expression, his discussion assumed that his readers had a prior understanding of "liturgical drama"

and of the repertory that defined it. Scholars who have dealt with the notion of “liturgical drama,” in fact, appear to have depended heavily upon the understanding of their predecessors, while failing to notice that their predecessors had come no closer to defining the expression themselves. On the whole, definitions for “liturgical drama” have thus tended toward circularity. The words “liturgical” and “drama” have drawn onto themselves the individual ceremonies and plays that would delineate the category, and these in turn have provided the parameters for the definition.

It is little wonder that I was unable to come up with a definition that could adequately cover the repertory of what we now call “liturgical drama.” The splintered nature of the repertory precluded an easy definition, and scholars largely avoided the task. Indeed, the problem of definition did not result from any deficiencies on the part of the various scholars. The problem resulted from a defect in the notion “liturgical drama” itself. The bulk of the repertory is made up of liturgical rites whose dramatic nature has only recently been claimed, while the remainder are religious plays whose liturgical nature lacks evidentiary binding. Although each text can make an individual claim for its inclusion within the category, the category crumbles when all are considered together. The repertory of what we have come to know as “liturgical drama” was not a bifurcation, therefore, not a division of similar things into multiple branches, but rather an amalgam of different kinds: liturgical ceremonies, religious plays, and perhaps other things as well.

Words and Such

Given the difficulty of defining “liturgical drama,” coming to terms with the vocabulary invoked in its treatment can be vexing. In this study, I will distinguish between the two sorts of musical texts typically included among the so-called liturgical dramas. For those preserved in liturgical manuscripts and celebrated at specific moments in the liturgical *cursus* I will use the expression “representational rites,” while for those found in non-liturgical manuscripts or in non-liturgical contexts that offer scant evidence of liturgical attachment, I will use the expression “religious plays” or “religious representations” (since I am not fully convinced that these should be seen as drama either).

One attempt to deal with the difficulties of the expression “liturgical drama” was the invention in the mid-twentieth century of “music-drama” or “medieval music-drama,” an expression popularized by musicologist

William Smoldon to make clear that these rites and plays were sung rather than spoken.¹¹ Indeed, for Smoldon and for most musicologists since, the melodies to which the texts were set were as important as the texts, if not more so.¹² This expression, though, has proven even more troublesome than “liturgical drama.” While the expression did highlight the need to consider the melodies to which these texts were sung, it divorced the representational rites fully from their liturgical contexts. No longer “liturgical dramas,” the texts became “music-dramas” (along with the unfortunate Wagnerian overtones). The liturgical nature of these rites was overwhelmed by their musical attributes, and the label could no longer evoke its repertory. Indeed, music-drama could be anything.

Such terminological issues underscore the ontological problem that we face when dealing with the individual instances of what we call “liturgical drama.” There is no single noun that can adequately stand for all instances. The words “rite” or “ceremony” might be appropriate for what I am calling “representational rites,” but these do not suit those religious plays where evidence of liturgical use is scant. The word “play,” conversely, might well be appropriate for what I am here calling “religious representations,” but it is unsuitable for representational rites such as the *Visitatio Sepulchri* (for reasons that should become obvious as the study progresses). So, should I need to refer abstractly to an instance of the so-called liturgical drama, an instance that might be either rite or play, I will use the words “text” or “representation” or the expression “musical text.” I should note that my use of the single word “text” implies the presence of musical notation, whether specifically provided in the manuscript (as in antiphoners and graduals) or not (as typically in breviaries and ordinals).

Also problematic are terms that imply performance or that suggest theatrical activity when talking about the representational rites in particular. The study of what we now call “liturgical drama” has been ongoing for so long that it is difficult to avoid talking about individual rites or individual aspects of how these rites were celebrated without using terms and expressions drawn from the study of theater. I will strive to avoid using such terms and expressions when referring to these rites. I will use the term “represent” rather than “portray,” “celebrate” rather than “perform,” “in the person of” rather than “role,” “vestments” rather than “costume,” “movement” rather than “staging” and so on.

The ontological issues presented by the expression “liturgical drama” manifest also when dealing with the several subgenres of the representational rites and religious plays that constitute its repertory as cur-

rently understood. The manuscripts themselves rarely provide titles, and when they do, the titles are often inconsistently applied. For the liturgical visit to the sepulcher, I will use the expression “*Visitatio Sepulchri*,” while for the expanded versions that are not liturgically connected, I will use the expression “*Ludus Paschalis*.” For other liturgically bound rites, I will use the Latin “*officium*,” e.g., “*Officium Pastorum*” or “*Officium Stellae*,” while for texts lacking a liturgical context, I will use the Latin “*ordo*,” e.g., “*Ordo Pastorum*” or “*Ordo Stellae*.” To be sure, the terms “*officium*” and “*ordo*” were both commonly used to describe ritual acts of various sorts in medieval liturgical manuscripts. The distinction that I am drawing here is thus purely arbitrary. While the distinction holds generally among the medieval sources for these rites, there is some degree of crossover.¹³ So, I make the distinction here merely to clarify for the reader my own understanding of a particular musical text. I will not restrict my use of the term “*ordo*” only to religious plays (as I am calling them), moreover. I will also use the term to refer to texts where the liturgical intent is ambiguous or unknown, a text that might or might not have been used liturgically (see chapter 4).

Readers unaccustomed to dealing with liturgical matters may find the plethora of liturgical books and categories of liturgical books confusing. I have included a glossary at the end of this study that I hope will mitigate some of the issues the reader may encounter. However, a summary here might prove helpful. One major distinction in the types of documents preserving the rites and plays that have come to form the genre of what we now know as liturgical drama is that between manuscripts and printed books. While the majority of texts now included among the liturgical dramas were copied into manuscripts from the tenth century and later, more than a few have survived in printed liturgical books from the late fifteenth century and beyond. Should I need to indicate both manuscripts and printed books, I will use the term “books” to refer to the collection and “book” to refer to an individual instance from the collection. Beyond this, there are many ways to classify liturgical books in ways that are more meaningful. They can be classified according to the type of ceremony (e.g., books for the celebration of Mass and books for the celebration of the Divine Office), by content (e.g., books with musical notation and those without), by usage (e.g., books for the chorus, books used by priests, books used by cantors), or any number of other ways. In the brief survey below, I will proceed by content, by type of ceremony, and by usage. I should note that there is some degree of overlap in the various books, so the distinctions among the various types of books should not be held too firmly.¹⁴

Books containing musical notation were generally intended for choral use. *Antiphoners* contain music for the Divine Office (the round of eight prayer services held over the course of a day). This book is typically arranged chronologically, beginning with Advent and moving through the liturgical year. In some books, the feasts for the saints are interspersed with those for the events of Christ's life and ministry and their associated seasons (e.g., Advent, Christmas, Lent, Easter, and Pentecost), while in others they are given separately. For each feast, the music for the antiphons and responsories are given in the order that they are sung. Music for vespers, matins, and lauds are typically provided, while antiphons for the lesser hours (prime, terce, sext, none, and compline) are entered when they diverge from normal usage. *Graduals* contain the music for the Mass. Items for the Proper of the Mass (texts that change with the feast, including the Introit, Gradual, Alleluia/Tract, Offertory, and Communion) are listed for each feast day, which are arranged chronologically beginning with Advent as in antiphoners. Separate sections are typically provided for the music of the Ordinary chants (the invariable texts of the Mass, including the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei) as well as for tropes and sequences. *Sequentiaries* contain sequences for the Mass, often but not always with music. *Processionals* contain the music for liturgical processions and, in some cases, the rites of Holy Week as well. *Hymnals* contain hymns for the Divine Office. *Troper*s contain tropes and other musical items intended for solo singers. Typically not including musical notation are the *breviary*, which contains the order of items for the Divine Office, and the *ordinal*, which includes the order for both Mass and Divine Office. These contain textual incipits along with rubrics that outline the details for celebration. Some breviaries and ordinals, particularly those copied before the fourteenth century, contain musical notation as well. *Missals* are books intended for the use by priests at Mass. A final group of books, variously called *rituale*, *agenda*, *obsequiale*, or *benedictionale* contain the liturgy for sacraments such as baptism, marriage, and the rites for the sick and dying, along with blessings for various occasions. These books are destined for use by priests and often contain music for other rites as well, such as the processions for the Purification of Mary and Palm Sunday and the rites of Holy Week, including the *Visitatio Sepulchri*.

Unravelling the Threads

The story of “liturgical drama” began with a tectonic shift. Before 1834, there was no such concept. After 1834, the metaphor “liturgical drama” took hold, and with the publication of Coussemaker’s *Drames liturgiques* in 1860, the genre “liturgical drama” was born. Coussemaker’s approach to the idea of “liturgical drama” was more nuanced than those of his twentieth- and twenty-first-century successors. While the metaphor “liturgical drama” may have faded by the time of Coussemaker’s edition, Coussemaker and the French scholars who followed still saw “liturgical drama” broadly, as encompassing “the dramatic” in other venues—drama in its metaphorical sense—as well as embracing two broad groupings of texts, one securely set within the liturgy and the other not. This framework for understanding the divided repertory of “liturgical drama” prevailed throughout most of the nineteenth century among French scholars, evaporating as the nineteenth century gave way to the twentieth and as the language of scholarship shifted from French to English and to German (see chapter 1). This distinction between texts dramatic and liturgical, moreover, had dominated over the centuries that preceded the expression’s nativity as well (see chapter 3).

Thus, the arguments I advance here are not entirely new. The two classes of texts covered by the expression “liturgical drama” were evident from the outset, if later forgotten. More recently, C. Clifford Flanigan and Nils Holger Petersen have argued persuasively for considering those liturgically bound texts now called “liturgical dramas” as liturgical, rather than dramatic, phenomena, and I take these arguments one step further by challenging the notion “liturgical drama” itself. This genre “liturgical drama” is like a quilt pieced together from patches of conflicting materials and design haphazardly stitched together. From a distance, the quilt appears coherent and compelling. Up close, however, the patches clash in unexpected ways with stitching that is both slipshod and disjunct. While scholars have sought to understand some of the individual patches and have traced a few of the threads woven through them, the quilt as a whole has remained unexamined, and it is this lack of scrutiny that has hidden the defects of the so-called genre within its folds.

In this study, I will assess the quilt as a whole. I will offer a comprehensive, albeit not exhaustive, study of the origin and history of the notion “liturgical drama,” of the texts that make up the collection that we now call “liturgical drama,” and of the words that make up the expression.

I will also offer a critical analysis of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* that places it clearly within its liturgical and theological context. Each thread: historiographical, etymological, repertorial, and analytical, moreover, will wind to the same conclusion. The label “liturgical drama” does not, and cannot, adequately characterize the full range of rites and plays that have collected under its banner.

In short, this study traces how we got to our current understandings of what we have come to know as “liturgical drama” and how these understandings have distorted our perception of the rites and plays that have formed this synthetic genre. This was by no means a linear progression. Nor did the transformations in scholarly outlook occur smoothly. In building such an historical narrative for the concept “liturgical drama,” I am mindful of Nils Holger Petersen’s admonition that any such narrative must “tell the story of how generations after generations have appropriated and thus changed what they inherited, re-contextualising and bringing it to new uses.” He observed further:

Discontinuity and continuity work hand in hand in that re-contextualisation is sometimes closely based on former uses, but at other times, consciously or unconsciously, radically changes the practice that was taken over. The narrative of such changes is a narrative that does not presuppose an ontological essence of what is studied, but at the same time does not shy away from telling a narrative of transformations which over time have contributed to a situation at the end of the narrative which could not have been expected from the outset. Still, the narrative connects these different historical situations, constituting an interpretation of the course of events from one end-point to the other.¹⁵

This study thus seeks both to contextualize the ways that the notion “liturgical drama” has been regarded over the century and three-quarters of its existence and to recontextualize the texts embraced by the notion in ways drawn both from earlier attempts to understand these texts and from others altogether new.

Prospectus

When I began my research into the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, the ideas of C. Clifford Flanigan were just beginning to take hold. As I absorbed the substance of what he had put forth, and as I delved ever deeper into the liturgical fabrics into which the *Visitatio Sepulchri* was woven, the notion

“liturgical drama” became for me ever less relevant, an illusion that was incapable of capturing a singular essence for that vast array of liturgical rites and representational texts that it strained to contain. While I was aware that scholars on the dramatic side of the divide likely saw this differently, I was confident that the cumulative arguments of Flanigan, and of Hardison and De Boor before him, would ultimately prevail. What I could not anticipate was the widespread indifference to the thrust of these arguments that would ensue once the voices of their framers had been stilled (see chapter 2).

Ignoring the issues, however, does not negate them, and the difficulties presented by both the label and the notion “liturgical drama” continue to resonate whether sounded or not. The problem with liturgical drama, ultimately, is ontological. If there is such a thing as liturgical drama, what is it that defines the collection that has gathered under its rubric? Indeed, can we justify applying the label “liturgical drama” to the prescriptions for—or the performances of—those medieval rites since cast as drama and those religious plays since assumed to be liturgical in the absence of any encompassing and concurrent notion of liturgical drama? Asked more broadly, was there a notion “liturgical drama” that existed independently of the minds that would one day consider it?

Such questions form the core of this study, with each set of questions triggering the questions that animate the inquiries to follow. If the expression “liturgical drama” was an invention of the mid-nineteenth century, for example, then how were the rites and plays covered by the expression understood before the expression came to be? Given this, is the category “liturgical drama” at all viable? If so, how broadly should this category extend, and if not, how should the rites and plays included among the liturgical dramas be considered? If the notion “liturgical drama” should fail as a category, then what, if anything, might the expression “liturgical drama” signify? What do we mean by the words “liturgy” and “drama,” and what can these words possibly mean when combined? Since Flanigan’s passing, such questions are rarely asked, and when they are, their force has tended to dissipate before their influence could be felt. In the chapters that follow, I address these questions anew, with each chapter confronting a discrete aspect of the notion “liturgical drama” and the ways that it has spawned our reimagining of medieval theater.

In chapter 1, “A Prodigious Birth: Creating ‘Liturgical Drama,’” I trace the expression “liturgical drama” from its creation in the mid-1830s through the early years of the twentieth century. The expression was intro-

duced during a course on the history of drama given at the Sorbonne by Charles Magnin, curator of printed books at the Royal Library in Paris. For Magnin, “liturgical drama” served as a metaphor that stood in place of the dramatic tendencies that he observed within the rites of the Church and within medieval society at large. This metaphorical sense was carried forth in the writings of most critics over the following quarter-century. As late as the early 1850s, Félix Clément clearly understood “liturgical drama” as metaphor, and he used the label to describe the expressive, indeed dramatic, nature of the texts and melodies of hymns, sequences, and proses rather than those ceremonies that we might consider to be liturgical dramas today. It was not until 1860 that the expression began to take on the sense of genre that we have come to expect of it. From this point, subsequent scholars abandoned any metaphorical understanding they may once have held, and the category “liturgical drama” took hold. By the latter part of the nineteenth century the expression found its way into the work of scholars outside of France, and despite all attempts to challenge it, the notion has remained steadfast in scholarly discussions.

In chapter 2, “An Improbable Fiction: Confronting ‘Liturgical Drama,’” I examine efforts to challenge the notion of “liturgical drama” over the course of the twentieth century. In the century’s first decade, John Manly challenged the theory of medieval drama’s incremental development, thus laying the groundwork for the challenges that would follow. Beginning in 1930 and continuing through the mid-1950s, scholars began to challenge the accepted view that drama had originated within the liturgy as well. Oscar Cargill saw the origin of medieval drama in the activities of medieval minstrels, while Robert Stumpff and Benjamin Hunnigher saw drama’s beginnings in pagan ritual. All three saw liturgical drama as having been imported into the medieval liturgy from external sources rather than serving as the origin for drama in the Middle Ages. Beginning the mid-1960s and continuing through the early 1990s, the tenor of scholarship shifted from examinations of dramatic texts to inquiries into the liturgical foundations and contexts of the liturgical rites within which most of these texts were embedded. The studies of O. B. Hardison, Jr. and Helmut de Boor set the parameters for much that followed, and with the studies of C. Clifford Flanigan in particular, the notion of liturgical drama was shown to be largely vacuous. In the decades since Flanigan’s passing, treatments of liturgical drama have reverted among some literary scholars to attitudes that prevailed before the mid-1960s, this despite the efforts of Nils Holger Petersen and others to carry forward Flanigan’s voice.

In chapter 3, “Past as Prologue: Preceding ‘Liturgical Drama,’” I examine the rites and plays that came to make up the category “liturgical drama” as they were understood before the introduction of the expression. I approach this in reverse chronological order, beginning with the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries—the period separating the era when these rites and plays were celebrated and performed and the invention of the concept “liturgical drama.” For the literary and liturgical scholars of the seventeenth through early-nineteenth centuries, liturgy and drama (or theater) were distinct classes. The liturgical aggregators of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries published texts for many of the ceremonies that would later fall under the banner “liturgical drama” without any sense that these rites were anything other than liturgical ceremonies that had fallen out of general use. Several religious representations now considered to be plays were also published during the eighteenth century, including three from what we have come to know as the Fleury Playbook along with the *Sponsus* of Saint-Martial and the Tegernsee play of Antichrist, but these were seen strictly as theater. The polemics of Protestant reformers from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, often cited as evidence for the theatrical nature of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and other Holy Week ceremonies, did not single out the rites of Holy Week for special consideration. Rather, they treated the entire Roman liturgy as idolatrous pomp or theatrical pageant—what we now see as liturgical drama was no more and no less theatrical than the rest. Puritan critics of theater during the seventeenth century appear also to have included instances of religious drama among their condemnations. However, these turn out to have been festivals or tournaments rather than theatrical productions. Complaints by twelfth- and thirteenth-century critics are often cited as evidence for the existence of drama with the liturgy as well. Under closer scrutiny, however, these criticisms do not appear to point to any of the liturgical ceremonies that we might today designate as liturgical dramas.

In chapter 4, “Strange Bedfellows: Unfolding ‘Liturgical Drama,’” I offer an overview of the rites and other representations that make up the repertory of liturgical drama as currently understood. Looking at these in terms of the contexts within which these are found within the manuscripts and books that preserve them, I divide the repertory into two broad categories: representational rites and religious plays. Included among the representational rites are those ceremonies preserved within liturgical books that clearly show the liturgical context for their celebration. Included among the religious plays are those settings that offer no such context,

most of which are included in manuscripts containing sermons or other exegetical works. A third category of ambiguously placed works includes those that might have been representational rites in practice but which are preserved in a context that does not allow their liturgical intent to be established along with what might have been religious plays that are preserved in liturgical books but which hold a tenuous connection to the book in which they are preserved.

In chapter 5, “What’s in a Name: Defining ‘Liturgical Drama,’” I consider the label “liturgical drama” itself. I examine the words “liturgy” and “drama” in their ancient and medieval contexts, and I trace the meanings of these words from the beginnings of their modern incarnations in the sixteenth century until the present. Both words have a manifold set of meanings with a great many shades depending on context. Putting the words together to form “liturgical drama” magnifies the range of possible meanings to an even greater degree. After looking at what the words could possibly mean, I conclude that whatever decisions we may make in that regard are ultimately meaningless, as the expression has no clear referent. There are two different kinds of activities joined together under that label, one that is liturgical but not drama and the other that may be drama but not liturgical.

In chapter 6, “All That Glitters: Dismantling ‘Liturgical Drama,’” I observe that it was Magnin’s definition of drama, later refined by Karl Young, that made it possible for the first time to see texts that were not intended as dramatic as drama nonetheless. This reclassification of what were originally liturgical ceremonies into theatrical forms removed the representational rites from the liturgical contexts into which they had been copied and within which they had been celebrated, allowing them to become something altogether different in the eyes of literary scholars. However, neither the literary perspective, which saw these rites as a form of theater, nor the more recent musicological perspective, which saw them as a form of innovative chant composition, was wide enough to offer insight into how those involved in their celebration might have experienced these rites. Using the *Visitatio Sepulchri* as an example, I provide an alternative view, examining the rite within the context of the Holy Week liturgy and offering one interpretation of how it functioned within the cycle of special rites between Palm Sunday and Easter. In addition, I offer an analysis of a twelfth-century revision of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* often noted for its enhanced realism and dramatic potential. I argue that this rite is more easily understood in liturgical and theological terms than in

terms of theatrical realism. I take a closer look at the process of metaphorical transformation by which a figurative understanding of dramatic processes within the medieval liturgy was reconstituted into a literal category, and I consider the implications of expunging the expression and the category that it describes from scholarly discourse. I suggest that, all ontological arguments aside, we can have a clearer understanding of the individual rites or ceremonies and plays if we consider them as individual expressions rather than as members of the larger category that we have come to know as liturgical drama.

* * *

This is not an introductory text. I do not intend to lay out for my readers what liturgical drama might be or what kinds of musical texts might be included under its banner, although I will deal with these issues along the way. I see this book not as an entranceway into the study of liturgical drama, but as an exit ramp. To ensure that my readers can find their way to the exit, I expect that they should have some familiarity with the subject of liturgical drama at the start and that they have in mind some idea of what they believe liturgical drama to be, although, given the problem of definition, I do not expect that these understandings will correlate with my own or those of others. I expect that my readers know what I am talking about when I refer, for example, to the *Visitatio Sepulchri* or the *Officium Stellae* or the Fleury Playbook and that they have some familiarity with the classical works on liturgical drama from the last century, such as Edmond K. Chambers's *The Mediaeval Stage*, Karl Young's *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, O. B. Hardison, Jr.'s *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages*, and Helmut de Boor's *Die Textgeschichte der lateinischen Osterfeiern*.

What I argue here is not wholly new. Nor am I alone among contemporary scholars in putting these arguments forth. I may or may not be successful in convincing others of liturgical drama's illusory nature. This remains to be seen. However, in pursuing my thesis from multiple perspectives: historical, repertorial, etymological, and philosophical, I hope that my arguments might find more fertile soil. To accept my thesis requires reimagining the nature of the rites and plays now called "liturgical drama," and this might prove too much for some. If nothing else, I can only hope that the combined force of these perspectives might at least resurrect and bring into focus the stilled voices of those who not only made these claims before, but who made them far more eloquently than I could ever hope.

NOTES

¹ “Les drames liturgiques sont ceux qui se liaient d’une manière intime aux cérémonies du culte; ils étaient la mise en action des offices des temps et des saints; ils en étaient le développement ou le complément. . . . Les drames liturgiques, au contraire, n’eurent pour scène que les églises et les monastères, pour acteurs que les clercs monastiques ou séculiers. Ces jeux dramatiques n’ont jamais été composés dans un but théâtral. Les spectateurs ne venaient pas là pour s’égayer ou se livrer à des émotions mondaines ou terrestres, pour applaudir au talent des acteurs; ils y étaient pour participer à la fête qu’on célébrait, pour s’identifier à la cérémonie du jour dont le drame n’était que la mise en action.” Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, viii.

² “Le drame liturgique était la représentation mimique, non seulement des offices des temps et des saints, mais encore de toutes les histoires religieuses figurées sur les vitraux, sur les murs, dans les stalles, dans les niches, par la peinture et la sculpture; ce qui leur donnait une grandeur, une pompe, un éclat qui devaient agir puissamment sur l’imagination des fidèles.” Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, viii–ix.

³ “Indépendamment de la différence qui existait entre les drames liturgiques et les mystères, il convient, suivant nous, d’établir aussi une distinction entre les drames liturgiques eux-mêmes. Ceux-ci étaient de deux sortes: les uns se liaient étroitement aux cérémonies religieuses, et faisaient en quelque sorte corps avec elles, en empruntant le texte liturgique qu’on paraphrasait légèrement, et qu’on mettait en dialogue pour le besoin de l’action. Les autres, tout en ayant le même caractère religieux, n’avaient pas une liaison aussi intime avec le culte. Ce furent déjà de véritables créations dramatiques. Ils ont pour sujet le texte sacré; mais le développement qu’on y donna en fit des compositions spéciales dont l’étendue ne permit plus de conserver leur place dans les offices. On les représenta tantôt aux processions, tantôt pendant ou après les cérémonies, soit au chœur, soit au jubé.” Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, ix–x.

⁴ Smoldon, “Liturgical Drama,” 175.

⁵ Rankin, “Liturgical Drama,” 310.

⁶ Meredith, “Latin liturgical drama,” 55–56.

⁷ Coldeway, “From Roman to Renaissance,” 27–28.

⁸ On the history of the term of “drama,” see chapter 5, pp. 166–70. For Magnin’s and Young’s definition, see chapter 6, pp. 179–81.

⁹ Donovan, *The Liturgical Drama in Spain*, 6–7.

¹⁰ Palazzo, “Performing the Liturgy,” 487–88.

¹¹ Smoldon, “The Easter Sepulchre Music-Drama” (1946), “Mediaeval Music-Drama” (1953), and *The Music of Mediaeval Church Dramas* (1980).

¹² See, for example, Andrew Hughes’s masterful demonstration of the ways in which an understanding of the musical structures can both clarify ambiguities inherent in the texts and make possible a deeper understanding of the exegetical potential of these rites and plays. Hughes, “Liturgical Drama.”

¹³ For example, the term “ordo” is used to identify settings of the non-liturgical *Ordo Stellae* in the Fleury manuscript, the non-liturgical *Ordo Rachelis* from Freising, and the *Ordo Paschalis* (*Ludus Paschalis*) of Klosterneuburg (see chapter 4, table 4.2). It is used also for the ambiguously situated representations from Bilsen (*Ordo <Stellae>*), Laon (*Ordo Prophetarum*, *Ordo Stelle*, and *Ordo Joseph*), the *Ordo de Ysaac et Rebecca* from Vorau, and the *Ordo ad Peregrinorum* from Beauvais (see chapter 4, table 4.3). It is used sometimes for liturgically placed rites as well, for example the settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Augsburg (LOO 526) and Bamberg (LOO 530), both from the late sixteenth century, as well as Metz (LOO 268), Prüfening (LOO 311A), Würzburg (LOO 371), Wrocław (LOO 536V), and Gurk (LOO 543). The term “officium,” on the other hand, is almost always used for liturgical rites, and nearly all of these are preserved in manuscripts from the Rouen cathedral (*Officium Pastorum*, *Officium Trium Regem*, *Officium Sepulchri*, and *Officium Peregrinorum*—see chapter 4, tables 4.1C–4.1E).

¹⁴ The problem of determining the classification of liturgical books based on their contents is particularly acute when working with liturgical manuscripts antedating the thirteenth century. In a recent conference presentation, for example, Hanna Zühlke, outlined a number of difficulties that she encountered when trying to determine the book types of processions from the tenth century. I thank Dr. Zühlke for providing me a copy of this stimulating paper, Zühlke, “Angehängt, integriert oder separiert.”

¹⁵ Petersen, “Medieval Latin Performative Representations,” 5 (pre-publication text). I thank Dr. Petersen for providing me a copy of this paper prior to its publication. See also the discussion in Petersen, “Introduction,” 13–17.

Chapter 1

A Prodigious Birth: Creating “Liturgical Drama”

BY THE EARLY 1830S, France was accustomed to upheaval. From the revolution of 1787 to the terror that followed, from the rise of Napoléon to the restoration of the monarchy and the July Revolution, France had undergone profound changes in its culture and in its institutions. Largely unnoticed in the tumult, a librarian from the Royal Library in Paris offered a novel approach to the study of drama that spawned an upheaval of its own. He argued that drama was not reborn in modern times following its untimely death at the hands of early Christians. Rather, drama had never ceased to exist, expressing itself from time to time within the liturgy of the medieval western Church. To convey this understanding, he conceived the metaphor “liturgical drama,” a broadly construed expression that he used to capture a great many representational aspects of medieval religious practice. While the expression itself would endure, its metaphorical sense was transient, and by the middle of France’s Second Empire it yielded to the genre that remains with us today. The story of this passage, from metaphorical youth to categorical maturity, is one of both persistence and serendipity. And it took place at the juncture where studies in musicology, iconography, liturgiology, literature, and theater began their campaigns to recapture (or perhaps rebrand) the monuments of their medieval past.

Charles Magnin and the Drama in the Liturgy (1834–1835)

The expression “liturgical drama” (or “drame liturgique”) was coined by Charles Magnin and introduced to the scholarly community during a course on the origins of modern theater given at the Sorbonne during the academic year 1834–1835.¹ Magnin was the curator of printed books at the Bibliothèque royale in Paris and served for that year as the acting pro-

fessor for the chair of foreign literature in the Faculté des lettres.² Magnin was highly regarded by his peers, both as a critic and as a scholar. He was the subject of two essays by Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve,³ and upon his death in 1862, his eulogy was offered by none other than Paulin Paris, vice-president of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres and director of the Bibliothèque impériale in Paris (not to mention the father of Gaston Paris).⁴ Magnin's influence reverberated well beyond his death, and he was memorialized by Henri Alexandre Wallon with an extensive biography and bibliography on the twentieth anniversary of his passing.⁵

Magnin's course galvanized the incipient community of Parisian medievalists and literary scholars. French drama, he argued, did not originate *ex nihilo* during the fourteenth century as his predecessors had maintained, but developed from earlier forms of drama born within, and borne by, the ritual of the medieval Church. Magnin noted the magnitude of this claim a decade later in his review of Monmerqué and Michel's *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge*: "It would have been quite astonishing twenty years ago if we had seen a volume entitled: French Theater in the Middle Ages, during the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries. It was then universally accepted that the birthplace of the theater in France goes back no further than the performance given by the confraternity of the village of Saint-Maur around 1398, and in Paris, in a room of the Hôpital de la Trinité in 1402."⁶ Five years later, Edmond de Coussemaker similarly observed: "A mere twenty-five years ago, it was still believed with Beauchamps and the brothers Parfaict that the modern art of drama did not date from a time earlier than the fourteenth century. It seemed at the least to have slept for a long time, until this branch of literature and archeology, like many others long forgotten, finally attracted the attention of scholars."⁷

For Magnin, the development of modern drama had followed the same path as had the drama of the ancients, moving from ecclesiastical to aristocratic to popular.⁸ This was not a developmental, or teleological progression, however. Rather it was, as John M. Manly would later reassert,⁹ a series of separate beginnings. For Magnin there were three classes, or families, for the *jeux scéniques* of the Middle Ages, whose origins could be treated separately. The first encompassed "the marvelous, theocratic religious theater, the grand theater, that had for its stage the naves of Hagia Sophia, of Santa Maria Maggiore, the cathedrals of Strasbourg, of Rouen, of Rheims, and of Cambrai, the monasteries of Corbie, of Saint-Martial, of Gandersheim, and of St. Alban."¹⁰ The second family included "the manorial and royal theater, that shone in the palaces of the dukes of Provence,

Normandy, Brittany and Aquitaine, in the dungeons of the counts of Champagne; in the castles of the lords of Coucy, for the feasts of the kings of France and England, in the court of the emperor, in the official receptions of the kings of Sicily and Aragon.”¹¹ The third family then embraced “the popular and fairground theater that came and went regularly on certain days with great noise and gaiety in the streets of Florence, on the quays and canals of Venice, in the public squares of London and Paris.”¹²

What we know of Magnin’s course comes from notes to his lectures published between 1834 and 1836¹³ and from a series of articles that appeared in the *Revue des deux mondes* and the *Journal des savants* between 1834 and 1861.¹⁴ His opening lecture, published in full in the December 1834 issue of the *Revue des deux mondes*, offered the earliest, seemingly unambiguous use of the expression “drame liturgique.”¹⁵ Magnin spoke of the grand spectacle of contemporary opera as successor to the pious representations of medieval confraternities, which “had themselves followed others more solemn and more serious, true liturgical dramas, approved by the papacy and by the councils, admitted in the diurnals and rituals, played and sung in the processions and in the cathedrals.”¹⁶

While it is tempting to interpret Magnin’s words according to our current understanding of the expression, it is unclear to what Magnin actually referred with the words “drame liturgique.” In the notes to his lectures, the expression appears only once more, and its reference is even less clear. Speaking of the second-century *Exagoge* of Ezekiel (assigned by Magnin to the fourth century), Magnin observed: “Indeed, while the human spirit was gradually developing among the clergy in the liturgical drama, a literature was being formed within which were diverse elements from Christian society.”¹⁷ He abandoned the expression in his subsequent lectures in favor of the more inclusive “drame hiératique,” “drame sacerdotale” and “drame ecclésiastique,” and we are left to infer his meaning from the content of his course as a whole. From this perspective, Magnin’s understanding of “drame liturgique” appears quite expansive. He offered a brief glimpse into his conception later in the opening lecture. After summarizing the efforts of the Church to stamp out theater and other spectacles during the early centuries of Christianity, Magnin noted that:

At the same time, the Church made its own call to the dramatic imagination, it instituted representational ceremonies, multiplied processions and the transfers of relics and instituted finally those offices that are true dramas, that of the *Praesepe* or the manger for Christmas, that of the star or the three kings for Epiphany, that

of the sepulcher and the three Marys for Easter, where the three women were represented by three canons who veiled their heads with amices *ad similitudinem mulierum*, as the Ritual says; that of the Ascension, where a priest would represent Christ's ascension, sometimes on the choir screen, sometimes on the outside gallery above a portal; all truly mimetic ceremonies that drew, as we will see, the admiration of the faithful in the Middle Ages.¹⁸

But these *véritables drames* did not arise fully formed, nor were they alone in the panoply of dramatic activities that bubbled up during the long course of early and medieval Christianity. Rather they were, in Magnin's view, the result of dramatic impulses that were evident already in the earliest practices of the Church. In Magnin's reconstruction, the *drame hiératique* emerged over three eras. From the first to sixth centuries, mimetic and sometimes even pagan practices crept into the liturgy in the wake of the receding classical drama, practices that included the dialogue-like songs sung at common meals and dances that were allowed in liturgical processions and around the tombs of martyrs. With the sixth to twelfth centuries came the full flowering of the *génie sacerdotal*, as demonstrated by the performance of masques in convents, by the plays of Hrosvitha of Gandersheim, and by the representations of the great feast days. The twelfth through the sixteenth centuries saw the escape of the drama from the cloister to the town, where it moved from the control of the Church to the confraternities, and from Latin to the vernacular.¹⁹

Even in those lectures that dealt with specific instances of what we now call "liturgical drama," Magnin's focus shifted from discussions of the so-called plays to sundry other topics large and small, related and seemingly not. He began his discussion of the "true dramas" within the liturgy only in the sixteenth lecture of the first semester (near the end of the term), where he focused on the *Officium Stellae* for Epiphany and the *Officium Pastorum* of Christmas, the earliest of the "true dramas" in his view, having originated during the time of Charlemagne. The topics for the lecture as a whole included:

Eighth and ninth centuries.—Materialization of objects for worship.—Dances in the churches.—Prohibitions of the councils.—Antiphoners.—The claims of Agobard.—Valdamnus.—Christmas carols.—Use of wax for liturgical representations.—Diptychs.—Office of the three Kings or of the Star.—Office of the Shepherds.—Liturgy performed by laity.—Royal feasts.—Charlemagne's moon.—Fairs.—Jongleurs.—Secular works.—National songs.—National festivals at Venice.²⁰

A similar range is evident in the lecture dealing with the *Sponsus* of Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 1139, 53v–58v (hereafter Paris 1139), given as the third lecture of the second semester:

Eleventh century—Liturgy mixed with vernacular. Latin is no longer understood by the people—It is preserved by the church.—Lives of the saints.—Farced legend of St. Stephen.—*Versus* in honor of St. Mary.—Mystery of the wise and foolish virgins, preserved in a manuscript of Saint-Martial.—Bas-reliefs and sculptures of the cathedrals.²¹

Magnin argued here that the texts and melodies of the so-called *Sponsus* actually comprised three separate plays (Three Marys, Wise and Foolish Virgins, and Prophet Play) rather than the single play recognized by his predecessors, an argument that has been accepted by most subsequent critics.²² He discerned a fourth play in the manuscript as well (Lamentation of Rachel). Discussing the time he spent with the manuscript in 1835, he described his epiphany a decade later:

I thought I could see, not only as my knowledgeable predecessors had seen, a unique drama or mystery, but three separate and distinct mysteries, namely: first two complete mysteries, one in Latin and one in Latin mixed with the vernacular, and second, a fragment of a mystery totally in Latin. The more I thought about it, I recognized another Latin fragment of a dramatic office or mystery of the Holy Innocents that had not been previously reported.²³

In his second lecture dealing with what we now call the Fleury Playbook,²⁴ given as the sixth lecture of the second semester, Magnin offered a similarly disparate group of topics:

Twelfth century—Beginning of secularization—Albigensian heresies.—Military orders.—Development of hieratic art in sculpture, painting, and tapestries.—Protests on the part of the clergy.—St. Bernard.—Ritual of Saint-Aignan.—The colloquy between Gabriel and Mary.—Monastic liturgy.—Manuscript of Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire.—Mystery of the Conversion of St. Paul.—Mystery of the Resurrection of Lazarus.—Four Miracles of St. Nicholas.²⁵

Ultimately, Magnin was not so much interested in religious or liturgical theater as he was in the development—and the continuation—of what he called the “génie dramatique” during the Middle Ages. For Magnin, drama was not so much reborn as it was lying in wait, emerging intermittently in

various guises until finally awakening as ecclesiastical or hieratic drama. The “génie dramatique” was deeply engrained in human consciousness, and Magnin saw its manifestations persisting despite any and all attempts to deny it:

I believe neither in the revival nor in the sleep of the human faculties; I believe in continuity, in their transformations, especially their perfectibility and progress. I hope to establish by incontrovertible evidence, that is to say by monuments and texts, that the dramatic faculty, as natural to man as the lyric faculty, for example, has never ceased to exist and to occur. No, gentlemen, throughout the long interval of decay and social reconstruction which I must call, like everyone else, the Middle Ages, until we know it well enough to be able to provide a name less vague, for all this long interval, the dramatic genius has not entirely been missing to humanity: the one, the main difficulty for the critic is how to discern it and how to recognize it in the new costumes that dress it and under the thick layer of barbarism that covers and disguises it.²⁶

His focus was thus not so much on individual acts of drama or theater, but rather more generally on medieval forms of expression and representation wherever they might be found, whether in drama *per se* or, as the scope of his lectures reveals, in dance, in sculpture, in tapestries, or even in funeral orations. The “dramatic faculty,” or “dramatic genius,” was for Magnin, an innately human capacity that could ultimately elevate what would become European theater out of the bog of barbarism to which it had been consigned. Indeed, the list of churches whose naves served as stage for the *drame théocratique* cited above went far beyond what was needed to accommodate the true dramas to which he had alluded in his opening lecture. While the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, *Officium Stellae*, and *Officium Pastorum* may have been known in the cathedrals of Strasbourg and Rouen and in the monastery of Saint-Martial, they were certainly not a part of the liturgical fabrics of Hagia Sophia in Byzantium or the church of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome. Liturgical drama was not just a collection of representational rites, rites that appeared to have characters, sets, costumes, and staging. Liturgical drama embodied the full range of representational actions that might occur within or adjacent to the rites of the medieval Church. For Magnin, and his immediate successors, the expression “drame liturgique” was a metaphor—the drama in the liturgy, so to speak.

Magnin’s reimagining of theatrical history was revolutionary and its impact may well have been even more profound had he seen his way clear

to complete the ambitious project that he had begun. Indeed, Magnin had intended to offer his findings in a grand history of modern theater, but only one volume of his proposed four-volume study made it to print, and this volume, published in 1838, treated only the theater of the ancient world.²⁷ Magnin was acutely aware of the problems he faced in completing the work, and he lamented in his introduction that so much had changed since his course that only its broadest outline would survive.²⁸ Adolphe-Napoléon Didron, founder and publisher of the journal *Annales archéologiques*, however, was less inclined to sympathy. For him, Magnin's failure to complete was but the inevitable result of Magnin's 1838 entry into the French Academy: "In 1838, M. Magnin entered the Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, where he caught, we fear, the disease of the place, the inactivity, the somnolence."²⁹

In the end, it is remarkable that Magnin was able to make so much of so little. He knew comparatively few examples of what would later be included within the category of liturgical drama. He knew of the manuscripts reported by Lebeuf a century earlier: the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139 and what we now call the Fleury Playbook of Orléans 201, and he knew many of the representational rites published in the liturgical collections of Le Brun des Marettes (Le Prévôt) and Martène a half-century before that.³⁰ All that would soon change, and as newly discovered texts proliferated, Magnin's reimagining of theater history provided a template for understanding the budding repertory for the *drame liturgique* that appeared so clearly correct that none would question its propriety for nearly a century.³¹

In the Wake of Magnin's *Cours* (1835–1847)

The impact of Magnin's course was both immediate and far-reaching. Didron, for one, was so moved by Magnin's lectures that he left Paris the following year on a six-month voyage through southern France in search of further evidence for *le drame* in the remains of medieval churches. Referring to Magnin's lectures a dozen years later, Didron recalled:

I listened to this history with such passion that I have not forgotten its essential outline or its main facts. Freshly nourished by this knowledge from others, so excellent and substantial, I made a six-month journey in 1836 to several provinces of France, and particularly in *le Midi*. Attracted especially to religious monuments and to the carved and painted representations in such monuments, the facts that M. Magnin had outlined in his lessons from the Sorbonne

grew ever more significantly in my mind. They came to mind again and again, and I saw the liturgical dramas about which M. Magnin had spoken for so long in our class at the Faculté actually performed by the characters of sculpture and stained glass.³²

A quarter-century after Magnin's course, Edmond de Coussemaker still felt its impact:

In a memorable course taught in 1835 at the Sorbonne, M. Magnin, from the Institute, revealed for the first time the diverse phases of drama: religious, aristocratic, and popular, from the origin of Christianity to modern times. This course was a veritable revelation. The profound views, the lofty reflections, the ingenious realizations, the multiple analyses, the syntheses so full of wisdom, made these lessons all the more substantial and captivating.³³

While Magnin's contributions would be largely forgotten by the *fin de siècle*, Oscar Cargill could still add to the resonance of Magnin's voice nearly a century later, suggesting that it was Magnin's influence on the younger Victor Hugo that inspired the character of Pierre Gringoire, author of mysteries, in the first chapter of Hugo's *Notre Dame de Paris* (Paris, 1831).³⁴

The decade and a half following Magnin's lectures saw a surge in scholarly activity concerning the *drame liturgique*, especially in the discovery and publication of new sources for medieval Latin drama. Louis-Jean Nicolas Monmerqué published the texts of what we now know as the Fleury Playbook in 1834 along with two additional settings of the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri*,³⁵ and Jacques Joseph Champollion-Figeac offered the three plays of Abelard's student, Hilarius, four years later.³⁶ Thomas Wright brought these texts to the English-speaking world in 1838 in his *Early Mysteries and other Latin Poems of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, a volume that included not only the ten "rude dramas" of the Fleury manuscript, but the plays of Hilarius, the Greater Passion of the *Carmina Burana*, and the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139 as well.³⁷ Another unknown setting of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* also found its way into print about the same time. In 1830, Franz Kurz, canon and librarian at the Augustinian monastery of St. Florian (Austria), included a textual edition of a *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Klosterneuburg as an appendix to his study of Emperor Albrecht V.³⁸

The first transcriptions of the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* beyond those published by the liturgists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and those few published in the 1830s came in 1846 with the pub-

lication of Franz Josef Mone's two-volume *Schauspiele des Mittelalters*.³⁹ Mone, who served as archivist in Karlsruhe, was the first scholar to search through the libraries and archives of Europe for examples of Latin religious drama, adding several settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from manuscripts in the libraries of Karlsruhe, Einsiedeln, and Engelberg to the handful already known from France. Three years later, Édelstand du Méril included Mone's corpus along with all known Latin religious plays in his *Origines latines du théâtre moderne*.⁴⁰ Even though both Mone and du Méril included multiple examples of what we would come to know as liturgical drama, neither used this expression in a descriptive sense, as defining a particular category or genre. Du Méril used the label only in footnotes,⁴¹ while Mone avoided its use altogether. Nevertheless, both authors maintained a distinction between those texts that were performed within the liturgy, i.e., those contained within liturgical books, and those whose liturgical assignments were either missing or unsettled. Mone, for example, used the term "Osterfeier" to refer to settings of the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* and the term "Osterspiel" to refer either to vernacular Easter plays or to those settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* where the liturgical context was not clear.⁴² Du Méril, similarly, used the term "office" to refer to liturgical ceremonies such as the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and its siblings from Christmas and Epiphany and "mystère" to refer to those for which evidence for liturgical performance was lacking or unclear.⁴³

Félix Clément and the Drama of the Liturgy (1847–1851)

It is fortuitous that the merger of "liturgy" and "drama" should occur at this moment in French history. The French church was in disarray. Anticlerical fervor had risen yet again in the wake of the July Revolution. In 1831, there were riots at Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois that forced the closing of churches in Paris. The archepiscopal palace near Notre-Dame-de-Paris was destroyed, and the cathedral invaded. Mobs sacked seminaries and bishops' houses in Lille, Nîmes, Dijon, and Angoulême. In Le Mans, demonstrators gathered in the square before the cathedral on the feast of the Assumption to shout "Death to the priests," and the following year a mob desecrated an ancient cross that had stood in Le Mans for centuries.⁴⁴ Liturgy, moreover, had become an ineffectual and largely localized affair with little consistency in practice from one church to the next. The expression of liturgy was for many an afterthought, a requirement with little purpose. In the Church of Sainte-Marguerite in Paris, for example, compline

and vespers were said together, although the office was otherwise rarely said in public having become but “the mechanical duty of a private devotion of the clergy.”⁴⁵ At the church of Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas near the Sorbonne, the Divine Office was suppressed except for that of the church patron, and on Sundays, eleven Masses were celebrated simultaneously in the church’s twelve chapels.⁴⁶

At the same time, the merger of “liturgy” and “drama” could not have found more fertile ground. In the years preceding the July Revolution, beginning in the last decades of the *ancien régime* and resuming under Napoléon, there was a movement among the sophisticates of Paris toward a more theatrical expression of worship. The newer churches of Paris—Sainte-Genviève, Saint-Philippe-du-Roule, and La Madeleine—were modeled on pagan temples and became, in the words of R. W. Franklin, “sacred theatres, great halls of marble and gold, often including galleries and boxes,” expressing “the idea that the liturgy was holy drama to be performed by ecclesiastical actors on a stage raised and separated from the passive audience below.”⁴⁷ The sense of spectacle was even more pronounced at the royal chapel at Versailles, which served as:

a morning counterpart of the opera next door. A court mass was similar to a soirée, often including a divertissement by Lully, and the congregation sometimes faced the orchestra and not the altar. French piety greeted Christ as a divine king within the monstrance or visited him as the suffering prisoner of the tabernacle. The mass-liturgy was understood as a collection of rubrics, compulsory ceremonial for proper reception of a heavenly monarch. The liturgical text was smothered under the weight of profane polyphony; and fashionable masses, surrounded with lights, jewels, singers, pageantry, were “church concerts with liturgical accompaniment.”⁴⁸

The appointment of Jean-François Lesueur as musical director of the Tuileries chapel in 1804 brought a flood of operatically inspired works for singers and orchestra, including oratorios, Masses, motets, and cantatas, which only increased in intensity with the appointment in 1816 of Luigi Cherubini as co-director. Until it was sacked during the July Revolution of 1830, the Tuileries chapel stood as the most important institution for sacred music in France, with nearly one hundred singers and instrumentalists in its employ.⁴⁹

It was against this backdrop that the expression “drame liturgique” came to be, a backdrop where the church and stage could serve as one in some quarters while fully divorced in others. The disarray of liturgical

practice and understanding, the disassociation of liturgy from religiosity, the yearning for both a more pure and at the same time more meaningful, indeed dramatic, liturgical expression set the stage for a liturgical reform that would by the end of the nineteenth century take hold of the Church at large, and in so doing helped to solidify the notion “drame liturgique” in both the scholarly and popular imaginations.

The expression “drame liturgique” made its way fully into the scholarly lexicon with a series of essays by Félix Clément, organist for the Collège Stanislas and the Sorbonne and one of the leading voices for liturgical reform among French church musicians. Between 1847 and 1851, Clément published a serialized study on liturgical drama in Adolph-Napoléon Didron’s *Annales archéologiques*. Originally entitled “Liturgie, musique, et drame au Moyen Âge,” the title was changed midway through 1848 to “Drame liturgique.”⁵⁰ According to Didron’s introduction, the article’s intent was to cover the subject of liturgical drama for the entire church year, including the feasts for the saints. Moreover, the installments were scheduled to coincide with the feasts of the liturgical year, the installment for Advent and Christmas appearing in December 1847, that for Epiphany, in January 1848, and that for Ash Wednesday in February 1848. In the wake of the Revolution of 1848 in late February, however, the journal switched to a predominantly bi-monthly publication and such coordination ceased. Clément’s study dragged out another three years without moving beyond the liturgy of the time.

His title notwithstanding, Clément was not particularly interested in liturgical drama as we might characterize it. Like Magnin before him, Clément saw the notion of “drame liturgique” as metaphor.⁵¹ His use of the metaphor, though, was more polemical than descriptive. At twenty-five years of age, Clément was fast becoming one of the leading ultramontanes of his generation, seeking both to restore the texts and music of the medieval liturgy into contemporary usage and to impose this usage on the Church as a whole. The ultramontanes, including Clément, Alexandre-Étienne Choron, Félix Danjou, Joseph d’Ortigue, and other similarly inclined church musicians, served as the lay counterpart to the more scholarly, and ultimately more successful, monks of Solesmes under the leadership of Dom Prosper Guéranger in their efforts to return the chant to its medieval splendor in opposition to the neo-Gallican chant reforms that had held sway in France since the late seventeenth century.⁵² Clément’s concern thus was not with liturgical drama in the current sense of the expression, but with the dramatic sweep of the medieval liturgy as a whole.

His study, in fact, was an *apologia* for the medieval Mass as it progressed from Advent through Pentecost as set out largely in a single, unidentified gradual from the thirteenth century.⁵³ While this gradual included the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter Sunday, the *Officium Pastorum* of Christmas, and the *Officium Stellae* of Epiphany, Clément treated these rites only in passing. With missionary zeal, he focused his discussion instead on the dramatic nature of the Mass liturgy as a whole, and he argued for its superiority over the tepid liturgical practices of his own time. He devoted the bulk of his attention not to what we might consider to be liturgical drama, but to what he saw as the highly expressive, and even dramatic, poetry and music of proses, tropes, and hymns. Indeed, Clément included but two musical examples within his study, neither of which are liturgical dramas as currently reckoned: a harmonized setting of the sequence, *Qui regis sceptris*, for the third Sunday in Advent (3 voices plus organ accompaniment)⁵⁴ and a monophonic setting of the troped *Kyrie fons bonitatis*.⁵⁵

While Magnin sought to track the rise of modern theater from its chaotic medieval beginnings to a more perfect present, Clément sought perfection in the past itself.⁵⁶ For Clément, the contrast between old and new was striking and the superiority of the old over the new, self-evident. In his discussion of the liturgy for the feast of the Circumcision, for example, he compared a *versiculus* used at vespers in an unidentified thirteenth-century manuscript from Sens with a hymn from an eighteenth-century French breviary. Concerning the thirteenth-century text, *Trinitas, deitas, unitas*,⁵⁷ he remarked:

Such grandeur! such lavish enumeration! such sonority! The thought of the Middle Ages is wholly captured in this poetry with its originality and its boldness. The musical expression rises or moderates according to the force of the images; it arrives at its paroxysm when it expresses these words: “Tu Theos et heros, dives flos, vivens ros, rege nos, salva nos, perduc nos ad Thronos superos et vera gaudia.” That is only one example among thousands of the marvelous fruitfulness of the poets of the thirteenth century.⁵⁸

His view of the contemporary hymn, *Debilis cessent elementa legis*⁵⁹ was less generous: “Everyone, children, men, even women, foreigners for the most part to Latin, will be struck by the rhythm, the sonorous articulations of our thirteenth-century hymn; while that which replaced it could be appreciated at most by a few professors of rhetoric.”⁶⁰ He then asked rhetorically:

On which side was true poetry, the true intelligence of Christian art? Was it in this noble, grand, and fruitful series of verses [of the thirteenth-century *versiculus*], or in this weak quatrain, half poetic, half philosophical, whose words, scattered by the requirements of meter, chase one another around the page like fragments of a sliced-up snake. What did these intruders bring to Christian liturgy, these sapphic, adonic verses, with their heavy feet, anapestic and bacchic?⁶¹

The modern hymn, for Clément, was simply barbaric: “Why not go back to worshipping Jupiter and Saturn?”⁶²

On the music itself, Clément was equally effusive about medieval practice while disparaging of the modern. In his essay on Ash Wednesday and Lent, he noted with regard to contemporary efforts at chant composition:

How can anyone claim that the men responsible for all these things have done justice to the chant? Not only have they mutilated and rendered it almost unrecognizable, but again, while no longer understanding it, they invented absolute systems based on imaginary or fortuitous connections. In short, unable to understand the old chant, they have invented a new one, and the very least damage they caused was to prevent composers from writing plainsong at all. Who among them, in fact, has become subject to this morass of rules that are not justified by the monuments. No one has done so at any time, and no one else will. The chant of the Middle Ages, like all art, is nothing less than encyclopedic.⁶³

For Clément, there was no questioning the primacy of medieval liturgical practice over the modern. The art of the Middle Ages was something to strive toward, not to rebel against, and he used the expression “drame liturgique” to accentuate that fundamental aspect of medieval liturgical poetry and music that distinguished it from the tepid practices to which the church musicians of nineteenth-century France had become accustomed. He had little interest in what the expression “liturgical drama” would later come to represent. His focus was on the drama *of* the liturgy, not the drama *in* the liturgy.

“Liturgical Drama” at Mid-Century (1848–1860)

Interest in the newly identified drama of the medieval Church continued to grow throughout the 1840s and 1850s. In 1848, Félix Danjou, another of the ultramontanes and publisher of the journal *Revue de musique religieuse*, provided a musical edition of the Beauvais *Danielis Ludus*, then in private hands.⁶⁴ In 1852, Edmond de Coussemaker included a facsimile, transcription and analysis of the so-called plays of Paris 1139 in his book, *Histoire de l'harmonie au moyen âge*.⁶⁵ The transcription of the text and a facsimile of the *Ludus Paschalis* of Tours was published by Victor Luzarche in 1856,⁶⁶ and in 1858, Coussemaker provided a textual edition of the macaronic *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the convent of Origny-Sainte-Benoîte.⁶⁷

The first encyclopedia article on “Drame liturgique” appeared in 1854 in the *Dictionnaire liturgique* of Joseph d’Ortigue, which was drawn primarily from the chapter on the plays of Paris 1139 included in Coussemaker’s *Histoire de l’harmonie*.⁶⁸ That same year, Jules comte de Douhet included a series of articles on the plays of the Fleury manuscript, on the plays of Hilarius, and on the representational offices of Christmas, Epiphany, and Easter in his *Dictionnaire des mystères*, avoiding the expression “liturgical drama” (*drame liturgique*) in favor of the more general and somewhat more accurate “figural representations in the ecclesiastical rites” (*représentations figurées dans les rites ecclésiastiques*) or “figural rites” (*rites figurées*).⁶⁹ In 1860, Félix Clément extended his earlier discussion on the *drame liturgique* in his *Histoire générale de la musique religieuse*. In the chapter on *Drame liturgique* (easily the longest in the book), he not only retrod the ground he had covered over a decade earlier, but added new sections on the Marian feasts and on the feast of Thomas Becket.⁷⁰ Clément’s take on “liturgical drama” did not diverge from that of his earlier study, though, and his focus remained in these new sections on the music associated with liturgical poetry rather than on anything that we might see as liturgical drama.

The picture at mid-century was thus confused. On the one hand, a consensus was building for a category that encompassed two different kinds of apparently dramatic events: a specific group of liturgical offices for Christmas, Epiphany, and Easter that appeared self-evidently mimetic (Mone’s “Osterfeiern,” du Ménil’s “offices” and Douhet’s “rites figurées”) along with what appeared to be religious plays that were sung in Latin, plays that might have been liturgical but that lacked any clear liturgical connec-

tions (Mone's "Osterspiele" and du Méril's and Douhet's "mystères"). The expression "drame liturgique," however, was directed toward a wider array of ritual activities, any of which could be described as potentially dramatic whether properly "drama" (by whatever definition) or not.

This expansive understanding of "drame liturgique" was best expressed by Didron himself, who mused that had he the time he would have written such a book on the subject, and he would have given it the title "Dramatic Liturgy, or Liturgical Drama in the Middle Ages."⁷¹ Other writers, both near to and far from the study of medieval theater, took to this reading as well. In 1839, Édouard de Bazelaire, in a youthful essay on the last of the mysteries, commented on "the *Kyrieles* [i.e., the processional litanies] of Remiremont, the procession of Reynard [the Fox], the burial of the Mardi Gras, the travesties with animals of all kinds, the thousand follies that we can see in the glossary of Du Cange," noting that "this shamelessness of mind lasted long enough, but about the fourteenth century, the improving standard and refining ideas drove out sacrilegious jokes, and primitive symbols themselves gave way to a more spiritual way of thinking. These liturgical dramas, expelled from the church, ascended the stage, and as the ancient theater in times past emerged from the Eleusinian mysteries."⁷²

If Bazelaire's understanding of "drame liturgique" echoed that of Magnin, Paul Scudo stretched the metaphor yet further in his 1857 biographical novel on the life and works of composer Giuseppe Sarti. In describing performance of Sarti's sacred works, for example, Scudo noted several symphonic interludes that had the effect of "pleasantly suspending the action of the liturgical drama."⁷³ In discussing the music of Palestrina, Scudo extended the metaphor yet again, noting that "the absolute merit of the works of Palestrina . . . has effected all parts of the liturgical drama."⁷⁴

"Liturgical Drama" as Category: Cousse-maker, Sepet, and Gautier (1860–1872)

As well entrenched as this metaphorical reading of "drame liturgique" appeared to be, its hold was weak, and with the 1860 publication of Edmond de Cousse-maker's *Drames liturgiques du Moyen Âge*, it was largely abandoned in favor of the genre that remains with us today. Nearly two centuries after Le Brun des Marettes had offered musical editions for the *Officium Stellae* and *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the cathedral of Rouen, Cousse-maker provided musical editions and scholarly treatments for

twenty-two so-called liturgical dramas. More significantly, he transformed the way that the expression “drame liturgique” came to be understood.

Coussemaker was one of the great polymaths in a century of polymaths. A performer, composer, musicologist, ethnologist, jurist, and champion of Flemish culture in France, Coussemaker studied music in his youth and went on to study law in Paris.⁷⁵ He continued his study of music and his research into its history while also serving as an advocate in Douai (1830) and later as justice of the peace for Bailleul (1836), and judge for Bergues (1843), Hazebrouk (1845), Dunkerque (1852), and Lille (1858). As a musicologist and ethnologist, he was prolific, particularly considering the demands of his legal career. In addition to his book on liturgical drama and a great many articles, he published on a number of different subjects, including several books on medieval musical theory,⁷⁶ the works of Adam de la Halle,⁷⁷ and popular song in French Flanders.⁷⁸

For Coussemaker, “drame liturgique” was not a metaphorical abstraction. It was a categorical descriptor. Expanding the distinction made by du Mériel a decade earlier, Coussemaker saw two types of religious drama during the Middle Ages: liturgical dramas and mysteries. While based on the same subject matter, these types were completely different: “The liturgical dramas were those bound in an intimate way to the ceremonies of worship, having developed from the liturgy of the time and of the saints. . . . The mysteries were represented in a theater itself and by lay actors.”⁷⁹ The *dramas liturgiques*, moreover, could themselves be subdivided:

Independently of the differences that existed between the liturgical dramas and the mysteries, it is necessary also to distinguish among the liturgical dramas themselves. These were of two types. The one was bound closely to the religious ceremonies and formed, to some extent, a unit with them by borrowing the liturgical texts that were paraphrased and put into dialogue that required action. The others, while having the same religious character, did not have such an intimate connection with the ritual. They were dramatic at their creation. They have as their subject the sacred text, but their development made them into special compositions whose extent made it impossible to be kept in the offices.⁸⁰

The impact of Coussemaker’s study, like that of Magnin’s a generation earlier, was profound. Coussemaker brought to his inquiry into liturgical drama not only a deep knowledge of the musical and liturgical practice of the Middle Ages at a time when such studies were in their infancy, he

brought also a jurist's insistence on evidence and, to a lesser extent, precision in the use of terms. Eschewing the metaphor "drame liturgique," he pinned the expression to a definable collection of liturgical actions, actions that could by anyone's reckoning be considered as drama. It is unfortunate, therefore, that Coussemaker did not carry these distinctions forward into his discussions of the individual works that he included in his edition, and we are left to divine for ourselves which of his examples belong to one type of liturgical drama or the other.

In the wake of Coussemaker's edition, the expression "drame liturgique" became ubiquitous, at least among French-speaking scholars, and its scope settled within the boundaries that Coussemaker had suggested.⁸¹ While the field of rites, ceremonies, and other activities covered by the rubric was constrained to those most demonstrably mimetic, the distinction claimed by Coussemaker between *mystères* and *dramas liturgique* did not hold. Even Coussemaker could not maintain the distinction, intermixing the expressions in his discussions of individual texts.⁸² In his discussion of the *Ordo Prophetarum* of Paris 1139, for example, he noted that "This mystery had its origin in the catholic liturgy. It is therefore a true liturgical drama."⁸³

Marius Sepet used the expressions interchangeably in his study of the "Prophètes du Christ" in 1867 as well, and he included under their rubric settings of the *Officium Pastorum* and *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Rouen and elsewhere along with the *Ordo Prophetarum* of Saint-Martial. While he conflated the usage of "mystère" and "drame liturgique," Sepet saw the divisions among the *dramas liturgiques* in much the same way as had Coussemaker, reserving the expression "drame liturgique" (or "mystère liturgique") for dramatic ceremonies whose position within the liturgy was fixed and "drame semi-liturgique" or ("mystère semi-liturgique") for those whose position was variable, if known at all. Comparing what he felt to be the fixed liturgical position of the *Ordo Prophetarum* of Paris 1139 with the the moveable placement of the *Processionarum Asinorum* of Rouen, for example, Sepet noted that:

The more or less obligatory character of the dramas that had a place in the liturgy is one of nuances, often difficult to grasp, that serve to distinguish the liturgical mystery of this type of transition to which I, as the first, believed I had to impose the name semi-liturgical mystery, thus indicating a mixture, a compromise, if you will, where again are merged worship and that which is truly drama, although the latter tends visibly to emancipate itself and to break the ties that hold it in the heart of the liturgy where it was born.⁸⁴

Sepet continued this line of reasoning in his discussions of the Beauvais *Danielis Ludus* and the *Jeu d'Adam* of Tours, which, although still associated with the liturgy in his view, were even less securely bound to it.⁸⁵

Léon Gautier, in his 1872 article on the origins of modern theater,⁸⁶ also used the labels “mystère” and “drame liturgique” interchangeably, and, like Sepet, he used these terms in the narrow sense suggested by Coussemaker. However, Gautier expanded the two-part division of the *drame liturgique* framed by Coussemaker and Sepet into seven *degrés* spread over three epochs, prepending to this a preliminary form, a proto-drama, represented in the tropes for Christmas and Easter.⁸⁷

“Liturgical Drama” Outside of France (1847–1933)

The idea of liturgical drama was a product of French literary and musical scholarship. Outside of France, scholars were noncommittal, and acceptance of the new notion was scattered at best. Mid-nineteenth-century scholars in Britain and America in particular appear to have been puzzled by this new notion, and what little interest existed was held by antiquarians and by students of the liturgy. As late as 1847, the playwright George Soane, in his discussion of customs formerly observed in the British Isles for the celebration of Easter, still spoke in terms reminiscent of sixteenth-century Protestant reformers, seeing the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and other rites as curiosities and follies that were themselves little different from the theater: “In the times of Roman Catholic predominance, the church celebrated the day with many pageants that differed little from those of the theatre, except in being less amusing and less rational. Amongst other follies we are told, that as on the previous evenings the watching of the sepulchre had been acted, so upon this day the resurrection was represented. The form of the ceremony varied as to details in different places, though substantially the same in all countries.”⁸⁸

Two years later, Fr. Daniel Rock granted the notion (if not the label) of liturgical drama in his study of the rites of Salisbury cathedral, acknowledging in a footnote on liturgical interludes that:

There were two kinds of sacred plays; of the first, which may be called liturgical, were such as the younger clergy acted with much ritual solemnity at church during service, and were meant to set before the people’s eyes in a strong light some portion of Holy Writ which spoke of the mystery commemorated in that festival.

. . . Of the first or liturgical sort of representation, traces may be found in the Anglo-Saxon ritual; St. Dunstan especially lays down the rubric for the one exhibited upon Easter morning, and which was kept up in this country till it changed its religion.⁸⁹

In the third volume of the same study, though, Rock introduced the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the *Regularis Concordia* without reference to any purported dramatic intent: “Easter Sunday had one rite which exclusively belonged to itself, and consisted in showing how the two Marias and Salome made their sunrise Visit to the Sepulchre of our Lord.”⁹⁰

It was only in the latter part of the nineteenth century that the expression “liturgical drama” was taken up by literary scholars in Britain and America. As late as 1875, Adolphus Ward could claim that there was “No drama in England before the Norman Conquest,” and he had nothing to say about the so-called liturgical dramas that had been accumulating in the literature since the 1830s.⁹¹ In 1887, however, Francis H. Stoddard, instructor in English literature at the University of California, provided numerous references for the “Latin Liturgical Drama” in his bibliography of medieval miracle plays and mysteries.⁹² By the turn of the twentieth century the expression would become as commonplace in English as it was in French, with numerous references in the monumental studies of both Edmond K. Chambers⁹³ and Karl Young.⁹⁴

The expression did not translate well into German, however. Of the several scholars who treated the religious drama of the Middle Ages during the latter half of the nineteenth century in German-speaking Europe, only Robert Pröhl found use for the expression or its equivalent (“kirchlichen Spiele”).⁹⁵ While some musicologists did find use for the expression,⁹⁶ for literary and theater scholars, the expressions used were either more general: “Schauspiele” or “geistliche Schauspiele,”⁹⁷ “lateinisches Kirchendrama,”⁹⁸ or more particular: “liturgisch-dramatische Auferstehungsfeier”⁹⁹ and “Weihnachtsspiele” or “Osternachtsfeiern.”¹⁰⁰ Beginning with the study of Gustav Milchsack in 1880¹⁰¹ and continuing with those of Carl Lange in 1881 and 1887,¹⁰² most subsequent German-speaking scholars avoided the broader categories altogether, choosing to focus instead on individual forms, the *Osterfeiern* and *Osterspiele* in particular.

The creation of the metaphor “liturgical drama” in 1834 enabled the comingling of an assortment of both liturgical and non-liturgical actions that could be regarded as drama according to the way that nineteenth-century scholars tended to understand that term. As the collection grew, the metaphor crystallized into category, and the expression “liturgical drama” became a term of art that brought together under a single banner two very different kinds of activities. It was not the collection that defined the genre, but the other way around. The neologism spawned the collection that would gather around it. Indeed, this union of “liturgical” and “dramatic” was a novelty, and it would change the way that nearly all scholars approached the study of medieval drama thereafter. But this new notion was not without difficulties. As the nineteenth century gave way to the twentieth, and as the language of scholarship moved from French to English to German, the notion was slowly but inexorably ground down by a succession of scholars over the generations that followed.

NOTES

¹ Magnin’s course began with the start of the first semester on December 1, 1834 with lectures scheduled at 9:30 (am) on Mondays and Fridays (*Journal générale de l’Instruction publique* 4 [1834], 36). The second semester likely met even earlier. In his review of Magnin’s *Cours*, Achille Jubinal complained of the “inconvenience of having taken place at eight in the morning and in the depths of the old Sorbonne, that is, at one of the extremities of Paris” (inconvenient d’avoir eu lieu à huit heures du matin et au fond de l’antique Sorbonne, c’est-à-dire à l’une des extrémités de Paris). Jubinal, “Cours de M. Charles Magnin,” 1:313.

² The chair of foreign literature was held by Claude-Charles Fauriel, for whom the position had been created in 1830. Fauriel used this respite to complete his *Histoire de la Gaule méridionale*, the middle part of a three-part general history of southern France that he had intended to write but did not complete. Fauriel’s work focused largely on Provençal poetry. His lectures from 1831–1832 were published posthumously as *Histoire de la poésie provençale*.

³ Sainte-Beuve, “Écrivains critiques . . . Charles Magnin” (1843). Sainte-Beuve’s second essay came after Magnin’s death in 1862: Sainte-Beuve, “Un érudit écrivain: M. Charles Magnin.”

⁴ Paris, “Discours de M. Paulin Paris.”

⁵ Wallon, “Notice sur la vie.” While neither a musician nor a musicologist, Magnin had at least a tangential relationship with some of the more notable musical figures of that era as well. When the Paris Conservatoire suspected that its former librarian, François Fétis, had stolen its materials, Charles Magnin was called in to help recover them. See Lesure, “L’affaire Fétis.” As a critic, moreover,

Magnin was intimately involved with the performances of Shakespeare led in Paris by Charles Kemble during the 1827–1828 season, and he was particularly taken with the performances of Harriet Smithson, who would inspire Hector Berlioz's *Symphonie fantastique* and who would become the composer's wife. On Magnin's influence as a theater critic, particularly with reference to the performances of Shakespeare in Paris in 1827–1828, see Borgerhoff, *Le théâtre anglais à Paris* and Elliott, "The Shakespeare Berlioz Saw."

⁶ "C'eût été, il y a vingt ans, un étonnement général, si l'on eût vu paraître un gros volume ayant pour titre comme celui-ci: Théâtre français au Moyen Âge, pendant les XIe, XIIe, XIIIe et XIVe siècles. Il était alors universellement admis que le berceau du théâtre en France ne remontait guère au delà des représentations données par les Confrères au bourg de Saint-Maur, vers 1398, et à Paris, dans une salle de l'hôpital de la Trinité en 1402." Magnin, Review of *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* (1846): 5–6

⁷ "Il y a à peine vingt-cinq ans, on croyait encore, avec Beauchamps et les frères Parfait, qui l'art dramatique moderne ne datait pas d'une époque antérieure au quatorzième siècle. Il semblait du moins avoir sommeillé pendant bien longtemps, lorsque cette branche de littérature et d'archéologie nationale, comme plusieurs autres demeurées trop longtemps dans l'oubli, attira enfin l'attention des savants." Coussemaker, "Drame liturgique," 197. Coussemaker refers here to Beauchamps, *Recherches sur les théâtres de France* (1735–1740) and Parfait, *Histoire du théâtre françois* (1734–1749). On Coussemaker's article and the book from which it was drawn, see n. 58.

⁸ Until recently, Oscar Cargill was the only scholar to offer a critical assessment of Magnin's approach to the history of drama. He was particularly disparaging of Magnin's attempt to draw parallels between the history of modern drama and that of the ancients: "Magnin writes: 'Things came to pass in the Middle Ages in the same manner as they did in antiquity. . . . The modern theater received, just as did that of antiquity, its first development in the ritual, hence it is necessary to subordinate in our researches the history of the aristocratic and popular drama to that of the ecclesiastical drama.' Nearly every critic since Magnin has borrowed this same dangerous analogy." Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, 7. A more recent assessment of Magnin's work has been offered by Petersen, "The Concept of Liturgical Drama: Coussemaker and Magnin."

⁹ Manly, "Literary Forms." On Manly's contribution, see chapter 2, p. 55–56.

¹⁰ "le théâtre religieux, merveilleux, théocratique, le grand théâtre, qui a eu pour scène au moyen-âge les nefs de Sainte-Sophie, de Sainte-Marie-Majeure, les cathédrales de Strasbourg, de Rouen, de Rheims, de Cambrai, les monastères de Corbie, de Saint-Martial, de Gandersheim, de Saint-Alban." Magnin, "Des origines du théâtre," 585.

¹¹ "la théâtre seigneurial et royal, qui brilla aux palais des ducs de Provence, de Normandie, de Bretagne et d'Aquitaine, aux donjons des comtes de Champagne, aux châteaux des sires de Coucy, aux fêtes des rois de France et d'Angleterre, à la

cour de l'Empereur, aux galas des rois de Sicile et d'Aragon." Magnin, "Des origines du théâtre," 585.

¹² "le théâtre populaire et forain, qu'on vit constamment à de certains jours, s'agiter et s'abattre, à grand renfort de bruit et de gaité, dans les places de Florence, sur les quais et les canaux de Venise, dans les carrefours de Londres et de Paris." Magnin, "Des origines du théâtre," 585.

¹³ Charles Magnin, "Cours Publics." A manuscript copy of the article is available in the New York Public Library under the shelfmark: "Magnin Papers." The title page reads: "Origines du théâtre moderne. Cours professé à la Sorbonne par M. Charles Magnin pendant l'année scolaire 1834–35. (Copie textuelle de Compte rendu inséré dans les T. IV et V des *Journal général de l'Instruction publique*). Beauvais. Janvier 1850." While the catalogue entry for this manuscript claims it to be the "lecture notes compiled by Magnin from a course of study at the Sorbonne, 1834–35, which constitute the source materials he used to write *Les Origines du théâtre moderne* 1838" along with "transcripts by Magnin of reviews of his book," this is likely not the case. This manuscript contains a copy of the notes to Magnin's lectures as printed in the *Journal générale de l'Instruction publique* made some fifteen years after the fact, along with other items, including several book reviews by Magnin (and not reviews of his book). The text of the "Magnin Cours" is copied by several hands and is written exclusively on the recto side of the page, with numerous additions and corrections on the facing versos. Included among these are quotations from other Magnin essays published before 1850 (see n. 14) that clarify or amplify the material in the notes for the *Cours*. The manuscript contains also the outlines for two books published between 1834 and 1850: Monmerqué and Michel, *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* and du Ménil, *Origines latines*. The provenance of the manuscript is unknown. It entered the manuscript division of the New York Public Library in 1959, having been transferred from the Printed Book Division where it had likely been misfiled (information on the provenance of the manuscript was communicated via email by Megan O'Shea, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library, Nov. 21, 2007).

¹⁴ Magnin, "Des origines du théâtre;" Magnin, "La comédie au IVe siècle;" Magnin, "Études sur les origines;" Magnin, Review of *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge*; and Magnin, Review of *Drames liturgiques*. An incomplete list of Magnin's publications is given in Wallon, "Notice sur la vie," 137–40.

¹⁵ While Magnin had used the phrase "théâtre liturgique" as early as 1827, his use of the expression was directed more toward religious drama generally rather than toward what we know as liturgical drama specifically. See Magnin, Review of *Résumé de l'histoire littéraire*. This review was revised and reprinted in Magnin, *Causeries et méditations* as "Du théâtre en Portugal," where the phrase "théâtre liturgique" was changed to "drame liturgique."

¹⁶ "succédaient elles-mêmes à d'autres bien plus solennelles et plus graves, véritables drames liturgiques, approuvés par la papauté et par les conciles, admis dans les diurnaux et dans les rituels, joués et chantés aux processions et dans les

cathedrals.” Magnin, “Des origines du théâtre,” 582.

¹⁷ “En effet, pendant que l’esprit humain se développait graduellement au sein du clergé dans le drame liturgique, il se fondait une littérature avec des éléments divers de la société chrétienne.” “Magnin Cours” 4/29 (8 Feb. 1835): 135 (NYPL, Magnin Papers, 70r).

¹⁸ “En même temps, l’église faisait de son côté appel à l’imagination dramatique, elle instituait des cérémonies figuratives, multipliait les processions et les translations de reliques et instituait enfin ces offices qui sont de véritables drames, celui du *Praesepe* ou de la crèche à Noël, celui de l’étoile ou des trois rois à l’Épiphanie, celui du sépulcre et des trois Maries à Pâques, où les trois saintes femmes étaient représentées par trois chanoines la tête voilée de leur aumusse *ad similitudinem mulierum*, comme dit le Rituel; celui de l’Ascension où l’on voyait quelquefois sur le jubé, quelquefois sur la galerie extérieure, au-dessus de portail, un prêtre représenter l’ascension du Christ; toutes cérémonies vraiment mimiques, qui ont fait, comme nous le verrons, l’admiration de fidèles au moyen-âge.” Magnin, “Des origines du théâtre,” 589–90. Magnin’s reference to what we now know as the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter was likely drawn either from the setting of the office from Rouen given in the second edition (1679) of Le Prévôt, *Joannis Abricensis Episcopi*, 211–15, edited and enlarged by Le Brun des Marettes (reprinted in PL 147:139–42) or that found in the article “Sepulchri officium” in du Cange, *Glossarium* 3:814–15 of 1678. The transcriptions by Le Brun des Marettes and du Cange of this office are the only settings of those conceivably known by Magnin that included the phrase “ad similitudinem mulierum.” Le Brun des Marettes was also the first to provide musical transcriptions of this office and of the Rouen *Officium Stellae*. It would be nearly two centuries before Edmond de Coussemaker would become the second. See the discussion of Coussemaker’s contribution below (pp. 33–35). For the other settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* known at the time of Magnin’s lectures, see n. 30.

¹⁹ Magnin, “Des origines du théâtre,” 591–92.

²⁰ “Huitième et neuvième siècles.—Matérialisation des objets du culte.—Danses dans les églises.—Défenses des conciles.—Antiphoniers.—Réclamations d’Agobard.—Valdiamnus.—Chants de Noël.—Emploi de la cire pour les représentations liturgiques.—Diptyques.—Office des trois Rois ou de l’Étoile.—L’office des pasteurs.—Liturgies exécutées par des laïcs.—Fêtes royales.—Lune de Charlemagne.—Foire.—Jongleurs.—Pièces laïques.—Chants nationaux.—Fêtes nationales à Venise.” “Magnin Cours” 4/52 (30 Apr. 1835): 245 (NYPL, Magnin Papers, 143r). For both offices, Magnin cited manuscripts from the cathedral at Rouen as given by Le Brun des Marettes in the second edition of Le Prévôt, *Joannis Abricensis Episcopi*, 206–10 (PL 147:135–40) from 1679 and from Martène, *Tractatus*, 87 and 111–12 from 1706. The Rouen rites were republished in Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus*, 3:96 and 3:122–23 from 1736–38 and in the posthumous editions of 1763, 1783, and 1788. The settings of the various dramatic offices from an unknown (and presumably lost) ordinal from Rouen found

their way also into the *Glossarium* of du Cange. These are presented in the following articles: “Pastorum officium” (3:186–87), “Peregrinorum officium” (3:241), “Sepulchri officium” (3:814–15), and “Stellae festum” (3:956–57). See Karl Young, “A Contribution to the History of Liturgical Drama at Rouen,” 24–27. On Martène’s sources in particular, see Martimort, *La documentation liturgique*, 243. See also n. 30.

²¹ “Onzième siècle.—Liturgie mêlée de langue vulgaires. Le latin n’est plus compris du peuple.—Il est conservé par l’Église.—Vies des Saints.—Légende farcie de S. Étienne.—Versus sainte Marie.—Mystère des vierges folles et des vierges sages, tiré de manuscrit de S. Martial.—Bas reliefs et sculptures de cathédrales.” “Magnin Cours” 4/77 (26 Jul. 1835): 395 (NYPL, Magnin Papers, 213r). This play, or series of plays, was first noted by Lebeuf in 1741 in his *Dissertation sur l’histoire*, 2:65 and first published in 1817 by Raynouard, *Choix des poésies originales*, 2:139–43.

²² Magnin’s most thorough defense for this thesis was given in his review of *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* (1846): 76–93. Challenging Magnin’s division, Symes, “The Appearance,” 794–801, argues that this was likely a single play and not the three discerned by Magnin and his successors.

²³ “Je crus y apercevoir, non pas seulement, comme mes savants prédécesseurs, un drame ou un mystère unique, mais bien trois mystères séparés et distincts, a savoir: 1e deux mystères complets, l’un tout en latin et l’autre en latin mêlé de langue romane; 2e un fragment de mystère tout latin. De plus je crus reconnaître un autre fragment latin d’un office dramatique ou mystères des Innocents, que l’on n’avait pas signalé jusque-là.” Magnin, Review of *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* (1846): 77.

²⁴ Orléans, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 201, pp. 176–243 (hereafter Orléans 201). The expression “Fleury Playbook” was likely coined in 1903 by Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage*, 2:59 and 61. A decade and a half earlier, Francis Stoddard noted that this manuscript was generally known at that time as the “St. Benoit MS.” Stoddard, *References for Students of Miracle Plays and Mysteries*, 22. The collection of plays contained within the manuscript was first noted in 1729 by Lebeuf, “Remarques envoyée d’Auxerre,” 2981–93. This essay included a textual transcription of *Tres Clerici*. In a second essay published six years later, “Lettre d’un solitaire,” 698–708, Lebeuf included a partial transcription of the text of *Tres Filiae* and a discussion of the *Iconia Sancti Nicolai*. The musicological contributions of Jean Lebeuf are treated in Aubry, *La musicologie médiévale*, 31–43. The Fleury manuscript was noted also in the 1776 octavo abridgement of du Cange’s *Glossarium* for the word “Hacla”: “HACLA, genus vestis. Liber Repraesentationum Historicarum in MS. Floriacensi XIII Saeculi, in Repraesentatione Peregrinorum Emmaus; Accedat quidam alius in similitudine Domini, hacla vestitus et tunica.” Du Cange and Carpentier, *Glossarium*, 4:5. The ten plays contained within the manuscript were first edited in 1834 by Monmerqué in his “Mysteria et miracula.” According to Thomas Wright, only thirty copies of Monmerqué’s

edition were printed. The texts were edited again four years later from Monmerqué's uncorrected proofs in Wright's, *Early Mysteries*, 1–53. See also Wright's introduction to the manuscript on pp. vi–vii and the notes to his edition on pp. 124–26. The notice from du Cange is given also by Wright, *Early Mysteries*, 125.

²⁵ “Douzième siècle.—Commencement de sécularisation.—Hérésies des albigeois.—Ordres militaires.—Développement de l'art hiératique dans la sculpture, la peinture, les tapisseries.—Protestation d'une partie de clergé.—S. Bernard.—Rituel de S. Aignan.—Colloquium entre Gabriel et Marie.—Liturgies monastiques.—Manuscrit de S. Benôit-sur-Loire.—Mystère de la Conversion de St. Paul.—Mystère de la Résurrection de Lazare. Quatre Miracles de S. Nicolas.” “Magnin Cours” 4/91 (13 Sep. 1835): 478 (NYPL, Magnin Papers, 233r). Magnin limited his discussion here to the Conversion of St. Paul, the Resurrection of Lazarus, and the four plays of St. Nicholas, having treated the plays of the Christmas and Easter seasons in the second lecture of the second semester.

²⁶ “Je ne crois ni au réveil ni au sommeil des facultés humaines; je crois à la continuité, à leurs transformations, surtout à leur perfectibilité et à leurs progrès. J'espère établir par des preuves irréfragables, c'est-à-dire par des monumens et par des textes, que la faculté dramatique, aussi naturelle à l'homme que la faculté lyrique, par exemple, n'a jamais cessé d'exister et de se produire. Non, messieurs, pendant tout ce long intervalle de décomposition et de recomposition sociale, qu'il me faut bien appeler, comme tout le monde, le moyen-âge, jusqu'à ce qu'on le connaisse assez bien pour lui pouvoir donner un nom moins vague, pendant tout ce long intervalle, le génie dramatique n'a pas manqué tout à fait à l'humanité: la seule, la grande difficulté pour le critique est de savoir le discerner et le reconnaître sous les nouvelles apparences qu'il revêt, et sous la couche épaisse de barbarie qui le recouvre et le déguise.” Magnin, “Des origines du théâtre,” 580–81.

²⁷ Magnin, *Les origines du théâtre moderne*. While he did not complete his study of the origins of modern theater, he did publish two major studies on other subjects in subsequent years, including a study and translation of the plays of Hrosvitha of Gandersheim: Magnin, *Théâtre de Hrosvitha* (1845) and a study on the history of marionettes: Magnin, *Histoire des marionettes* (1862). In addition, a collection of Magnin's essays culled from various periodicals was published in 1843: Magnin, *Causeries et meditations*.

²⁸ Magnin, *Les origines du théâtre moderne*, i–ii.

²⁹ “Depuis 1838, M. Magnin est entré à l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, où il a gagné, nous le craignons, la maladie du lieu, l'inactivité, la somnolence.” Didron, Introduction to Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 7: 303. Didron was one of the early champions of iconography and the study of Gothic art and architecture in mid-nineteenth-century France. In addition to his publication of the *Annales archéologiques*, Didron also published several books on medieval art and iconography, including *Manuel d'iconographie chrétienne* (1845), *Iconographie des chapiteaux* (1857), and *Manuel des objets de bronze et d'orfèvrerie* (1859). Ironically, Didron followed Magnin's example in publishing only one vol-

ume of what was to be his monumental study of Christian iconography: *Histoire de Dieu* in 1843. See Brisac and Léniaud, “Adolphe-Napoléon Didron,” 33–42.

³⁰ It is unclear which settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* Magnin may have known beyond the Rouen setting transmitted by Le Brun des Marettes (Le Prévôt) and du Cange. He does not deal with the *Visitatio Sepulchri* directly in his lectures, but given his knowledge of Martène’s transcriptions of the dramatic rites from the Christmas season (see n. 20), we can presume he was likely familiar with those that Martène gave for the Easter season as well. Among these are settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the *Regularis Concordia* and from the churches of Saint-Aper in Toul, Saint-Denis, Monte Cassino, Narbonne, Poitiers, Soissons, Saint-Martin in Tours, Laon, Vienne, Strasbourg, and Verdun. Martène, *De antiquis monachorum ritibus* (1690), 446 (*Regularis Concordia*, LOO 394–95), 446–47 (Saint-Aper in Toul, LOO 168A), 450 (Saint-Denis, not in LOO: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 564, 57r), and 450–51 (Monte Cassino, LOO 14: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 364, 309v) and *Tractatus* (1706), 478–79 (Laon, LOO 109), 479–80 (Narbonne, LOO 116), 481–82 (Saint-Martin in Tours, LOO 63), 497–98 (Soissons, LOO 167: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 8898, 97v–100v), 501 (Tours, LOO 169), 504 (Vienne, LOO 73), and 505 (Strasbourg, LOO 342). These were reprinted in Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus* (1736–1738), 3:483–507 and 4:419–25 along with an additional settings from Poitiers (3:484, LOO 152) and Saint-Vitus in Verdun (4:853, LOO 360). All are given in the posthumous editions of 1763, 1783, and 1788 as well. For Martène’s sources, see Martimort, *La documentation liturgique de dom Edmond Martène*, 127–29, 157–58, 224–27, 496, 519–20, 523, and 544–47. For the Saint-Denis manuscript, which does not appear in LOO, see Foley, *The First Ordinary*, 195 and 387.

³¹ See, for example, Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, 5–6: “Almost immediately [following Magnin’s lectures] there began the publication of numerous texts of an antiphonal nature from the liturgy together with the texts of Old French Plays. No close, comparative scrutiny of these texts was made, however, to test Magnin’s theory, because what he had asserted seemed so obvious.”

³² “Cette histoire, je l’écoutais avec une telle avidité, que je n’en ai oublié ni les contours essentiels, ni les faits principaux. Nourri tout fraîchement de cette science d’autrui, si excellente et substantielle, je fis un voyage de six mois, en 1836, dans plusieurs provinces de France et notamment dans le Midi. Attiré surtout vers les monuments religieux et, dans ces monuments, vers les représentations sculptées et peintes, les faits que M. Magnin avait esquissés dans ses leçons de la Sorbonne finirent par se développer singulièrement dans mon esprit. Ils me revenaient sans cesse à la mémoire, et je crus voir exécutés réellement, par les personnages de la sculpture et des vitraux, les drames liturgiques dont M. Magnin nous avait entretenus si longtemps sur les bancs de la Faculté.” Didron, Introduction to Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 7:303–4.

³³ “Dans un cours memorable professé, en 1835, à la Sorbonne, M. Magnin,

de l'Institute, a déroulé pour la première fois les diverses phases du drame religieux, aristocratique et populaire, depuis l'origine du christianisme jusqu'aux temps modernes. Ce cours fut une véritable révélation. Des vues profondes, des considérations élevées, des aperçus ingénieux, des analyses multipliées, des rapprochements pleins de sagacité, ont fait de ces leçons une histoire des plus substantielles et des plus attrayantes." Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, v.

³⁴ Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, 6.

³⁵ Monmerqué, "Mysteria et miracula." A setting of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from a presumably lost thirteenth-century rituale from the cathedral at Sens (LOO 164) is given following the Fleury *Ludus Paschalis* (165–67). A setting from a late twelfth-century ordinal from the cathedral at Soissons, previously given in Martène's *Tractatus* of 1706 (LOO 167; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS 8898, 97r–v) is provided as well (168–71). Also mentioned are others offered by Martène, including those from Tours, Vienne, and Strasbourg. See n. 30.

³⁶ Champollion-Figeac, *Hilarii Versus et Ludi*. Jacques Joseph Champollion-Figeac was elder brother of Jean-François Champollion, who had deciphered the Rosetta Stone. For a recent account of the younger Champollion, see Meyerson, *The Linguist and the Emperor*. The plays of Hilarius are contained in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 11331, 9r–20v.

³⁷ Wright, *Early Mysteries*. Wright drew his editions of Latin medieval drama from other publications and not from the manuscripts themselves (as his subtitle claimed). His edition of what is now known as the "Fleury Playbook," was based on proofs from Monmerqué's "Mysteria et miracula" from 1834. The Passion play of the *Carmina Burana* was taken from Hoffman von Fallersleben's *Fundgruben* of 1837. The edition for the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139 was taken from a copy provided by Francisque Michel for his and Monmerqué's upcoming volume on medieval French drama, *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* (1839). See Wright, *Early Mysteries*, vi–xiv.

³⁸ Kurz, *Oesterreich unter Herzog Albrecht IV*, 2:425–27. The Klosterneuburg *Visitatio Sepulchri* was the first liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* to be described in print as a dramatic, rather than as a liturgical event, although this occurred quite by accident. Kurz had very much wanted to publish the text of the Klosterneuburg *Ludus Paschalis* that Pez had noted the prior century in his *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, 2:liiii. But his counterpart at Klosterneuburg was unable to locate the manuscript containing the *ludus* and referred Kurz instead to the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* contained in Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, CCI 629, 103v–105v (LOO 595, a rituale copied around 1330), which Kurz published as his *Beylage Nro. 1*. For the exchange of letters between Kurz and Maximilian Fischer, librarian at Klosterneuburg, as well as the "rediscovery" of the *Ludus Paschalis* in the early twentieth century, see Pfeiffer, "Klosterneuburger Osterfeier und Osterspiel," 1–8. Pfeiffer also provided a facsimile of the *ludus* as an appendix. The *ludus* is found in Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, CCI 574, 142v–144v (LOO 829).

³⁹ Before Mone, little effort had been expended to uncover examples of the

liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter beyond those published in the liturgical collections of Martène and Le Brun des Marettes (Le Prévôt) and the few published in the 1830s, a result possibly of Magnin's earlier lack of interest in this ceremony. While Mone ignored the French sources found in those earlier collections, he did include two texts previously published in the liturgical collections of Gerbert: a setting of a *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Zurich (now Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, MS C.8.b., 55r–v [LOO 767]), published in Gerbert, *Vetus liturgia Alemannica* (1776), 3:864, and another from St. Blasien (manuscript lost [LOO 318]) in Gerbert, *Monumenta veteris liturgiae Alemannicae* (1777–1779), 2:237. One further setting of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Paris, although without manuscript citation, was published the same year as Mone's edition by Caron, *Notice historique*, 22.

⁴⁰ Du Ménil was the first among the new scholars of medieval theater to publish the early tenth-century Introit trope *Quem quaeritis* from Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 1240, 30v (LOO 52—Saint-Martial troper; du Ménil, 97) as well as the *Visitatio Sepulchri* contained within the later-tenth-century *Regularis Concordia* (Du Ménil, 116–17), the former seen by some later critics as the oldest, if not the original, form of the trope, and the latter considered by most subsequent scholars to be the first fully-formed liturgical drama. Du Ménil attached no such significance to these texts, however, as he relegated both to footnotes. The *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the *Regularis Concordia* (LOO 394–95) was well known to students of the liturgy, however, having been published twice before the turn of the eighteenth century, first in 1626 by Baker in *Apostolatus Benedictinorum*, “Appendix,” 89 and in 1690 by Martène in *De antiquis monachorum ritibus*, 446.

⁴¹ Du Ménil's use of the expression “drame liturgique” is limited to discussions of the larger religious dramas found in Mone's collection, such as the Passion of Donaueschingen and the Passion of the *Carmina Burana*, where he used the expression to refer to the liturgical quotations found within these texts. In a footnote to some of the German lines in the Passion of the *Carmina Burana*, for example, he noted (p. 117): “The German Passion of Donaueschingen . . . also preserved in its original language several fragments of a liturgical drama, and this source of all mysteries in the vernacular appears even more prominently in the Passion, published by the learned editor, after a manuscript from the fourteenth century in the library of St. Gall.” (La Passion allemande de Donaueschingen . . . avait même conservé dans leur langue primitive plusieurs fragments d'un drame liturgique, et cette source de tous les mystères en langue vulgaire se montre avec encore plus d'évidence dans la Passion publiée par ce savant éditeur, d'après un ms. du XIVe siècle, de la Bibliothèque de Saint-Gall.)

⁴² The *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 366 (*olim* 179), pp. 55–56 (LOO 563) and that from Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 314 (*olim* 4/25), 75v–78v (LOO 784), for example, were labeled “Osterfeiern,” while the longer, and more elaborate setting of the Easter play from Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 300, pp. 93–94 (LOO 783) was labeled “Osterspiel.” This latter setting, included by Young among the texts of his third stage, followed a series

of sermons and other works of Peter Abelard and thus offered no liturgical connection, a peculiarity that Young saw as “totally irrelevant” (Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:389–90).

⁴³ Du Méril, *Origines latines*, consistently labeled settings of the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* as “Office du Sépulcre” or “Office de la Résurrection” (89, 91, 94, 96, 98, 100, and 101), the *Officium Pastorum* as “Office des Pasteurs” (147), and the *Officium Stellae* as “Office des Mages” or “Office de l’Étoile” (151 and 153). The plays of the Fleury manuscript, conversely, were labeled either “mystère,” e.g., “Mystère de la Résurrection” (108), “Mystère de l’Apparition à Emmaüs” (120), and “Mystère de l’Adoration des Mages” (162), or given no designation at all, e.g., “Massacre de saints Innocents” (173).

⁴⁴ Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches*, 355.

⁴⁵ Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches*, 359.

⁴⁶ Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches*, 359.

⁴⁷ Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches*, 361.

⁴⁸ Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches*, 361.

⁴⁹ Smither, *History of the Oratorio*, 3:541–44 and 579–82. A summary is provided by Rowden, “Choral Music and Music-Making in France,” 206.

⁵⁰ Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame du Moyen Âge” (1847–1848) continued as “Le drame liturgique” (1848–1851).

⁵¹ The opening sentence of his essay on Easter week, for example, signaled both the thrust of his essays and his metaphorical understanding of the expression “drame liturgique,” noting with respect to the liturgical sequence that precedes the Gospel during Mass that “sequences occupy an important place in the liturgical drama” (“Les séquences occupaient dans le drame liturgique une place importante). Clément, “Drame liturgique,” 10:154.

⁵² On the neo-Gallican reforms of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see Hiley, “Neo-Gallican Chant” and Emerson et al., “Plainchant,” 852–53. On the ultramontanes in nineteenth-century France, see Moulinet, “Un réseau ultramontain.” The larger liturgical movement is treated by Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches*. Briefer accounts are provided by Emerson, “Plainchant,” 853–58 (pp. 853–55 deal specifically with the reform movement in France), and Ellis, *Interpreting the Musical Past*, esp. 21, 71–72, and 194–202. Bergeron, *Decadent Enchantments* provides an engaging history of the efforts to restore the chant of the Middle Ages by the monks of Solesmes. See also the history given by Combe, *Histoire de la restauration*.

⁵³ This manuscript was later identified by Coussemaker (*Drames liturgiques*, 335) as Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 904 (hereafter Paris 904), a thirteenth-century gradual from the cathedral at Rouen. The manuscript was acquired by the Bibliothèque royale in the early eighteenth century as a part of a cache of rare manuscripts and printed books purchased from the collection originally assembled by the seventeenth-century collector Jean Bigot (1588–1645), seigneur of Sommesnil and counselor at the court of Normandy. See Delisle, *Le*

cabinet des manuscrits, 1:322–29 (“Bibliothèque des Bigot. 1706”) and Delisle, *Bibliotheca Bigotiana manuscripta*.

⁵⁴ Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 7:between 312 and 313.

⁵⁵ Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 8:between 36 and 37. The facsimile of Philip the Chancellor’s sequence, *Ave gloriosa virginum*, drawn from a Soissons manuscript now in Paris (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS nouv. acq. fr. 24541), and which appears within Clément’s discussion of Easter Sunday (10:between 154 and 155), is associated with the article by Jouve, “Histoire de l’harmonie,” which includes the conclusion of the facsimile.

⁵⁶ I borrow this insight from Donnalee Dox, who noted in a private communication (June 2, 2011), “Magnin recoups the past as historical trajectory leading to the more perfect present. Clément, on the other hand, recoups the past as superior with a utilitarian purpose – to bring old practices into current use because they are better. . . . Clément’s is a recuperative effort that idealizes the past as perfect in comparison with the present.”

⁵⁷ This text was variously employed in medieval liturgical manuscripts, most often as a trope to the Sanctus or Agnus Dei. See the discussions by Schlager, “*Trinitas, unitas, deitas*” and Iversen, “Music as *Ancilla verbi*.” The text was edited in AH 47:348–49 (#345) and in Iversen, *Tropes du Sanctus*, 196–99 (no. 161*). The text cited by Clément was drawn from Sens, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 46, 3r–v, where it was included in first vespers for the office of the Circumcision, as *versiculus* after the prosa that followed the responsory *Descendit de coelis*. The text and music from this manuscript was given in Villetard, *Office de Pierre de Corbeil*, 90–91 [text] and 136 [music]. The melody was treated also by, among others, Gastoué, *Les anciens chants liturgiques*, 9 and 18 and Arlt, *Ein Festoffizium des Mittelalters*, 2:124–25. On the new office of the Circumcision in thirteenth-century France and its relation to the Feast of Fools, see the discussions by Fassler, “The Feast of Fools” and Harris, *Sacred Folly*, 98–112.

⁵⁸ “Quelle grandeur! quelle pompeuse énumération! quelle sonorité! La pensée du moyen âge apparaît tout entière dans cette poésie avec son originalité et sa hardiesse. L’expression musicale s’élève ou se modère, suivant la force des images; elle arrive à son paroxysme lorsqu’elle exprime ces mots: ‘Tu Theos et heros, dives flos, vivens ros, rege nos, salva nos, perdue nos ad Thronos superos et vera gaudia.’ Ce n’est là qu’un exemple entre mille de la merveilleuse fécondité des poètes du XIIIe siècle.” Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 8:41.

⁵⁹ The hymn text, *Debilis cessant elementa legis*, was written by l’Abbé Sebastian Besnault (d. 1724), who served as priest at the church of Saint-Maurice in Sens. The hymn was included in the Paris Breviary of 1736 (*Breviarium Parisiensis, Pars hiemalis* [1736], 272–73) and was still in use a century later (*Breviarium Parisiensis, Pars hiemalis* [1836], 260–61). This text survives in many contemporary Protestant hymnals. A musical setting by Johann Sebastian Bach, for example, is given to an English translation of Besnault’s text, “The Ancient Law Departs,” in *The Lutheran Hymnal*, #117 as well as in the more recent *Lutheran*

Service Book, #898. See also Julian, *A Dictionary of Hymnology*, 285.

⁶⁰ “Tout le monde, les enfants, les hommes, les femmes mêmes, étrangères pour la plupart au latin, seront frappés du rythme, des articulations sonores de notre hymne du XIII^e siècle; tandis que celle qui l’a remplacée ne saurait tout au plus être goûtée que par le très-petit nombre de professeurs de rhétorique.” Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 8:41–42.

⁶¹ “De quel côté était la vraie poésie, la véritable intelligence de l’art chrétien? Était-ce dans cette noble, grandiose et féconde série d’épithètes toutes resplendissantes d’images, ou dans ce chétif quatrain, moitié poétique, moitié philosophique, dont les mots, déplacés par l’exigence du mètre, sont autant de tronçons de reptiles courant les uns après les autres. Que sont venus faire dans la liturgie chrétienne ces intrus, ces vers saphiques, adoniques, avec leurs pieds molosses, anapestes et bachiques?” Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 8:42.

⁶² “Pourquoi ne pas nous ramener tout de suite à adorer Jupiter et Saturne?” Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 8:42.

⁶³ “Comment admettre que les hommes qui ont fait toutes ces choses aient fait grâce au plain-chant? Non-seulement ils l’ont mutilé et rendu presque méconnaissable, mais encore, ne le comprenant plus, ils ont inventé des systèmes absolus, basés sur des rapports imaginaires ou fortuits. En un mot, impuissants à comprendre l’ancien plain-chant, ils en ont inventé un nouveau, et le moindre mal qu’ils ont causé a été d’empêcher les compositeurs de rien écrire en plain-chant. Qui d’entre eux, en effet, s’assujettirait à ce fatras de règles que les monuments ne justifient pas. Aucun ne l’a fait dans aucun temps et pas un ne le fera. Le chant du moyen âge, comme tout art, n’est rien moins qu’encyclopédique.” Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 8:85–86. Among the new treatises on chant composition that accompanied the neo-Gallican liturgical reforms (see n. 52) were Nivers, *Méthode certaine* (1666) and *Dissertation* (1683); Lebeuf, *Traité historique et pratique* (1741); Poisson, *Nouvelle method* (1745); Feillée, *Méthode nouvelle* (1748); Oudoux, *Méthode nouvelle* (1772); and Imbert, *Nouvelle methode* (1780). See also Lescat, *Méthodes et traités musicaux*.

⁶⁴ Danjou, “Le théâtre religieux,” edition after p. 81. The manuscript was owned at that time by M. Pacchiorotti of Padua. It was purchased by the British Museum in 1883 and stored under the shelf number: Egerton 2615. See the *Catalogue of Additions*, no. Eg. 2615. Danjou, who served as organist at the cathedral of Notre-Dame in Paris, is perhaps best known by musicologists for his discovery in 1847 of the Saint-Bénigne tonary: Montpellier, Faculté des médecine, MS H. 159. Danjou, “Découverte d’un exemplaire.”

⁶⁵ Coussemaker, *Histoire de l’harmonie*, 24–39; facsimiles are provided in Plates 13–23 and musical transcriptions are given in examples 18–21. The chapter on *Drame liturgique* was published separately in Didron’s *Annales archéologiques* the year prior, although without the facsimiles or examples. The chapter was devoted to the plays of Paris 1139 as outlined earlier by Magnin (see nn. 21–22). Coussemaker’s facsimiles showed the folios in their original contexts as well,

beginning with the rubric “Hoc est de mulieribus” (omitting the conclusion of the preceding *versus*) a fact that escaped the notice of Carol Symes in her critique of the one-page facsimile from the same manuscript included in Coussemaker’s later study, *Drames liturgiques* (1860). In her essay, “The Appearance,” 794–95, Symes took Coussemaker to task for having removed the play from its manuscript context when he merged portions of two folios onto the single-page facsimile in *Drames liturgiques* (beginning with the rubric “Sponsus”). Since he had provided the full facsimile in context in his earlier study, however, and since he was focusing only on the *Sponsus* portion of the manuscript as outlined earlier by Magnin, it is unlikely that Coussemaker intended the acontextual reading that Symes discerns. His intent, rather, was more instructive than interpretive, “to give an idea of the original notation by reproducing a facsimile from each manuscript” (“de donner une idée de la notation originale, nous avons reproduit un facsimile de chacun des manuscrits”). Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, xvii.

⁶⁶ Luzarche, *Office de Pâques*. Tours, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 927, 1r–8v (twelfth-century miscellany, LOO 824). The text of the *Jeu d’Adam* from this manuscript was published by Luzarche two years earlier as *Adam: Drame anglo-normand*.

⁶⁷ Coussemaker, *Office du sépulcre*. Saint-Quentin, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 86, pp. 609–25 (thirteenth-century miscellany, LOO 825).

⁶⁸ D’Ortigue, *Dictionnaire liturgiques*, 508–13.

⁶⁹ Douhet, *Dictionnaire des mystères*. Included in this work are articles on the Fleury manuscript: “Apparition de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ (L’),” 150–53; “Benoît-sur-Loire (Manuscrit de Saint),” 199–201; “Filles dotées (Les),” 373–75; “Fils de Getron (Le),” 375–78; “Hérode ou l’Adoration des Mages” 402–6; “Innocents (Le massacre des),” 459–61; “Juif volé (Le),” 479–82; “Lazare ressuscité (Saint),” 486–89; “Miracles de Saint-Nicolas,” 517; “Paul (Conversion de Saint),” 825–26; “Résurrection (La),” 855–57 (first of the *représentations dramatiques* following the *rites figurées*); and the “Trois clercs (Les),” 970–72. In addition are articles dealing with the plays of Hilarius: “Daniel d’Hilaire,” 279–84; “Hilaire, disciple d’Abailard,” 406–7; “Lazare (La Résurrection de),” 489–92; and “Nicolas (La statue de saint),” 533–40 (also includes a discussion on *Le jeu de saint Nicolas* of Jean Bodel) as well as articles on the *rites figurées*: “Nativité de notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ,” 519–22; “Résurrection (La),” 847–55; and “Trois Rois (Les),” 973–75.

⁷⁰ The chapter on *Drame liturgique* occupies pages 89–318 (of 597).

⁷¹ “Si j’avais eu le temps, j’aurais sans doute composé quelque livre sur ce sujet, et je l’aurais intitulé: ‘Liturgie dramatique, ou Drame liturgique au moyen âge’, Commençant avec l’année religieuse, à l’Avent, j’aurais parcouru le cycle entier, de Noël, à l’Épiphanie, au Carême, aux Rameaux, à Pâques, à l’Ascension, à la Pentecôte, à la Trinité, à la Fête-Dieu, à l’Assomption, jusqu’à la Toussaint. Puis, entre ces grandes stations, j’aurais recueilli les principaux saints, chacun au jour de sa fête, et j’aurais ainsi exploré, sous le rapport du drame, le cycle entier de l’année

religieuse.” Didron, Introduction to Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 7:305.

⁷² “ces *kiriolès* de Remiremont, cette procession du *Renard*, cet enterrement du mardi gras, ces travestissements en animaux de toutes sortes, ces mille folies dont on peut voir de détail dans le glossaire de Ducange. . . . Ce dévergondage de l’esprit dura assez long-temps; mais, vers le XIV^e siècle, le progrès des moeurs et l’épuration des idées chassèrent ces farces sacrilèges, et les symboles primitifs eux-mêmes firent place à une idée plus spiritualiste. Ces drames liturgiques, expulsés de l’Église, montèrent sur les tréteaux, et le théâtre antique était sorti jadis des mystères d’Eleusis.” Bazelaire, “Le dernier des mystères,” 20–21.

⁷³ “suspendre agréablement l’action du drame liturgique.” Scudo, *Le chevalier Sarti*, 161–62.

⁷⁴ “la valeur absolue de l’oeuvre de Palestrina . . . a touché à toutes les parties du drame liturgique.” Scudo, *Le chevalier Sarti*, 368.

⁷⁵ Coussemaker’s biography was given shortly after his death by Dehaines in “Notice sur la vie,” which served as a preface to Coussemaker’s *Troubles religieux du XVIe siècle*, 1:i–xxv. Appended to the article are a bibliography of Coussemaker’s writings in music, history, and archeology (xxxvi–xliv) along with a collection of notices on the death of Coussemaker (xlv–lii). A summary of Coussemaker’s contribution to musicology is provided also by Aubry, *La musicologie médiévale*, 64–68. A recent dissertation by Coussemaker’s grand-niece, Solange de Coussemaker-Van Robais, “Comité flamand de France” (2010) treats Coussemaker’s role in preserving Flemish culture in France.

⁷⁶ Among Coussemaker’s most important publications are: *Hucbald moine de St. Amand et ses traités de la musique* (1841), *Histoire de l’harmonie au Moyen Âge* (1852), *Les harmonistes des XIIe et XIIIe siècles* (1864), *Les harmonistes du XIVe siècle* (1869), and *Scriptorum de musica medii* (1864–1876).

⁷⁷ Coussemaker, *Oeuvres complètes du trouvère Adam de la Halle* (1872).

⁷⁸ Coussemaker, *Chant populaires des Flamands de France* (1856).

⁷⁹ “Les drames liturgiques sont ceux qui se liaient d’une manière intime aux cérémonies du culte; ils étaient la mise en action des offices des temps et des saints. . . . Les mystères étaient représentés sur un théâtre proprement dit et par des acteurs laïques.” Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, viii.

⁸⁰ “Indépendamment de la différence qui existait entre les drames liturgiques et les mystères, il convient, suivant nous, d’établir aussi une distinction entre les drames liturgiques eux-mêmes. Ceux-ci étaient de deux sortes: les uns se liaient étroitement aux cérémonies religieuses, et faisaient en quelque sorte corps avec elles, en empruntant le texte liturgique qu’on paraphrasait légèrement, et qu’on mettait en dialogue pour le besoin de l’action. Les autres, tout en ayant le même caractère religieux, n’avaient pas une liaison aussi intime avec le culte. Ce furent déjà de véritables créations dramatiques. Ils ont pour sujet le texte sacré; mais le développement qu’on y donna en fit des compositions spéciales dont l’étendue ne permit plus de conserver leur place dans les offices.” Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, ix–x.

⁸¹ The effect was not immediate. The following year, for example, Jouve, “Du Théâtre et de ses diverse conditions,” 353–69, continued to use the expression in the more expansive sense favored by Magnin and Clément even though the author was well aware of Coussemaker’s edition.

⁸² Coussemaker, *Drames liturgique*, 311–47.

⁸³ “Ce mystère avait son origine dans la liturgie catholique. C’est donc un véritable drame liturgique.” Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, 318.

⁸⁴ “Le caractère plus ou moins obligatoire des drames qui avaient place dans la liturgie est l’une des nuances, souvent difficiles à saisir, qui servent à distinguer le mystère liturgique de cette espèce de transition à laquelle, le premier, j’ai cru devoir imposer le nom de mystère semi-liturgique, indiquant par là une sorte de mélange, de compromis, si l’on veut, où se confondent encore le culte et le drame proprement dit, bien que ce dernier tende visiblement à s’émanciper et à rompre les liens qui le retiennent au sein de cette liturgie où il a pris naissance.” Sepet, “Prophètes du Christ,” 29:223–24.

⁸⁵ Sepet, “Prophètes du Christ,” 29:264–65.

⁸⁶ Gautier, “Origines du théâtre moderne.”

⁸⁷ Gautier expanded on this discussion in *Histoire de la poésie liturgique—les tropes* (1886).

⁸⁸ Soane, *New Curiosities of Literature*, 1:191. Soane’s approach to the rite of the sepulcher was little different from that of his predecessors. William Hone, for example, in his *Ancient Mysteries Described* (1823), 220–22 drew from Marnix/Gilpin, *Beehive of the Romish Church* (1569/1579), 201r in his discussion of “theatrical performances by the clergy,” performances that include what appears to be a *Visitatio Sepulchri* along with other rites such as the Adoration of the Cross of Good Friday and other ritual practices from Pentecost and the Ascension. See chapter 3, pp. 93–97 (“Protestant Protests”).

⁸⁹ Rock, *The Church of Our Fathers*, 2:427.

⁹⁰ Rock, *The Church of Our Fathers*, 3/2:102–4. Rock provides a translation of the text on p. 102 and gives the Latin on pp. 103–4.

⁹¹ Ward, *A History of English Dramatic Literature*, 1:6.

⁹² Stoddard, *References for Students of Miracle Plays and Mysteries*, 21–24. The following year, Stoddard took up the professorship at New York University. Stoddard’s biography to about the year 1900 is available in the *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, 10:143. Within the section on “Latin Liturgical Drama,” Stoddard provided entries for all previously published exemplars of Latin liturgical drama as well as references to the available scholarly literature. While he provided references to the works of Clément, Didron, Coussemaker, Sepet, and Gautier, he omitted any references to the pioneering work of Magnin. This oversight was corrected in a supplement to Stoddard’s bibliography provided two decades later by Klein, “A Contribution,” 202–5.

⁹³ Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage*, 2:xviii, 7, 10, 15, 36, 39, 41, 44, 50, 51, 64, 71, 75, 88, 92, 93, 96, 97, 108, 132, 143, 146, and 157. I exclude here the expression

“liturgical play(s),” which is equally common.

⁹⁴ Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:xiv, 81, 260, and 550; 2:244 and 397.

⁹⁵ Pröll, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas* (1880–1883), especially the chapter on “Entwicklung der kirchlichen Spiele bis zum Uebergang derselben in die Volkssprache” (1/1:35–60).

⁹⁶ See, for example, Schubiger, *Musikalische Spicilegien* (1876) and Wagemann, *Geschichte des Oratoriums* (1882), whose discussion of “Die deutschen liturgischen Dramen” (36–40) is drawn from Schubiger’s *Musikalische Spicilegien* and that of “Die französischen liturgischen Dramen” (40–50) from Coussemaker’s *Drames liturgiques*.

⁹⁷ Hase, *Das geistliche Schauspiel* (1858).

⁹⁸ Reidt, *Das geistliche Schauspiel* (1868), 12–24.

⁹⁹ Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas* (1893), 1:47–107. Creizenach also used the expression “geistlichen Drama.”

¹⁰⁰ Wilken, *Geschichte der geistlichen Spiele* (1872).

¹⁰¹ Milchsack, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern* (1880).

¹⁰² Lange, *Programmabhandlung* (1881) and *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern* (1887).

Chapter 2

An Improbable Fiction: Confronting “Liturgical Drama”

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

Dislodging the Liturgical Theory

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Undermining Liturgical Drama

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sundering the Scholarly View

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

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

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

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

William Tydeman and *The Medieval European Stage*

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

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

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

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

Eli Rozik and *The Roots of Theatre*

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

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

Carol Symes on “Early Vernacular Plays” and Medieval Theatre

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* * *

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NOTES

¹ Manly, “Literary Forms.”

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

³ Manly, “Literary Forms,” 581.

⁴ Manly, “Literary Forms,” 586.

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

⁶ Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, 31.

⁷ Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, 33.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁷ Stumpff, *Kultspiele der Germanen*, 38.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁴³ Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage* (1903).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁵² Stemmler, *Liturgische Feiern* (1970).

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁵⁹ Flanigan, "The Roman Rite," 280.

⁶⁰ Flanigan, "The Liturgical Context," 49.

⁶¹ Flanigan, "The Roman Rite," 281.

⁶² Flanigan, "The Fleury Playbook," 350.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁷³ Rozik, *The Roots of Theatre*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁸² Iversen, "Aspects of the Transmission."

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

⁸⁴ Fassler, "The Feast of Fools."

⁸⁵ Boynton, "Performative Exegesis."

⁸⁶ Norton, "*Sermo in Cantilena*."

⁸⁷ Norton, "Of 'Stages' and 'Types.'"

⁸⁸ Symes, "The Appearance," 778–79.

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

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

⁹⁰ Symes, “The Appearance,” 781.

⁹¹ Symes, “The Appearance,” 793.

⁹² Symes, “The Appearance,” 794.

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

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

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

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

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

⁹⁸ Bedingfield, “Ritual and Drama,” 296.

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

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

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

¹⁰² Kobialka, *This Is My Body*, 30.

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

¹⁰⁴ Kobialka, *This Is My Body*, 198.

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

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

¹⁰⁷ Coldeway, "Plays' and 'Play'."

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

¹⁰⁹ Dox, *The Idea of Theater*, 73.

¹¹⁰ Dox, *The Idea of Theater*, 94.

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), abbess 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 alemannicae*, 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 symphoniaicis cum thuribulis. Hi, vbi in aditu Altaris constiterint, illicanentes 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 Responsum 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:l.iii. 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 Compilateurs 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.

Chapter 4

Strange Bedfellows: Unfolding “Liturgical Drama”

THE RITES AND PLAYS now considered to be liturgical dramas are normally arranged and discussed according to theme, with those texts associated with a particular liturgical celebration collected together no matter what the evidence for their intended liturgical usage might show. This has led to an anomalous grouping of liturgical and non-liturgical texts whose casting as drama is as variable as their expressed liturgical intent, and this has lent to the notion of liturgical drama a legitimacy that it does not warrant. C. Clifford Flanigan noted the difficulties in this arrangement some thirty years ago:

In Karl Young's *Drama of the Medieval Church* as well as in its predecessors and successors, plays have been edited and discussed according to their subject matter. However different their contents, musical and literary forms, and places of origin, all Christmas plays, for example, have been lumped together in the standard histories. This practice has several unfortunate results. In the first place, the plays' textual histories have been obscured. . . . But another difficulty arising from the persistent tendency to edit and study these texts according to their subject matter has yet to be addressed. Without exception the modern editions of these works utterly divorce them from the words and music which surround them in the surviving manuscripts.¹

Considering these texts according to the contexts of their presentation within the manuscripts and books that preserve them reveals three broad, and to some extent overlapping, clusters of texts. The first cluster includes those texts whose liturgical placements are secure. These are given in tables 4.1A through 4.1E (“Representational Rites”). The second cluster includes those texts for which evidence of liturgical intent is lacking. These are given in table 4.2 (“Religious Plays”). The third cluster contains those texts for which evidence of liturgical intent is equivocal. These are given in table 4.3 (“Ambiguously Situated Representations”).

Representational Rites

The largest cluster of texts includes those liturgical rites that have appeared most clearly dramatic to modern critics. Following Nils Holger Petersen, I am calling these “representational rites.”² The most abundant of these rites is the *Visitatio Sepulchri*. Built upon an exchange between two sets of clerics, one standing in for the angel or angels at the empty tomb of Christ and the other the Marys seeking the body of Christ, this rite survives in over 800 manuscript and printed liturgical books.³ These books stem from nearly every corner of the western Church and date from the early tenth century into the eighteenth.⁴ The rite is found in varying liturgical placements and in liturgical books of varying types. In most cases, its liturgical placement is well defined, and its location within the liturgical book is consistent with its intended use. Most settings of the rite are placed either before the Mass of Easter Sunday or at the conclusion to Easter matins. The most commonly occurring settings of this rite are summarized in table 4.1A (“Representational Rites: *Visitatio Sepulchri*, without Magdalene—Mass and Matins”). These are grouped by their liturgical placements and by the types of manuscript or book within which each was cast. Due to the large number of manuscripts and printed liturgical books involved, I do not list these individually. Nor do I distinguish here among the forms of the central dialogue used between the Marys and the angel(s).⁵

When celebrated prior to the Mass, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* (or *Quem quaeritis* trope, as it is often called) was typically included within a troper, gradual, ordinal, or processional.⁶ The distinction between the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue when included among the tropes to the Easter Introit and when entered within the procession to the Easter Mass may well be overstated. As David Bjork demonstrated, both placements were common in southern Europe while the rite celebrated at matins dominated further north.⁷ The distinction was more likely one of liturgical classification than it was of liturgical function, as the trope and processional versions of the dialogue would in most cases have occurred at the same point in time: the *Quem quaeritis* trope was sung just prior to the Introit to the Easter Mass or prior to the introductory trope to the Introit, while the processional version of the dialogue was typically placed at or near the end of the procession to Mass, thus before the Introit as well.⁸

When celebrated at the end of matins, the rite was most often included within a breviary, an ordinal, or an antiphoner. Later medieval settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* that include music are more often than

not found in liturgical books variously called *agenda*, *benedictionale*, *rituale*, or *obsequiale*, books that contain blessings, sacraments and other rites of various sorts (profession, funerals, excommunication, reconciliation, marriage, etc.) as well as a number of special rites for various feasts, in particular the sequence of Holy Week rites within which the *Visitatio Sepulchri* was cast.

A few settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* are placed elsewhere in the Easter liturgy. These are given in table 4.1B (“Representational Rites: *Visitatio Sepulchri*, without Magdalene—Non-standard Placements”). A handful of rites are placed prior to Easter matins, including those from the cathedral of Laon, the monastery at St. Gall, and the basilica of St. Mark in Venice.⁹ Several of these are explicitly linked with the *Elevatio Crucis* that sometimes preceded the office of matins. A ceremony from the convent of Sainte-Croix in Poitiers is placed after lauds, while those from St. Domingo in Silos (Spain) and Székesfehérvár (Hungary) appear to be celebrated during Easter vespers. Also given here are several settings whose liturgical use is ambiguous, having been preserved within Mass books but concluding with antiphons typical for the matins versions of the rite. Among these are settings from the cathedrals in Minden and Winchester, the monasteries of St. Blasien and St. Gall, and the convent of Marienberg am Schonenberg.

The most commonly discussed settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, albeit relatively few in number and stemming from an even smaller number of churches, are those incorporating the appearance of the risen Christ to Mary Magdalene. These are listed in table 4.1C (“Representational Rites: *Visitatio Sepulchri*, with Magdalene”). All were performed in conjunction with Easter matins. Roughly a fourth stem from Anglo/Norman institutions, including the convents at Barking and Wilton in England, the Benedictine monastery at Mont-Saint-Michel, and the cathedrals at Coutances and Rouen in Normandy. The remainder stem from churches spread throughout the Holy Roman Empire, and the majority of these stem from women’s houses of varying orders, including the royal *Damenstiften* in Gandersheim, Gernrode, Obermünster in Regensburg, and St. George in Prague; the *Liebfrauen* in Münster; and the Augustinian convents in Marienberg bei Helmstedt and Nottuln bei Münster.¹⁰

Other liturgical ceremonies since cast as drama are both limited in number and geographically constrained. Modeled on the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter were the rites of Christmas morning that represent the shepherds at the manger. These are given in table 4.1D (“Representational

Rites: *Officium Pastorum*—before Mass and End of Christmas Matins”). Parallel versions of the *Quem quaeritis* trope for Easter associated with the Introit of the third Mass of Christmas are found in thirty-two trope manuscripts mostly from southern France, northern Italy, and Spain, while settings of the *Officium Pastorum* of Christmas matins are found in a handful of manuscripts from Rouen along with two from Clermont-Ferrand and three from Padua.¹¹

Other rites are more rare yet, and most of these are preserved in liturgical manuscripts from areas influenced by Norman liturgical practices. These are given in Table 1E (“Representational Rites: Other”). The *Officium Peregrinorum* of Easter week, which tells of Christ’s appearance to the disciples on the road to Emmaus following the resurrection, for example, is found in a few liturgical manuscripts from Rouen and Norman Sicily along with a single manuscript from Padua,¹² while a handful of settings for the *Officium Prophetarum*, drawn from the pseudo-Augustinian sermon, *Contra Judeos, Paganos, et Arianos Sermo de Symbolo*, are found in manuscripts from Rouen and Tours.¹³ Liturgical settings of the *Officium Stellae*, which depicts the visit of the three Magi, are both more plentiful and more widely dispersed, with several stemming from Rouen and Norman Sicily.¹⁴ This unusual distribution may have resulted from having been conceived not as a liturgical rite, but, as Susan Rankin has argued, to serve royal interests as a “vehicle for the working out and ritual display of elements of Ottonian political theology” in the wake of the struggle over succession following the death of Otto II in 983.¹⁵

Connecting these rites from the Easter and Christmas seasons are their placements within liturgical books that make clear the liturgical circumstances of their celebration. Nothing in the rubrics for these rites sets them apart from other rites detailed in the manuscripts and books that preserve them. In no instance do these rites offer evidence that they were considered as anything other than liturgical actions. The *Visitatio Sepulchri* preserved in the tenth-century *Regularis Concordia* of St. Aethelwold, bishop of Winchester, is often singled out as the earliest example of mimetic drama in the Middle Ages due in part to its use of the word “imitation” and its use of outward representation. As several recent scholars have argued, however, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the *Regularis Concordia* is actually more similar in this respect to other ceremonies introduced by the *Regularis Concordia* into English practice than it is to any later theatrical representations. The *Cena Domini* of Holy Thursday, for example, also specified what was specifically labeled as “outward rep-

resentation,” as Michal Kobialka observed. Kobialka observed further that the notion of “imitation” was used also in the *Depositio* ceremony of Good Friday, where two phrases stood out: “(1) on the part of the altar where there is space for it *there shall be a representation as it were of a sepulcher* [*assimilatio sepulchri*] and (2) [w]hen they have laid the cross therein, *in imitation as it were of the burial of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ* [*ac si Domini Nostri Ihesu Christi corpore sepulco*]. Both of them referred to some form of imitation and representation” [Kobialka’s emphasis].¹⁶

Viewing these as representational rites, moreover, allows us to see these more broadly with other rites that, while having never been considered as drama by modern critics, can be seen as representational in one way or another. Indeed, the events of salvation history permeate the liturgy in ways both great and small. This is particularly evident during Holy Week, where both people and clerics process carrying palms while, in some areas of Europe, pulling a *Palmesel* during the procession of Palm Sunday,¹⁷ where the ranking cleric commemorates Christ’s washing of the apostles’ feet on Holy Thursday, where the altarcloth is torn or stripped “like thieves” (as the *Regularis Concordia* puts it)¹⁸ at the point Christ’s clothes are divided during the reading of the St. John Passion on Good Friday, where the clerics and people queue to adore the cross on Good Friday, where the clerics and people observe the ritual burial of the cross and/or Host at the conclusion of the Good Friday rites, and where the cross and/or Host are removed to mark the moment of the resurrection on Easter morning. Indeed, it is this series of ceremonies that the *Visitatio Sepulchri* concluded, and it is within this context that the *Visitatio Sepulchri* is best understood.¹⁹ One of the more elegant and accessible depictions of this broader context is given by O. B. Hardison Jr. in his *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages* of 1965,²⁰ particularly the essays on “The Lenten Agon: From *Septuagesima* to Good Friday” (pp. 80–138) and “*Christus Victor*: From Holy Saturday to Low Sunday” (pp. 139–77). Nils Holger Petersen has also offered a compelling case for understanding the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in the broader context of the liturgy of Easter Sunday, situating the rite found in a late-twelfth-century processional from Soissons (LOO 167)²¹ and in the tenth-century *Regularis Concordia* (LOO 394–95)²² in the broader context of the day. I offered a similar account on how the Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri* functioned within the larger cycle of Holy Week rites in my 1983 dissertation.²³ I will return to this discussion in the final chapter.

Representational practices infuse the liturgy in other instances as well. A sixteenth-century Sarum processional, for example, directs a boy to dress as a prophet to sing the prophetic Lesson *Hierusalem, respice ad orientem et vide* (Baruch 5) during the Palm Sunday procession.²⁴ A fourteenth-century ordinal from Klosterneuburg directs that the procession preceding the baptismal rite of Holy Saturday should circle the font “as Joshua the walls of Jericho.”²⁵ A twelfth-century ordinal from Augsburg notes that at the end of the procession preceding the Mass for the Purification of Mary “a senior priest representing St. Symeon receives a *plenarium* [a service book or Gospel book] in his arms, and carries it into the church as the Christ child.”²⁶ A later direction from Augsburg calls for a senior priest to carry an effigy of the infant Jesus on a cushion at the same point in the procession for the Purification.²⁷ The nuns of Essen carried a *plenarium* along with an effigy of the Virgin Mary at the same point in their procession for the feast of the Purification.²⁸ I might note also the rite for the expulsion of penitents on Ash Wednesday, found in many pontificals, with its explicit reference to the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise.²⁹ Other ceremonies, including those associated with the feasts of the Ascension and Pentecost and other Marian feasts can also be seen as representational in one way or another.³⁰

These more overt representational aspects of medieval ritual observance reflect a common medieval understanding of the ways in which the historical and eschatological events of salvation history infused the specific elements of ritual practice that stood in their stead. As early as the late-sixth century, Isidore of Seville (ca. 560–636) noted the connection between the biblical events of Holy Thursday and the cleansing of the church, altars, and sacred vessels that marked the liturgy of that day. After describing the last supper, where “Christ handed over to his apostles the mystery of his body and blood,” after describing the betrayal of Judas, and after describing Christ’s washing of the feet of his disciples “in order that the form of humility that he had come to teach would be recommended,” Isidore concluded: “He did this because it was most fitting that he should teach by doing what he had previously admonished the disciples to observe. For this reason on this day the altars and the walls and floors of the church are washed and the vessels that are consecrated to the Lord are purified.”³¹

In his discussion of Pentecost, Isidore offered a typological coupling of Old and New Testament histories to justify the cancellation of abstinence during the fifty days following Easter. He noted that “the day

of Pentecost received its start when the voice of God was heard calling down from on Mount Sinai and the Law was given to Moses,” and that the New Testament Pentecost “began when the advent of the Holy Spirit, whom Christ had promised, was shown.” This harmonization of the feast of the Gospel with the feast of the Law had numerological parallels as well: “after the lamb was immolated, fifty days having passed, there was given to Moses the Law written by the *finger of God*. Now, after Christ was killed, ‘like a lamb that is led to the slaughter’ [Isa 53:7], the true Passover is celebrated and, fifty days having passed, there is given the Holy Spirit who is *the finger of God* upon the one hundred and twenty disciples constituted by the number of the Mosaic era.” The number fifty was significant also as the “seven of sevens,” which marked not only the day of Pentecost, through which comes the remission of sin, but the Jubilee of the Hebrews, which was held at fifty-year intervals and which promised the “remission of the land and liberty of slaves and restitution of possessions.” Thus, with “abstinence having been canceled, all of the fifty days after the resurrection of the Lord are celebrated only in joy on account of the symbol of the future resurrection when there will not be labor but the relaxation of joy. Therefore during these days there is no kneeling in praying because, as one of the wise ones says, kneeling is an indication of penance and sorrow.”³² While not overtly representational in themselves, the washing of altars and vessels on Holy Thursday and the absence of kneeling during the fifty days after Easter were understood within the context of biblical events nonetheless and thus were embedded within what might be described as an abstract representational overlay.

Two centuries later, Amalarius of Metz (ca. 775–ca. 850) justified the liturgical placements of the Mass through the timing of Christ’s Passion and of other significant events marked by the liturgical year. Mass was celebrated at the third hour because “the Lord was crucified by the tongues of the Jews at that hour.” The sixth hour was also acceptable, since “the Lord was crucified by the hands of his persecutors at the sixth hour of the day,” as was the ninth hour, “because he gave up his spirit then.” Should Mass be celebrated at some other hour, there was always justification for doing so. This was the case on Christmas, “when Mass is celebrated at night because of the birth of the bread that is now daily eaten from the altar, or because of the choir of angels. . . . Mass is celebrated that same morning because of the rising of the new light, or because of the visitation of the shepherds to the Lord’s manger, where they found the fodder from which the souls of the saints are daily refreshed.” He offered justification

for other irregularities as well, including the placements for the Masses for John the Evangelist and John the Baptist and for the Easter Vigil.³³

Perhaps best known to contemporary scholars is Amalarius' allegorical interpretation of the Mass. The following extract from Enrico Mazza's more extensive summary offers a sense of Amalarius's understanding:

If, in Amalarius' way of interpreting the Mass, the altar is the cross, then it is correct to think that the taking of the Body of Christ from the altar in the act of elevating it can signify the taking down of the Lord from the cross. After the elevation, the chalice is set on the altar once again. At this point, the altar is the tomb of Christ: "He next places the chalice on the altar and wraps it in the shroud." In the text of the Canon at this point there are three prayers; . . . Amalarius says that this moment of the Mass signifies the three days of Christ in the tomb. After the Canon, the rite of Mass calls for the Our Father, a prayer composed of seven petitions; consequently, it is recited as a memorial of the seventh day, . . . the day of the resurrection.³⁴

Later medieval exegetes also infused individual liturgical items with biblical imagery that went beyond the texts themselves, thus offering another form of abstract representational overlay. The text for the responsory for Christmas vespers, *Judea et Iherusalem*, for example, was drawn from 2 Chronicles 20:17. While it concerned the plea for deliverance for Jehosephat and his armies as they faced an overwhelming foe, the commentators saw far more. In her dissertation on the musical organization of Notre Dame *organa*, Jennifer Roth-Burnette showed how twelfth-century exegetes readily refashioned such Old Testament passages into dramatic retellings of New Testament prophecy. Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153), in a sermon based on the text of this responsory, "invites his hearers into a role-play of the Old Testament narrative by referring to them as *Judaeos* (Judeans), defending this appellation in terms of Christian understanding."³⁵ Rupert of Deutz (1075–1130) offered a dramatic reading of the scene in which the responsory text is sung where "He depicts a church filled to overflowing on the Nativity, at which is heard the divine oracle of consolation. Rupert's description identifies the cantor of the responsory with Jahaziel, and the hearers with the people of Israel under Jehosaphat. He makes the Old Testament foe a symbol of sin and vice, to be overcome on the next day by the Lord."³⁶ While the text in its literal setting described events from the Old Testament, the commentators brought the liturgical participants into the story of Jehosephat which

was then merged typologically with the Nativity of Christ itself, or what might be called representation by proxy.

The liturgical depiction of biblical events through representational means was thus no anomaly. The whole of medieval liturgical practice was infused with multiple layers of meaning, and even when a rite was not in itself representational, it was often understood in a way that we might see as representational nonetheless. While it is clearly possible to assess the rites and practices now called “liturgical drama” by the degree of mimetic representation that we may attribute to them, such an assessment misses the point. A liturgical celebration may or may not involve some degree of mimesis as seen from our modern perch, but it remains a ritual nonetheless, both in function and in intent.

Religious Plays

A smaller cluster of texts includes those that offer little or no evidence of a liturgical association. These are given in table 4.2. While many of these treat the same themes as the liturgical rites outlined above, most are outliers and include those texts that modern critics have judged to be the most demonstrably dramatic (see the discussion of “Drama” in chapter 5, pp. 166–70). These texts were typically copied into, or bound with, collections of texts that have little or no association with the liturgy, such as sermons or other exegetical texts. What we have come to know as the Fleury Playbook is surely the most famous example in this regard, its ten plays collected together and bound with a series of sermons for Lent.³⁷ An eleventh-century *Ordo Stellae* from Compiègne was added by a second scribe in the space following the sermon for Epiphany.³⁸ Two eleventh-century plays from the cathedral at Freising, an *Ordo Stellae* and a *Ordo Rachelis* were copied on spare pages in collections of sermons by John the Deacon³⁹ and on the Epistles of St. Paul.⁴⁰ The *Ludus Paschalis* from Klosterneuburg was copied at the end of a gathering including a *vita* for St. Servatius along with rhymed offices for St. Catherine and St. Thomas of Canterbury that was itself appended to a group of gatherings containing sermons and other exegetical works.⁴¹ Similarly, an expanded *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Einsiedeln was preserved in a manuscript containing works of Peter Abelard and Adam Monachus,⁴² while a Latin/Bohemian *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Prague was copied within a manuscript containing *passionales* and sermons on the saints.⁴³ Also copied among sermons was the *Ordo de Ysaac et Rebecca et filiis eorum* that survives in a fragment

that once served as the front cover to a fifteenth-century sermon collection at the Stiftsbibliothek at Vorau (MS 302 [CCXXIII]). The four-page fragment contains the *ordo* on the first two pages and the conclusion to a Latin homily on the third (the fourth page is blank).⁴⁴

Other venues are also evident. The earliest witness to the *Ordo Stellae* is preserved in a flyleaf to the Psalter of Charles the Bald.⁴⁵ A twelfth-century *Ordo Stellae* is copied over an erasure in a manuscript formerly owned by the monastery of St. Emmeram containing the *Bellum Catilinae* of Sallust,⁴⁶ while that of Malmédy in Belgium survives as a fragment in a manuscript of the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Josephus.⁴⁷ The play of Antichrist is copied within a manuscript that contains, among other items, an early copy of Otto of Freising's *Gesta Friderici Imperatoris*.⁴⁸ A few surviving texts with music are included in collections that are more explicitly performative. The *Ludus Paschalis* of Tours, first published in 1856 by Victor Luzarche, is given in the same manuscript as the *Jeu d'Adam* along with a number of Latin songs,⁴⁹ while those from Zwickau are found in collections of plays compiled for the Latin School in that city.⁵⁰ The plays of the *Carmina Burana* are included in a manuscript of songs.⁵¹

Aside from their lack of liturgical context, many of these texts also show a lack of liturgical congruity, having been built on themes not otherwise found among the representational rites discussed above. Of the ten plays in the Fleury manuscript, for example, seven have no known parallels among the representational rites. Among the themes treated by the non-liturgical plays here and elsewhere are various legends of St. Nicholas (four in the Fleury manuscript, others from manuscripts stemming from Hildesheim, Villers, St. Emmeram in Regensburg, and one among the plays of Hilarius), the raising of Lazarus (Fleury manuscript and among the plays of Hilarius), the conversion of St. Paul (Fleury manuscript), and the slaughter of the Innocents (one in the Fleury manuscript and another from Freising). Other unique plays include the *Danielis Ludus* (among the plays of Hilarius),⁵² the *Ordo de Ysaac et Rebecca et Filiis* from a manuscript fragment now at Vorau, the play of Antichrist from Tegernsee, and the play of the King of Egypt and Passion plays of the *Carmina Burana*.

Those settings that do have parallels among the representational rites, moreover, are typically constructed on a scale that exceeds that of their more clearly liturgical cousins. Three plays from the Fleury manuscript offer expanded versions of representational rites found in churches influenced by Anglo/Norman liturgical practices (*Visitatio Sepulchri*, *Ordo Peregrinorum*, and *Ordo ad Representationem Herodem*). The *Ordo*

ad Representationem Herodem joins together an *Officium Pastorum* and an *Officium Stellae* into a single unit, bringing together expanded versions of the rites originally destined for Christmas and Epiphany. Although not to quite the same degree, the Fleury *Visitatio Sepulchri* also offers a structure that is more broadly conceived than those of other liturgically grounded ceremonies. While the Fleury *Visitatio Sepulchri* was likely based on an Anglo/Norman model,⁵³ it is more expansive than other Anglo/Norman liturgical settings, combining elements drawn from Norman rites as well as from similar rites from German-speaking Europe.⁵⁴ De Boor observed further differences with regard to its presentation: "It is a . . . guiding principle of the new composition from Fleury that it preaches the news of the resurrection to the people over and over again. This is a completely new interpretation of the old rite of Rouen that moved the women out of the world into the realm of sacred events. . . . Here the women turn away no fewer than five times, and always to the congregation, not to a chorus embedded into the action."⁵⁵

A number of scholars, moreover, have exposed an exegetical component for some of these plays that well exceeds anything we might find among the representational rites. Susan Boynton, for one, characterized the *Ordo Rachelis* of the Fleury manuscript as "exegesis in song," a representation whose text and music "function[s] as a form of performative exegesis through the medium of dramatic impersonation."⁵⁶ The texts and melodies of the *ordo* drew from the liturgies of Advent, Christmas, Holy Innocents Day, Good Friday, and even the feasts of the Virgin.⁵⁷ The themes treated embraced all four senses of scriptural interpretation, and the play as a whole reflected the exegetical traditions of both patristic and contemporary theologians. Rachel's lament, moreover, with its inclusion of the antiphon *Anxiatus est in me* from Good Friday lauds (CAO 1442), "effectively links Rachel's *planctus* to the *planctus* of the Virgin, constituting the strongest allusion to Rachel's prefiguration of Mary in the play."⁵⁸ For Boynton, the rich nature of the exegetical construction of the *ordo* did not preclude the sorts of antics to which Gerhoh and others had objected. While "the *Interfectio puerorum* embodies the juxtaposition of joy and mourning associated with the feast of the Innocents in the central Middle Ages," and while "the extended lament of Rachel at the center of the play is an expression of the mother's grief mentioned by liturgical commentators, . . . the play probably provided the same kind of boisterous entertainment as the dramas Gerhoh of Reichersberg directed for the Augsburg cathedral chapter."⁵⁹

Several plays show evidence of what might be called “exegetical design” in their texts and melodies. In my study of *Imago Sancti Nicolai*, the third of the four St. Nicholas plays in the Fleury manuscript, I also saw a “sermon in song.”⁶⁰ Not only was the play ordered by number, with five sections, the outer four divided into five parts and the central section into three, its melodic structure was chiasmic as well, its closing sections employing a series of melodic motives in inverse order from their original presentation in the opening sections. These numerical and rhetorical structures likely functioned symbolically, with both the number five and the chiasmus imposing the sign of the cross and the number three invoking the Trinity, thus overlaying a Christian understanding on what seemed otherwise to be a whimsical saint’s legend.⁶¹

The *Ludus Paschalis* of Tours (Tours, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 927, 1r–8v) was similarly constructed although on a much grander scale. This play was built on a scaffold that merged three distinct representational rites from three different churches, and this scaffold supported an expansive array of new poetic and musical forms with overlapping streams of repeated melodic motives that permeated the play as a whole. Not only was there further evidence of numerical composition, this time involving the numbers three, five, and six, the play offered yet another instance of musical chiasmus in addition to what appears clearly to be an attempt at a Gospel harmonization on the model of the second-century *Diatesseron* of Tatian.⁶² Although the play was hastily copied, and although the copy we have is incomplete, what has survived appears to be a work of great craftsmanship with deep symbolic meaning.⁶³

Given the exegetical intent of some plays and the inclusion of most in collections of sermons or other exegetical works, it is tempting to see the entire cluster of religious plays in terms of performative exegesis, as works infused with theological import and directed toward educated communities of some sophistication, communities well-versed in Latin and familiar with biblical and liturgical matters, and communities conversant with the senses and modes of scriptural interpretation. But this is likely naive. While the plays of this cluster share a common context, or at least the lack of a liturgical context, this does not mean that all were directed toward the same end. To find an exegetical intent for some plays, the shorter St. Nicholas plays (*Tres Clerici* and *Tres Filiae*) for example, might well prove challenging. Several plays, moreover, appear to have been motivated as much by political as by theological concerns. The *Officium/Ordo Stellae*, for example, may well have been written in support of Ottonian claims of

kingship following the death of Otto II in 983 as Susan Rankin has speculated. The play of Antichrist was likely also inspired by political concerns. As Amelia J. Carr observed:

In general, the *Ludus de Antichristo* portrays a conservative vision of Christian society sympathetic to Frederick Barbarossa's stance vis-à-vis the papal claims. The cortege of Ecclesia, clergy on the one hand, emperor and armies on the other, embodies the old Gelasian equality and separation of powers very clearly. . . . The power of the Christian emperor derives from the precedent of Roman law, and the sword representing physical coercion to the faith (or temporal power) has nothing to whatever to do with the pope, but is received from the hand of Justice, a figure subordinate only to the Church, that is, to Christ alone.⁶⁴

The inclusion of the play of Antichrist within a manuscript also containing Otto of Freising's *Gesta Friderici Imperatoris* is certainly suggestive of such a connection. The pairings of the *Ordo Stellae* from St. Emmeram and Malmédy with the *Bellum Catilinae* of Sallust and the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Josephus respectively, both of which chronicle revolts against Roman order in one way or another, are also suggestive of a political or historical connection understood by the compilers of these manuscripts. Indeed, settings of the *Ordo Stellae* from Freising and Fleury along with a possibly liturgical setting of the *Officium Stellae* from Stasbourg (see the following section on "Ambiguously Situated Representations") incorporate the singing by an angry Herod of Cateline's furious words to the Roman senate after having been shouted down and accused of treason and assassination: "Incendium meum ruina extingam."⁶⁵

Whatever purpose these plays may have been intended to fulfill individually, it is unlikely that any would have been understood as a liturgical rite, at least not in the same way that the representational rites discussed above were understood. While the *Ludi Paschales* of Easter or the *Ordo Stellae* of Epiphany might have been associated with a particular liturgical moment (such as the end of Easter matins or before the Mass of Epiphany), these would likely have been occasional events, performed in place of the rite specified in the liturgy of that place at that time, and likely performed only when the performing forces were sufficient to make such an event possible.⁶⁶ Less clear is whether these were understood at the time as drama, or theater, or even spectacle. While most of these appear clearly to function as plays, at least as that term is understood today, it is debatable whether any such understanding would have been current

during the period when most of these were copied. While a few of these were designated “*ludus*” within the manuscripts that preserve them, this word was more broadly understood than the sense of “stage-play” that we tend to associate with it (see the discussion of “Drama” in chapter 5, pp. 166–70), and we must be careful not to assume their placement within the same category as works from later (or even earlier) times that also bear this label.

Ambiguously Situated Representations

Some surviving texts contained within liturgical miscellanies or that have survived as fragments may well have been intended for liturgical use as well, but absent liturgical directions, their precise liturgical context, if any, remains unclear. These are given in table 4.3. The best-known example of such an ambivalent context is the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139. The so-called liturgical drama (or dramas) of Paris 1139 is (or are) copied between a series of polyphonic *versae* and a group of *Benedicamus* tropes.⁶⁷ Not only is the *Sponsus* devoid of liturgical context itself (whether we consider this in the singular or the plural), it follows a group of polyphonic *versae* whose liturgical intent is unclear. A liturgical miscellany from Einsiedeln incorporates a collection of liturgical fragments containing hymns and sequences as well as several folios that contain a *Visitatio Sepulchri*, an incomplete *Officium Stellae*, and an incomplete *Officium Prophetarum*.⁶⁸ These three ceremonies, though, were copied together and are not found within a context that makes their liturgical intent apparent. A similar grouping is found in a twelfth-century troper-proser-gradual from the cathedral of Laon. In this manuscript, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* is appropriately placed among other items for Easter. Three additional texts are included at the conclusion of this section of the manuscript, following the feasts of St. Andrew and St. Nicholas: an *Ordo Prophetarum*, *Ordo Stellae*, and an incomplete *Ordo Joseph*, all given without music.⁶⁹ Once again, the three texts are placed outside of the liturgically ordered section that precedes them, leaving their liturgical placement, if indeed they have one, ambiguous.

Several representations are preserved within liturgical manuscripts, but their presentation in these manuscripts, or the nature of the manuscripts themselves, leaves the intent of the so-called rites unclear. The *Officium Stellae* of Strasbourg, for one, may well have been intended for liturgical use, but it is copied between the octave of the Epiphany and the feast of St. Hilary (which falls on the octave of the Epiphany) rather than

within the feast of the Epiphany itself.⁷⁰ Likewise, the *Danielis Ludus* of Beauvais is preserved in a single manuscript that also contains a liturgy for the feast of the Circumcision.⁷¹ The liturgical position for the *ludus*, however, is not given, and we do not know whether the *ludus* would have been performed regularly, but once, or at all. Settings of the *Ordo Annunciatis Sancte Marie* from Cividale are preserved outside of their liturgical positions in their respective manuscripts with rubrics that place their celebration outside of the church. The dramatic procession from Philippe de Mézières's Presentation of the Virgin is similarly situated. While its association with the Mass for the feast is secure, this procession survives in a single manuscript in the hand of de Mézières, and there is little evidence that the procession was ever celebrated as described beyond the few observances of the feast overseen by de Mézières himself.⁷²

Several texts are preserved in books of liturgical readings for the Mass or Divine Office or in books of hymns, books that, while intended for liturgical use, typically do not contain such extraneous material. A twelfth-century *Ordo Stellae* from Bilsen, Belgium, for example, is copied at the end of an evangialary (Gospel book), just after the colophon.⁷³ An expanded, albeit fragmentary, *Visitatio Sepulchri* (with the appearance of Mary Magdalene) from Maastricht is included as a flyleaf within an evangialary,⁷⁴ while settings from Rheinau and Braunschweig, also with Mary Magdalene, are appended to lectionaries.⁷⁵ A number of texts have survived as fragments as well, providing few clues as to their liturgical intent (if any).

The ambiguity inherent in the manuscript placements for these rites and/or representations does not diminish the usefulness of the categories previously outlined in discussing these representations. For many settings, a strong enough correlation in liturgical content with other securely identified rites is likely sufficient to suggest their inclusion among the representational rites. While their liturgical placements may remain ambiguous, the simpler settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Corbie, Kremsmünster, Münster, Limoges, Stockholm, and Worms fit readily among the rites given in tables 4.1A and 4.1B. Several of the more robust settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, those including the appearance of Christ to Mary Magdalene from Braunschweig, Cividale, Engelberg, Kremsmünster, Medingen, Ossiach, and Rheinau, moreover, might also have been used liturgically and would not appear out of place among the expanded rites contained in table 4.1C. By the same standard, the *Ordo Peregrinorum* from Beauvais, the *Ordo Pastorum* from Montpellier (Rouen?), the *Ordo Stellae* from Strasbourg, and the *Ordo Prophetarum* from Laon and Zagreb

appear similar in length and style to the liturgical settings given in table 4.1E. Other settings, however, appear closer to those of the non-liturgical group. Given their length and complexity, the extended settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Egmont, Maastricht, and Vich are more closely connected to those given in table 4.2 than they are to the more properly liturgical settings given in table 4.1C. Also likely belonging among the plays of table 4.2 is the *Danielis Ludus* of Beauvais, which, while its liturgical use is certainly suggested, offers an exegetical structure much like those discussed earlier.⁷⁶ For other representations, however, such assignments remain elusive. Most notable in this regard are the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139 (whether a single play or a collection) and the trilogies from Einsiedeln (MS 366) and Laon (MS 263), all of which defy easy classification.

Some Observations

Seen from this contextual perspective, the manuscripts and books preserving what we call “liturgical drama” expose several features for these clusters that are often overlooked. First, representational rites greatly outnumber all other representations combined, and among these, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* dominates. While the pre-Mass settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* are localized to southern Europe,⁷⁷ the matins (and other) settings are pan-European, stretching from Dublin to Jerusalem and from Stockholm to Palermo. A similar distribution, albeit much narrower in scope, is evident with the *Officium Pastorum*, whose pre-Mass settings are similarly localized to southern Europe with the matins versions restricted to the cathedrals of Padua in northern Italy, Clermont-Ferrand in the south of France and Rouen in the north. If one can speak of a repertory for liturgical drama beyond these two rites, it would appear to be localized to Normandy and to the cathedral at Padua. Indeed, with the exception of a single manuscript from the cathedral of Padua, all surviving liturgical settings of the *Officium Peregrinorum* and *Officium Prophetarum* are Norman in origin, and most of these are specific to the liturgical use of the cathedral at Rouen.⁷⁸ Only the *Officium Stellae* appears to have had a wider distribution, and this may well have originated outside of the liturgy and only later incorporated liturgically, as Susan Rankin has speculated.⁷⁹ Another interesting pattern exposed by this arrangement is the distribution of those settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* that include the appearance of the risen Christ to Mary Magdalene, nearly a fourth of which are Anglo/Norman with double that number stemming from German convents.

Also intriguing are the types of manuscripts into which the non-liturgical (and even some of the equivocally placed) texts have been added or copied. While scholars have tended to view these placements as irrelevant or at best happy accidents,⁸⁰ it may well be that the scribes who entered these texts into existing manuscripts or the collators who chose to bind these with other texts had well-considered grounds for making the choices they made. Indeed, a substantial proportion of these were copied or inserted into collections of sermons or other exegetical works (see table 4.2) or into evangialaries or lectionaries (see table 4.3). Several scholars have speculated on the exegetical intent of several of these, and it may well be that many of the texts in these groupings were written to address concerns beyond those addressed by the liturgical rites to which we have assumed they were related.⁸¹ Also intriguing are the possible connections that might exist between the *Ordo Stellae* copied onto the opening folios of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* or that included within a manuscript of the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Josephus or between the play of Antichrist and Otto of Freising's *Gesta Friderici Imperatoris*.

Viewed contextually, moreover, the texts break out into the same broad categories that have long been recognized by students of liturgy and drama—a sizeable group of representational rites since deemed to be drama and a noticeably smaller group of what appear to be plays that have been branded liturgical. These broad categories have served further as focal points to which contemporary scholars been drawn. While the larger collection of liturgical texts has tended to attract those most interested in questions of origin, transmission, and liturgical function, the smaller collection of more theatrical texts has generally attracted those whose focus was drawn to the dramatic and literary features exhibited. Indeed, a remarkable testimony to these diverging priorities is found in the two largely independent and largely unrelated discussions of liturgical drama contained within the most recent edition of the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (2nd ed., 2001). The discussion offered by John Stevens in the article “Medieval Drama,” for example, moves quickly from a brief discussion of the liturgical rites of Easter to a broader treatment of the larger, and more dramatic texts, drawing heavily from the earlier work of Edmond K. Chambers and Karl Young with little reference to more recent scholarship.⁸² The discussion by John Emerson in his article on “Plainchant,” conversely, maintains its focus on the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and other liturgical settings, drawing from more recent critical work in its treatment of the issues.⁸³

Seen from the contexts of their placement in the manuscripts and books that preserve them, the rites and representations called “liturgical drama” hold too little in common to allow the expression “liturgical drama” to adhere. The majority of representations are certainly liturgical but by no means drama, while those that remain may well be drama, but are certainly not liturgical. But if the expression has no clear referent, what can its object possibly be? In the following chapter, I address the words themselves: their origin, history, and the ways in which these words are currently understood. I examine in turn the combination of terms and find that the expression, aside from having no clear referent, is also largely meaningless.

Table 4.1A: Representational Rites: *Visitatio Sepulchri*, without Magdalene—Mass and Matins

Dates	Liturgical Book	MSS/ Books	Notes
<i>Before Easter Mass (as trope, processional item, or independent ceremony)</i>			
11th–15th c.	Antiphoner	4	
11th c.	Breviary	1	
11th–15th c.	Customary	5	
11th–15th c.	Gradual/Missal	18	
11th c.	Liturgical miscellany	1	
12th–15th c.	Ordinal	11	
14th–15th c.	Processional	7	
10th–15th c.	Troper/Sequentiary/Proser	39	
	Total Mass MSS	86	
<i>End of Easter matins</i>			
11th–16th c.	Antiphoner	96	
11th–16th c.	Breviary	283	
12th–13th c.	Cantatorium	2	
10th–15th c.	Customary	11	
14th–16th c.	Diurnal	8	
10th–14th c.	Gradual/Missal	13	
12th–13th c.	Liturgical commentary	3	
10th–14th c.	Liturgical miscellany	4	
11th–18th c.	Ordinal	131	Includes <i>Directoriae</i> and <i>Registræ Chori</i>
12th–18th c.	Processional	46	
10th–16th c.	Rituale (Agenda, Obsequiale, etc.)	49	Includes Sacramentaries and Pontificals
11th–14th c.	Troper/Sequentiary	11	
12th–18th c.	Other/Unknown	7	Settings published in modern editions from MSS now lost or contained in fragments from MSS of indeterminate type—also 1 <i>Scannalia</i> and 1 <i>Viaticum</i>
	Total Matins MSS/Books	664	

Table 4.1B: Representational Rites: *Visitatio Sepulchri*, without Magdalene—Non-standard placements

Manuscript/Book	LOO	Date
<i>Before Easter Matins</i>		
Laon, Bibl. municipale, MS 215, 129r–v	109	13th c.
Bellotte, pp. 215–17	111	?
Bellotte, p. 819	112	?
*St. Gall, Stiftsbibl., MS 1290, 22r–24r, 134r–v	331	1582
St. Gall, Stiftsbibl., MS 1262, pp. 142–43	330	1583
*St. Gall, Stiftsbibl., MS 1296, pp. 24–27	332	1631
*St. Gall, Stiftsbibl., MS 525, p. 394	328	14th c.
*Castellani1, 276r–278v	429	1523
*Castellani2, 262r–263v	429A	1537
<i>Officium hebdomadae sanctae secundum consuetudinem ducalis ecclesiae Sancti Marci Venetiarum</i> (Venice, 1736), pp. 345–49	430	1736
<i>After Lauds</i>		
Monsabert, pp. 393–94.	151	13th c.
<i>Easter Vespers</i>		
*London, British Library, MS Add. 30848, 125v	461	late 11th c.
<i>Ambiguous Placement</i>		
*Laon, Bibl. municipale, MS 263, 145r–146r	110	ca. 1187
*Cologne, Universitätsbibl., MS 5 P 114 (Bäumker 979), 99r–100v	333	16th c.
*Berlin, Staatsbibl. zu Berlin, MS theol. qu. 15, 120r	271	1022–1036
*Cracow, Bibl. Jagiellonská, MS Berol. theol. lat. 11, 45v–46r	272	1024–1027
*Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibl., MS Helmst. 1008, 126r–v	273	1024–1027
*Engelberg, Stiftsbibl., MS 1003, 121v	318A	ca. 1140
*Bamberg, Staatliche Bibl., MS lit. 6, 94v	319	late 10th c.
*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 14845, 94r–v	320	mid-12th c.
*St. Gall, Stiftsbibl., MS 360, pp. 31–32	327	mid-12th c.
St. Gall, Stiftsbibl., MS 384, p. 240	329	14th c.
*Graz, Universitätsbibl., MS lat. 211, 83v	480	12th c.
*Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodl. 775, 17r–v	423	mid-11th c.
*Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 473, 26v	424	1020–1040
*Venice, Museo Civico Correr, Biblioteca, cod. Cicogna 1006, 23r–24v	^o 910	1250–1300

NOTES

- * Musical notation included
 Bellote Antoine Bellotte, *Ritus ecclesiae Laudensis*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1662)
 Castellani1 Alberto Castellani, *Liber sacerdotalis* (Venice, 1523)
 Castellani2 Alberto Castellani, *Liber sacerdotalis* (Venice, 1537)

Provenance	Type	Notes
Laon	Ordinal	
Laon	?	Original MS unknown or lost
Laon	?	Original MS unknown or lost
St. Gall	Processional	
St. Gall	Ordinal	
St. Gall	Processional	
Venice, St. Mark	Ordinal	Bound within a MS containing a vocabulary, sermons, glosses on the hymnal, and treatises on the virtues and vices. Liturgical position clearly indicated in the opening rubric
Venice, St. Mark	Ritual	Combines <i>Elevatio Crucis et Hostiae</i> with <i>Visitatio Sepulchri</i>
Venice, St. Mark	Ritual	Combines <i>Elevatio Crucis et Hostiae</i> with <i>Visitatio Sepulchri</i>
Venice, St. Mark	Ordinal	Combines <i>Elevatio Crucis et Hostiae</i> with <i>Visitatio Sepulchri</i>
Poitiers, Sainte-Croix	Ordinal	Original MS unknown or lost
Silos, St. Domingo	Breviary	Following the procession to the font at second Vespers
Laon	Gradual	Beginning rubric: <i>In aurora</i> . MS also contains <i>Ordo Stellae</i> , <i>Ordo Prophetarum</i> , and incomplete <i>Ordo Joseph</i> on folios following gradual
Marienberg am Schonenberg	Processional	Ends with antiphon <i>Surrexit Dominus</i>
Minden	Gradual	<i>In die sancto Pasche primo mane</i> —ends with <i>Surrexit enim</i>
Minden	Gradual	<i>In die sancto Pasche primo mane</i> —ends with <i>Surrexit enim</i>
Minden	Gradual	<i>In die sancto Pasche primo mane</i> —ends with <i>Surrexit enim</i>
St. Blasien	Gradual	Ends with antiphon <i>Surrexit Dominus</i>
St. Emmeram	Troper	In left margin. Ends with antiphon <i>Surrexit Dominus</i> .
St. Emmeram	Troper	Includes antiphon <i>Surrexit Dominus</i>
St. Gall	Processional	Ends with antiphons <i>Surrexit enim</i> and <i>Christus resurgens</i>
St. Gall	Breviary	Ends with antiphons <i>Surrexit enim</i> and <i>Christus resurgens</i>
Székesfehérvár	Antiphoner	After lauds or before vespers on Holy Saturday
Winchester	Gradual/Troper	Ends with antiphon <i>Surrexit Dominus</i> , entered before the <i>Benedictio cerei</i> of the Easter Vigil
Winchester	Troper	Ends with antiphon <i>Surrexit Dominus</i>
Venice, St. Mark	Ritual/Processional	Ends with antiphon <i>Venite et videte</i>

Evers/Janota Ute Evers and Johannes Janota, *Die Melodien der lateinischen Osterfeiern*, 2 vols. in 4 (Berlin, 2013) [LOO numbers ^o900 and above]

LOO Walther Lipphardt, *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*, 9 vols. (Berlin, 1976–1990)

Monsabert P. de Monsabert, “Document inédits,” *Revue Mabillon* 9 (1913–1914): 373–95

Table 4.1C: Representational Rites: *Visitatio Sepulchri*, with Magdalene

Manuscript	LOO
<i>Anglo/Norman</i>	
Oxford, University College, MS 169, pp. 121–24	770
*Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson Liturg. D. IV, 130r–132r	772
*Dublin, Archbishop Marsh's Library, MS Z.4.2.20, 59r–61r	772A
Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1301, 143v–145v	771
Avranches, Bibl. municipale, <i>olim</i> MS no. intér. 14, extér. 2524, foliation not given	774
Avranches, Bibl. municipale, MS 214, pp. 236–38	773
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 904, 101v–102v	775
Rouen, Bibl. municipale, MS 384, 82v–83r	776
Rouen, Bibl. municipale, MS 382, 70v–71r	778
Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1213, p. 86	777
*Solesmes, Abbaye-St.-Pierre, MS 596, 59r–64v	—
<i>German/Bohemian Convents</i>	
Wolfenbüttel, Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv, MS VII.B.48, 15r–v	785
*Berlin, Staatsbibl. zu Berlin, MS Mus 40081, 16v–18v, 93r–95r, 100v–107v, 178r, 241v–243v	786
*Berlin, Staatsbibl. zu Berlin, MS Mus 40080, 109v–112v, 117r–123v, 225v–227r	786A
*Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibl., MS Guelf. 309 Novi, 68r–69v	791
*Münster, Bibl. des Priesterseminars, MS K4.214, 48v–55r	793
*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 28947, 64v–65v	794
*Münster, Bibl. Archiv und Bibl. des Bistums Münster, BAM PfA MS 113, 112r–113v	795
Prague, Národní knihovna, MS VI.E.13, pp. 3–4	798
Prague, Národní knihovna, MS XII.A.22, 2r–v	798A
*Prague, Národní knihovna, MS VI.G.10a, 149r–153v, 185r–187v	799
*Prague, Národní knihovna, MS XIII.H.3c, 107r–114v	800
*Prague, Národní knihovna, MS XII.E.15a, 69v–74v	801
Prague, Národní knihovna, MS XIII.E.14d, 77r–78r	802
*Prague, Národní knihovna, MS VI.G.3b, 84r–90r	803
*Prague, Národní knihovna, MS VI.G.10b, 72v–78v	804
*Prague, Národní knihovna, MS VI.G.5, 243v–251r	804A
*Prague, Národní knihovna, MS VII.G.16, 95v–103r	805
*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 27301, 72r–73v, 76r–77r	796

Date	Provenance	Type	Notes
1365	Barking	Ordinal	Before Matins, follows <i>Elevatio</i>
after 1352	Dublin	Processional	Corresponds to other Anglo-Norman settings but missing Magdalene/Christ
after 1352	Dublin	Processional	Corresponds to other Anglo-Norman settings but missing Magdalene/Christ
ca. 1400	Coutances	Ordinal	
?	Mont-Saint-Michel	?	MS lost, reported by du Ménil, 94–96
14th c.	Mont-Saint-Michel	Ritual	
13th c.	Rouen	Gradual	
14th c.	Rouen	Ordinal	
ca. 1495	Rouen	Ordinal	
15th c.	Rouen	Ordinal	
13th/14th c.	Wilton	Processional	ca. 1860 copy of 13th/14th c. MS (cited by Rankin). 37 of the original 165 leaves from the original MS have been located by Alstatt
1438	Gandersheim	<i>Registrum Chori</i>	16th c. copy
ca. 1500	Gernrode	Processional	Before Matins, with <i>Elevatio</i>
ca. 1500	Gernrode	Processional	Before Matins, with <i>Elevatio</i>
12th/13th c.	Marienberg bei Helmstedt	Antiphoner	
ca. 1600	Münster, Leibfrauen	Processional	
ca. 1420	Nottuln bei Münster	Gradual	Formerly owned by Otto Ursprung
before 1493	Nottuln bei Münster	Antiphoner	
12th c.	Prague, St. George	Breviary	
14th c.	Prague, St. George	Breviary	
1280–1320	Prague, St. George	Processional	
ca. 1300	Prague, St. George	Processional	
ca. 1310	Prague, St. George	Processional	
14th c.	Prague, St. George	Ordinal	
ca. 1300	Prague, St. George	Processional	
1280–1320	Prague, St. George	Processional	
1300–1350	Prague, St. George	Processional	
1300–1325	Prague, St. George	Processional	
1587	Regensburg, Obermünster	Processional	

(continued overleaf)

Table 4.1C: Representational Rites: *Visitatio Sepulchri*, with Magdalene (*cont.*)

Manuscript	LOO
<i>Other</i>	
*Nürnberg, Germanische Nationalmuseum, MS 22923, 105v–107v	782
*Istanbul, Topkapi Serayi Müzesi, MS Gayri Islami, Eserler 68, 97r–98r	807
Gerona, Bibl. Capit., Acta Capitularium 1528–29, 360r–v	821
Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibl., MS Guelf. 84.2, 23r–v	787
St. Gall, Stiftsbibl., MS 448, pp. 105–6	788
Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, MS 4o 62, 397v–398r	779A
The Hague, Koninklijke Bibl., MS 71.A.3, 43v	826A
*Trier, Bistumsarchiv, BATr Abt. 95 Nr. 493, 102v	795A
Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibl., MS lat. 13427, 129r–v	806

NOTES

- * Musical notation included
- Alstatt Alison Alstatt, “Re-membering the Wilton Processional,” *Notes: the Quarterly Journal of the Music Library Association* 72 (2016): 690–732
- Du Ménil Édélstand du Ménil, *Origines latines du théâtre modern* (Paris, 1849)
- Evers/Janota Ute Evers and Johannes Janota, *Die Melodien der lateinische Osterfeiern*, 2 vols. in 4 (Berlin, 2013)

Table 4.1D: Representational Rites: *Officium Pastorum*—Before Mass and end of Christmas Matins

Manuscript	Date	Provenance
<i>Before Mass (as trope)</i>		
Southern France		
*Apt, Basilique de Sainte-Anne, MS 17, p. 28	11th c.	Apt
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 779, 1r	11th c.	Arles(?)/Limoges(?)
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1084, 53v–54r	11th/12th c.	Aurillac, Saint-Gérauld
*Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS n. a. lat. 1660, 15v	14th c.	Central France
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 887, 9v	11th c.	Limoges, Saint-Martial
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 909, 9r–v	10th/11th c.	Limoges, Saint-Martial
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1118, 8v–9r	10th/11th c.	Limoges, Saint-Martial
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1119, 4r–v	after 1031	Limoges, Saint-Martial
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1121, 2r–v	ca. 1000	Limoges, Saint-Martial
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS n. a. lat. 1871, 4r	11th c.	Moissac
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 9449, 7r–v	ca. 1060	Nevers
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS n. a. lat. 1235, 183v–184r	12th c.	Nevers
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 13252, 3r–v	1150/1200	Paris, Saint-Magliore
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 903, 147v	11th c.	Saint-Yrieix

Date	Provenance	Type	Notes
1250–1300	Chiemsee (LOO), Gurb (Evers/Janota)	Antiphoner	Contains 2 settings: 1 with Magdalene, the other without
1463	Eger or Budapest	Gradual	
1539	Gerona	<i>Acta Capitularium</i>	
15th c.	Havelberg	Ordinal	
ca. 1440	Hersfeld	Ritual	
1481–1483	Hirsau? (Klugseder). Augsburg, St. Ulrich und Afra (LOO)	Ordinal	
1385	Maastricht, St. Maria	Ordinal	
15th c.	Oberwesel, Liebfrauenkirche?	Antiphoner	Incomplete
14th c.	Prague	Breviary	

- Klugseder Robert Klugseder, *Quellen des gregorianischen Chorals für das Offizium aus dem Kloster St. Ulrich und Afra Augsburg* (Tutzing, 2008)
- LOO Walther Lipphardt, *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*, 9 vols. (Berlin, 1976–1990)
- Rankin Susan K. Rankin, “A New English Source of the Visitatio Sepulchri,” *Journal of the Plain-song and Mediaeval Music Society* 4 (1981): 1–11

Book	Notes
Troper	
Troper	Beginning absent
Troper	
Missal	
Troper	
Troper	
Troper	
Troper	
Troper	
Troper	Beginning absent
Troper	
Gradual	
Troper	
Troper	

(continued overleaf)

Table 4.1D: Representational Rites: *Officium Pastorum*
—Before Mass and end of Christmas Matins (*cont.*)

Manuscript	Date	Provenance
Northern Italy		
*Turin, Bibl. Nazionale, MS G.V.20, 20v	11th c.	Bobbio
*Turin, Bibl. Nazionale, MS F.IV.18, 9v–10r	12th c.	Bobbio
*Bologna, Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale, MS Q 7, 23r	11th c.	Italy
*Modena, Bibl. Capitolare, MS O.I.7, 6v–7r	11th/12th c.	Forlimpopoli
*Ivrea, Bibl. Capitolare, MS 60, 10v	11th c.	Ivrea
*Verona, Bibl. Capitolare, MS 107, 5v–6r	11th c.	Mantua
*Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 222, 6r–v	11th c.	Novalesa
*Padua, Bibl. Capitolare, MS A.47, 16v	12th c.	Ravenna
*Padua, Bibl. des Seminario Vescovile, MS 697, 45v	12th c.	Padua
*Piacenza, Bibl. Capitolare, MS 65, 229v	12th c.	Piacenza
*Pistoia, Bibl. Capitolare, MS C. 121 (70), 14v	12th c.	Piacenza
*Vercelli, Bibl. Capitolare, MS 161, 118v	12th c.	Vercelli
*Vercelli, Bibl. Capitolare, MS 146, 107r	11th c.	Vercelli
*Vercelli, Bibl. Capitolare, MS 162, 187r–v	12th c.	Vercelli
*Volterra, Bibl. Guarnacci, MS L.3.39, 3v	11th c.	Volterra
Spain		
*Huesca, Bibl. Capitolare, MS 4, 124r	11th/12th c.	Huesca
*Vich, Bibl. Episcopal, MS 106 (31), 30r	12th/13th c.	Vich
*Vich, Bibl. Episcopal, MS 124, Av–Bv	13th/14th c.	Vich
Other		
*Rome, Bibl. Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. lat. 10645, 52r	12th c.?	?
<i>Christmas Matins</i>		
Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1274, 40v	14th c.	Clermont-Ferrand
Clermont-Ferrand, Bibl. municipale, MS 67, 28v	15th c.	Clermont-Ferrand
*Padua, Bibl. Capitolare, MS C.55, 1r–v	14th c.	Padua
*Padua, Bibl. Capitolare, MS C.56, 1r–v	14th c.	Padua
Padua, Bibl. Capitolare, MS E.57, 40v–41v	13th c.	Padua
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 904, 11v–14v	13th c.	Rouen
Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1213, pp. 17–18	15th c.	Rouen
Rouen, Bibl. municipale, MS 382, 23r–v	15th c.	Rouen
Rouen, Bibl. municipale, MS 384, 22r–23r	14th c.	Rouen
Martène (1706), p. 87	?	Rouen
NOTES		
*	Musical notation included	
Cattin/Vildera	Giulio Cattin and Anna Vildera, <i>Il "Liber Ordinarius" della Chiesa Padovana</i> , 2 vols. (Padua, 2002)	
<i>Corpus Troporum 1</i>	Ritva Jonnson, <i>Corpus Troporum 1, Tropes du propre de la messe, Cycle de Noël</i> (Stockholm, 1975)	
De Bartholomaeis	Vincenzo De Bartholomaeis, <i>Origini della poesia drammatica italiana</i> (Bologna, 1924)	

Book	Notes
Troper	
Troper	Cited by Young, 2:6 and Planchart, 225–26. Not in <i>Corpus Troporum 1</i>
Troper	Cited by Planchart, 225. Not in Young. Not in <i>Corpus Troporum 1</i>
Troper	Fragment
Troper	
Troper	
Troper	
Troper	Cited by Planchart, 225. Not in Young. Not in <i>Corpus Troporum 1</i>
Troper	Cited by Planchart, 225. Not in Young. Not in <i>Corpus Troporum 1</i>
Troper	Fragment
Troper	
Troper	
Troper	
Troper	Cited by Planchart, 226. Not in <i>Corpus Troporum 1</i>
Troper	
Troper	Cited by Young, 2:427. Not in <i>Corpus Troporum 1</i>
Troper	
Troper	Fragment. Cited by Young, 2:427. Not in <i>Corpus Troporum 1</i>
Collection of liturgical fragments	Cited by Young, 2:427 after Bartholomaeis, 525. Planchart, 225. Not in <i>Corpus Troporum 1</i>
Breviary	After Matins, before 2nd Mass of Christmas
Breviary	After Matins, before 2nd Mass of Christmas
Processional	Before Matins. Cited by Vecchi, 6–11 (edition)
Processional	Before Matins. Cited by Vecchi, 6–11 (edition), 183–84 (facsimile)
Ordinal	Before Matins. Cited by Cattin/Vildera 1:40v–41v and 2:51–52
Gradual	After Matins, before 2nd Mass of Christmas
Ordinal	After Matins, before 2nd Mass of Christmas
Ordinal	After Matins, before 2nd Mass of Christmas
Ordinal	After Matins, before 2nd Mass of Christmas
?	After Matins, before 2nd Mass of Christmas
Martène (1706)	Edmond Martène, <i>Tractatus de antiqua ecclesiae disciplinae in divinis celebrandis officii</i> (Lyons, 1706)
Planchart	Alejandro Enrique Planchart, “On the Nature of Transmission and Change in Trope Repertories,” <i>Journal of the American Musicological Society</i> 41 (1988): 215–49
Vecchi	Giuseppi Vecchi, <i>Uffici drammatici Padovani</i> (Florence, 1954)
Young	Karl Young, <i>The Drama of the Medieval Church</i> , 2 vols. (Oxford, 1933)

Table 4.1E: Representational Rites: Other

Manuscript	LOO	Date	Provenance
<i>Officium Peregrinorum</i>			
Bayeux, Bibl. du chapitre, MS 121, foliation not given	807A	13th c.	Bayeux
*Rouen, Bibl. municipale, MS 222, 43v–45r	812	13th c.	Rouen
Rouen, Bibl. municipale, MS 384, 86r–v	813	14th c.	Rouen
Rouen, Bibl. municipale, MS 382, 73r–v	814	ca. 1495	Rouen
Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1213, p. 90	815	15th c.	Rouen
Padua, Bibl. Capitolare, MS E.57, 103r–104v.	810A	13th c.	Padua
*Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, MS 288, 172v–173v	818	12th c.	Palermo, <i>Capella</i>
*Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, MS 289, 117r–118v	819	12th c.	Palermo, <i>Capella</i>
*Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, MS Vitr. 20.4 (C.132), 105v–108r	811	12th c.	Palermo, cathedral
<i>Officium Prophetarum</i>			
Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1232, 26r–27r		17th c.	Rouen
Rouen, Bibl. municipale, MS 382, 31v–33r		15th c.	Rouen
Rouen, Bibl. municipale, MS 384, 33r–35r		14th c.	Rouen
Martène (1706), pp. 106–7		14th c. (?)	Tours
<i>Officium Stellae</i>			
Besançon, Bibl. de la Ville, MS 109, pp. 44–46		1629	Besançon
Crombach (1654), pp. 732–34		?	Besançon
Civiale, Museo Archeologico nazionale, MS CXXX, 40r–v		14th c.	Civiale
*Zagreb, Metropolitanske knjizhice, MR 165, 28v–30r		11th/12th	Győr (Raab)
Martène (1706), p. 114		?	Limoges
*Paris, Bibl. Mazarine, MS 1708, 81v		11th c.	Nevers
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 9449, 17v–18r		11th c.	Nevers
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS n. a. lat. 1235, 198r–199r		12th c.	Nevers
Padua, Bibl. Capitolare, MS E.57, 58r–v		13th c.	Padua
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 904, 28v–30r		13th c.	Rouen
Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1213, pp. 34–35		14th c.	Rouen
*Rouen, Bibl. municipale, MS 222, 4r–v		13th c.	Rouen
Rouen, Bibl. municipale, MS 382, 35v–36r		15th c.	Rouen
Rouen, Bibl. municipale, MS 384, 38v–39v		14th c.	Rouen
Jean d'Avranche (PL 147:43)		11th c.	Rouen?
Martène (1706), pp. 111–12.		?	Rouen
*Madrid, Bibl. Nationale, MS 288, 168r–170r		11th c.	Palermo, <i>Capella</i>
*Madrid, Bibl. Nationale, MS 289, 107v–110r		12th c.	Palermo, <i>Capella</i>
Sion, Archives du chapitre, MS 47, 33r		13th c.	Sion

Book	Notes
Ordinal	Citation by Chevalier, p. 143. Vespers on Easter Monday
Processional	Vespers on Easter Monday
Ordinal	Vespers on Easter Monday
Ordinal	Vespers on Easter Monday
Ordinal	Vespers on Easter Monday
Ordinal	Vespers on Easter Monday. Cited by Cattin/Vildera, 1:103v–104v and 2:132
Troper	Vespers on Easter Monday
Troper	Vespers on Easter Monday
Gradual	Vespers on Easter Sunday or Monday
Ordinal	Before third Mass of Christmas. Copied from Rouen, MS 384 (Young, 1:154)
Ordinal	Before third Mass of Christmas
Ordinal	Before third Mass of Christmas
<i>ex MS Turocensis</i>	
<i>Liber Ceremoniale</i>	Epiphany, Mass—before the Gospel (description in French by Fr. Francis Guenard, priest of St. Stephen's in Besançon)
?	Epiphany, Mass—before the Gospel. Ceremony drawn from 3 MSS (given separately by Morandi)
Rituale	Cited by Morandi, 56–57 and 308–9
Agenda	Epiphany, Matins—after 9th responsory
Ordinal	Epiphany, Mass—after the Offertory
Collection of liturgical fragments	Epiphany, Matins—after 9th responsory
Troper	Epiphany, Matins—after 9th responsory
Troper/Gradual	Epiphany, Matins—after 9th responsory
Ordinal	MS: <i>Representatio Herodis in nocte Epyphania</i> . Epiphany, Matins—after 8th responsory. Magi not present. Cited by Cattin/Vildera, 1:58r–v and 2:74–75
Gradual	Epiphany, Mass—before the Introit
Ordinal	Epiphany, Mass—before the Introit
Processional	Epiphany, Mass—before the Introit
Ordinal	Epiphany, Mass—before the Introit
Ordinal	Epiphany, Mass—before the Introit
Liturgical commentary	Epiphany, Matins—after 9th responsory
?	Epiphany, Mass—before the Introit
Troper	Epiphany, Matins—after 9th responsory
Troper	Epiphany, Matins—after 9th responsory
Ordinal	Epiphany, Mass—before the Gospel

(continued overleaf)

Table 4.1E: Representational Rites: Other (*cont.*)

Manuscript	LOO	Date	Provenance
Sion, Archives du chapitre, MS 74, 120r–v		15th c.	Sion
<i>Purification of the Virgin</i>			
*Padua, Bibl. Capitolare, MS C.55, 15r–17v		14th c.	Padua
*Padua, Bibl. Capitolare, MS C.56, 15r–17v		14th c.	Padua
<i>Annunciation of the Virgin</i>			
Martène (1706), p. 75.		?	Besançon
Charnage, pp. 1:262–63		1452	Besançon
*Padua, Bibl. Capitolare, MS C.55, 36v–39r		14th c.	Padua
*Padua, Bibl. Capitolare, MS C.56, 36v–39r		14th c.	Padua
<i>Assumption of the Virgin</i>			
Bamberg, Staatsbibl., MS lit. 119, 166v–167r		1532	Halle
<i>Presentation of the Virgin</i>			
Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 17330, 18r–24r		1372	Avignon

NOTES

- * Musical notation included
 Cattin/Vildera Giulio Cattin and Anna Vildera, *Il “Liber ordinaries” della chiesa Padovana*, 2 vols. (Padua, 2002)
 Chevalier Ulysse Chevalier, *Ordinaire et coutumier de l’église cathédrale de Bayeux* (Paris, 1902)
 Charnage François-Ignace Dunod de Charnage, *Histoire de l’église, ville et diocèse de Besançon*, 2 vols. (Besançon, 1750)

Table 4.2: Religious Plays

Manuscript	LOO	Date	Provenance
<i>Ludus Paschalis</i>			
*Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibl., MS 300, pp. 93–94	783	12th/13th c	Einsiedeln?
*Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibl., CCl 574, 142v–144v	829	ca. 1200	?
*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 4660a, 5r–6v	820	13th c	Seckau/Brixen(?)
*Orléans, Bibl. municipale, MS 201, pp. 220–25	779	12th/13th c.	Fleury/Saint-Lhomer(?)
*Prague, Národní knihovna, MS I.B.12, 135v–137v	—	1384	Prague
*Saint-Quentin, Bibl. municipale, MS 86, pp. 609–25	825	14th c.	Origny, Sainte-Benoîte
*Tours, Bibl. municipale, MS 927, 1r–8v	834	13th c.	Tours
*Zwickau, Ratsschulbibl., MS XXXVI., I 24, 1r–17r	789 (1r–6r)	early 16th c.	Zwickau
*Zwickau, Ratsschulbibl., MS I.XV.3., 56r–77v	—	early 16th c.	Zwickau

Book	Notes
Ordinal	Epiphany, Mass—before the Gospel (not in Morandi)
Processional	<i>Inmediate post prandium</i>
Processional	<i>Inmediate post prandium</i>
?	At the reading of the Gospel for the Mass on the Wednesday of the Advent Ember Days
?	At the reading of the Gospel for the Mass on the Wednesday of the Advent Ember Days
Processional	<i>Post prandium</i>
Processional	<i>Post prandium</i>
Ordinal	After None
Liturgy for feast of the Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple	In the hand of the author, Philippe de Mézières— <i>Repraesentio figurate</i> , procession to Mass—a proposed liturgy apparently celebrated in Avignon at least between 1372 and 1385

- Crombach Hermann Crombach, *Primitiae Gentium seu Historia SS. Trium Regum Magorum Evangelicorum* (Cologne, 1654)
- LOO Walther Lipphardt, *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*, 9 vols. (Berlin, 1976–90)
- Martène (1706) Edmond Martène, *Tractatus de antiqua ecclesiae disciplinae in divinis celebrandis officiis* (Lyons, 1706)
- Morandi Nausica Morandi, *Officium Stellae* (Florence, 2016)

Book	Notes
Sermon collection	
Sermon collection	In a gathering containing offices for St. Thomas Beckett and St. Catherine along with a <i>vita</i> for St. Servatius that is appended to gatherings of sermons and other exegetical texts
Collection of songs, poems, plays	<i>Carmina Burana</i>
Sermon Collection	Fleury “Playbook”
<i>Passionales</i> and Sermons on the Saints	Latin/Czech
Miscellany with some liturgical items	Latin/French Added to the end of the MS by a later hand.
Miscellany with <i>Visitatio Sepulchri</i> , Latin hymns, <i>Ordo Representationis Ade</i> (Jeu d’Adam), versified saints’ lives (in French)	MS entitled “Prières en vers” in 1716 catalog prepared by the Benedictines of Marmoutier (Luzarche, <i>Office du Pâques</i> , p. xxxi)
Play collection for the Latin School	3 representations. 1: Latin, 2 & 3: Latin/German. Followed by <i>Planctus Mariae</i>
Miscellaneous exegetical texts	2 representations. Both Latin/German

(continued overleaf)

Table 4.2: Religious Plays (*cont.*)

Manuscript	LOO	Date	Provenance
<i>Ordo Peregrinorum</i>			
*Orléans, Bibl. municipale, MS 201, pp. 225–30	817	12th/13th	Fleury/Saint-Lhomer(?)
*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 4660a, 7r–v	829	13th c.	Seckau/Brixen(?)
<i>Ordo Pastorum</i>			
*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 4660, 99r–104v		13th c.	Seckau/Brixen(?)
<i>Ordo Stellae</i>			
*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 6264a, 1r		11th c.	Freising
*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 14477, 1r–v		12th c.	St. Emmeram?
*Orléans, Bibl. municipale, MS 201, pp. 205–14		12th/13th c.	Fleury/Saint-Lhomer(?)
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1152, fragment		10th/11th c.	Compiègne?
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 16819, 49r–v		11th c.	Compiègne
*Rome, Bibl. Vaticana, MS lat. 8552, 1v (fragment)		12th c.	Malmédy
Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibl, MS lat. 1054, 30v		14th c.	?
<i>Ordo Rachelis</i>			
*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 6264, 27v		11th c.	Freising
*Orléans, Bibl. municipale, MS 201, pp. 214–20		12th/13th c.	Fleury/Saint-Lhomer(?)
<i>Other</i>			
London, British Library, MS Add. 22414, 3v–4r		11th/12th c.	Hildesheim
*Orléans, Bibl. municipale, MS 201, pp. 176–82		12th/13th c.	Fleury/Saint-Lhomer(?)
Brussels, Bibl. royale, MS II.2256, 192v–193r		12th/13th c.	Villers
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 14834, 26v		12th c.	Regensburg, St. Emmeram
*Orléans, Bibl. municipale, MS 201, pp. 183–87		12th/13th c.	Fleury/Saint-Lhomer(?)
Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibl., MS 34, 2v–3r		12th c.	Einsiedeln
Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 11331, 11r–12r		12th c.	?
*Orléans, Bibl. municipale, MS 201, pp. 188–96		12th/13th c.	Fleury/Saint-Lhomer(?)
*Orléans, Bibl. municipale, MS 201, pp. 196–205		12th/13th c.	Fleury/Saint-Lhomer(?)
*Orléans, Bibl. municipale, MS 201, pp. 230–33		12th/13th c.	Fleury/Saint-Lhomer(?)
*Orléans, Bibl. municipale, MS 201, pp. 233–43		12th/13th c.	Fleury/Saint-Lhomer(?)
Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 11331, 9r–10v		12th c.	?
Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 11331, 12v–16v		12th c.	?
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 19411, 2v–7r		early 12th c.	Regensburg? (Tegernsee?)

Book	Notes
Sermon collection	Fleury "Playbook"
Collection of songs, poems, plays	<i>Carmina Burana</i>
Collection of songs, plays	<i>Carmina Burana</i>
Sermons of John the Deacon	MS: <i>Ordo Stellae</i>
Sallust, <i>Bellum Catilinae</i> and Berno, <i>Prologus in Tonarium</i>	Written over erasure preceding the Sallust
Sermon Collection	Fleury "Playbook". MS: <i>Ordo ad representandum Herodem.</i>
Psalter of Charles the Bald	Fragment on final flyleaf
Lectionary	Entered after a sermon on the Epiphany
Josephus, <i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i>	
Theological miscellany	MS: <i>Stella</i> . Precedes <i>Prologus super commento Apocalipsis</i> Cited by Morandi, pp. 112–13 and 350–51. This was originally cited by du Ménil, 151 and treated by Young, Poema (although not in Young, <i>Drama</i>)
Sermons on Epistles of St. Paul	MS: <i>Ordo Rachelis</i>
Sermon collection	Fleury "Playbook". MS: <i>Interfectio Puerorum</i>
Miscellany, mathematical and medical texts	<i>Tres Filiae</i> and <i>Tres Clerici</i> (St. Nicholas)
Sermon collection	Fleury "Playbook". <i>Tres Filiae</i> (St. Nicholas)
Letters of St. Bernard	<i>Tres Clerici</i> (St. Nicholas)
Ascetic miscellany	<i>Tres Clerici</i> (St. Nicholas)
Sermon collection	Fleury "Playbook". <i>Tres Clerici</i> (St. Nicholas)
William von Ebersberg, Commentary on the Song of Solomon	<i>Tres Clerici</i> (St. Nicholas). Copied on opening endpapers among Latin poems
Poems/Plays of Hilarius	Hilarius manuscript. MS: <i>Ludus super Iconia Sancti Nicolai</i> (St. Nicholas)
Sermon collection	Fleury "Playbook". <i>Iconia Sancti Nicolai</i> (St. Nicholas)
Sermon collection	Fleury "Playbook". <i>Filius Getronis</i> (St. Nicholas)
Sermon collection	Fleury "Playbook". <i>Conversio Pauli</i>
Sermon collection	Fleury "Playbook". MS: <i>Versus de Resurrectione Lazari</i>
Poems/Plays of Hilarius	Hilarius manuscript. MS: <i>Suscitacio Lazari</i>
Poems/Plays of Hilarius	Hilarius manuscript. MS: <i>Historia de Daniel Representanda</i>
Miscellany – also includes Otto of Freising's <i>Gesta Friderici Imperatoris</i>	Play of Antichrist. MS: untitled

(continued overleaf)

Table 4.2: Religious Plays (*cont.*)

Manuscript	LOO	Date	Provenance
*Vorau, Stiftsbibl., MS 302 (CCXXIII), former pastedown to front cover (4 pages)		12th c.	Vorau?
*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 4660, 105v–106v		13th c.	Seckau/Brixen(?)
*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 4660, 107r–112r		13th c.	Seckau/Brixen(?)
*Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibl., clm 4660a, 3v–4v		13th c.	Seckau/Brixen(?)

NOTES

- * Musical notation included
 Du Mériel Édélstand du Mériel, *Origines latines du théâtre modern* (Paris, 1849)
 LOO Walther Lipphardt, *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*, 9 vols. (1976–1990)

Table 4.3: Ambiguously Situated Representations

Manuscript	LOO	Date	Provenance
<i>Visitatio Sepulchri / Ludus Paschalis</i>			
*Wolfenbüttel, Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv, MS VII.B.203, 23r–27v	780	14th c.	Braunschweig
*Cividale, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, MS CI (101), 77r–79v	781	15th c.	Cividale
*Venice, Biblioteca S. Maria della Consolazione, MS Lit. 4, 73r–77v	0924	15th c.?	Cividale
Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 9508, 179r	48	17th c.	Corbie
*Engelberg, Stiftsbibl., MS 314, 75v–78v	784	1372	Engelberg?
*The Hague, Koninklijke Bibl., MS 71.J.70, 163v–170r	827	15th c.	Egmont
*Barcelona, Bibl. de Catalunya, MS M.911, 156v	822	13th c.	Gerona
*Kremsmünster, Stiftsbibl., MS 21, 96v	247	12th c.	Kremsmünster
*Kremsmünster, Stiftsbibl., MS 24, Ir	790A	mid- 13th c.	Kremsmünster
*The Hague, Koninklijke Bibl., MS 76.F.3, 3r and 14r	826	ca. 1200	Maastricht
*Hildesheim, Stadtarchiv, MS Mus. 383, 125v–127v	792	ca. 1320	Medingen
*Münster, Archiv und Bibl. des Bistums Münster, MS A/Dom 9, 141v	287	ca. 1500	Münster?
*Klagenfurt, Studienbibl., MS perg. 32, 77v–78r	790	13th c.	Ossiach
*Zurich, Zentralbibl., MS Rheinau 18, 282v–283r	797	13th c.	Rheinau
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1139, 53r	57	11th c.	Limoges, St. Martial
*Stockholm, Kammerarkivet, MS Vitterhets-Akad. Frag. Sequ. 37/Dalarna 1575, No. 14, IIr	450	13th c.	Stockholm?
*Vich, Bibl. Episcopal, MS 105 (<i>olim</i> 111), 58v–62v	823	12th c.	Vich
*Rome, Bibl. Apostolica Vaticana, MS Palat. 619, 25v	368	15th c.	Worms or Heidelberg

Book	Notes
Fragment appears to have been included with sermons. Attached to 15th c. MS containing sermons of Johannes Geuss de Teining.	MS: <i>Ordo de Ysaac et Rebecca et Filiis eorum Recitandus</i> – Fragment includes incomplete play on pp. 1 and 2. Page 3 contains end of a Latin homily. 15th c. hand in lower margin of p. 1: <i>Ordo seu Ludus</i> . Beneath in a similar hand: <i>Omelia super librum Geneseos</i> . (Young, <i>Drama</i> , 2:259)
Collection of songs, poems, plays	<i>Carmina Burana</i> . Play of the King of Egypt (partial)
Collection of songs, poems, plays	<i>Carmina Burana</i> . Greater Passion Play
Collection of songs, poems, plays	<i>Carmina Burana</i> . Lesser Passion Play

Morandi	Nausica Morandi, <i>Officium Stellae</i> (2016)
Young, <i>Drama</i>	Karl Young, <i>The Drama of the Medieval Church</i> , 2 vols (Oxford 1933)
Young, Poema	Karl Young, "The Poema Biblicum of Onulphus," <i>Publications of the Modern Language Association</i> 30 (1915): 25–41

Book	Notes
Lectionary	Entered at the end of the lectionary. Preceded by Lamentations of Jeremiah
Liturgical miscellany	Follows <i>Planctus Mariae</i> at end of manuscript
Liturgical miscellany	Follows <i>Planctus Mariae</i> and <i>Officium Annunciatis Sanctae Mariae</i>
Liturgical miscellany	Excerpts from liturgical manuscripts by M. Voisin, <i>Variae liturgiae ex Missalibus aliisque cujusque saeculi</i> — copied from an 11th c. missal (LOO 6:381)
Liturgical miscellany	
Hymnal	
Troper	Fragment
Latin Patristic MS	Fragment. Copied on spare folio, partially erased
Gregory I, <i>Dialogorum libri quatuor</i>	Fragment on opening endpaper
Evangelary	Flyleaf to the Evangelary
Orationale	Cistercian convent
Processional	Entered as addition, no liturgical cues
Liturgical miscellany	Fragment
Lectionary	13th c. addition to 12th c. lectionary
Liturgical miscellany	
Processional	Fragment
Troper	Part of 12th c. supplement inserted into the MS
Miscellany containing <i>Historia de Juda perduto</i> and sermons	Added to the space following the <i>Historia de Juda perduto</i>

(continued overleaf)

Table 4.3: Ambiguously Situated Representations (*cont.*)

Manuscript	LOO	Date	Provenance
<i>Ordo Peregrinorum</i>			
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 16309, 604r–605r	816	14th c.	Saintes
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS n. a. lat. 1064, 8r–11v	808	12th c.	Beauvais
<i>Ordo Pastorum</i>			
Montpellier, Faculté de médecine, MS H.304, 41r–v		12th c.	Rouen?
<i>Ordo Prophetarum</i>			
Laon, Bibl. municipale, MS 263, 147v–149r		12th c.	Laon
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1139, 55v–58v		11th c.	Limoges, St. Martial
*Zagreb, Nadbiskupijskog arhiva, <i>Collectio Fragmentarum</i> No. 1		13th c.	Zagreb?
<i>Ordo Stellae</i>			
*Brussels, Bibl. des Bollandistes, MS 299, 179v–180v		12th c.	Bilsen (Belgium)
*Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibl., MS 366, p. 53		12th c.	Einsiedeln
*Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibl., Barth 179, 5v		11th c.	Lorsch
*Geneva, Bibl. universitaire, MS lat. 38b, pp. 35r–40v		13th c.	Geneva
*Lambach, Stiftsbibl., Fragment 1, Iv		11th c.	Münster- schwarzach
Laon, Bibl. municipale, MS 263, 149r–151r		13th c.	Laon
Wilhelm Meyer fragment		12th c.	?
Montpellier, Faculté des médecine, MS H.304, 41v–42v		12th c.	Rouen?
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1139, 32v–33r		11th c.	St. Martial
*London, British Library, MS Add. 23922, 8v–11r		12th/ 13th c.	Strasbourg
<i>Ordo Annunciatis Sancte Marie</i>			
*Cividale, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, MS CII (102), 10r, 69v–71r		14th c.	Cividale
*Venice, Biblioteca S. Maria della Consolazione, MS Lit. 4, 71r–73r		15th c.?	Cividale
<i>Other</i>			
Laon, Bibl. municipale, MS 263, 151r–153v		12th c.	Laon
*Paris, Bibl. nationale, MS lat. 1139, 53r–55v		11th c.	St. Martial
*London, British Library, MS Egerton 2615, 95r–108r.		12th c.	Beauvais

NOTES

- * Musical notation included
 Evers/Janota Ute Evers and Johannes Janota, *Die Melodien der lateinischen Osterfeiern*, 2 vols. in 4 (Berlin, 2013) [LOO numbers ^o900 and above]

Book	Notes
Breviary	In appendix to the MS, located after truncated office of the Conception of Mary
Liturgical miscellany	Included with prayers, hymns, and other items collated from various manuscripts
Liturgical commentary	Copied at the end of an anonymous liturgical commentary, precedes <i>Ordo Stellae</i> —context is unclear
Troper/Hymnal/Gradual	MS: <i>Ordo Prophetarum</i> . First of three representations following the gradual section of the MS
Liturgical miscellany	
Fragment	
Evangelary	Copied after the colophon
Liturgical miscellany	Incomplete
<i>Rotulus</i> (litanies)	Fragment of the opening copied on the reverse side of the <i>rotulus</i> (cited by Morandi)
Evangelary	
Troper/Proser	Fragment—surrounded by tropes, context is unclear
Troper/Hymnal/Gradual	MS: <i>Ordo Stelle</i> . Combines <i>Stellae</i> with <i>Rachelis</i> —Second of three representations following the gradual section of the MS
Fragment	Fragment transcribed by Meyer. Given by Young, 2:445
Liturgical commentaries	Copied at the end of an anonymous liturgical commentary, follows an <i>Ordo Pastorum</i> —context is unclear
Liturgical miscellany	<i>Ordo Rachelis</i> (?)
Antiphoner	Copied after the octave of Epiphany—context is unclear
Processional	Celebrated in public place (10r). A similar rubric is found in Cividale, MS CI (101), 9r, although without the ceremony itself
Liturgical miscellany	Between <i>Planctus Mariae</i> and <i>Visitatio Sepulchri</i>
Gradual	MS: <i>Ordo Joseph</i> (incomplete)—Third of three representations following the gradual section of the MS
Liturgical miscellany	<i>Sponsus</i> (Wise and Foolish Virgins)
Miscellany with rites for feast of Circumcision	MS: <i>Danielis Ludus</i>

- LOO Walther Lipphardt, *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*, 9 vols. (Berlin, 1976–1990)
 Morandi Nausica Morandi, *Officium Stellae* (Florence, 2016)
 Young Karl Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1933)

NOTES

¹ Flanigan, “The Fleury Playbook,” 349.

² Among others, Petersen, “The Representational Liturgy” and Petersen, “Biblical Reception.”

³ This number is derived from the settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* found in LOO and Evers/Janota as well as others that have come to light since. This number is surely too low.

⁴ The most comprehensive treatment of the manuscript and printed sources of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* is that in LOO as supplemented in Evers/Janota.

⁵ Most settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* use one of two forms of the central dialogue. The most common form in Italy, France, and England begins “*Quem quaeritis in sepulchro, o Christicolae?*” (Type 1), while the most common form in German-speaking Europe and eastward begins “*Quem quaeritis o tremule mulieres in hoc tumultu plorantes*” (Type 2). On the distinction between the Type 1 and Type 2, see Norton, “Of ‘Stages’ and ‘Types.’” See also the summary given in chapter 6, pp. 194–95.

⁶ On the trope versions of *Quem quaeritis*, see Iversen, Björkvall, and Jonsson, *Cycles de Pâques*, 15–16 and 217–23. Both the trope and the processional versions of the dialogue are transcribed in the first volume of LOO with commentary in vols. 6–9. Iversen’s essay, “Aspects of the Transmission,” remains the most cogent discussion of the original form and function of this dialogue. The best treatments of the musical settings for the early *Quem quaeritis* are those of Rankin, “Musical and Ritual Aspects” and Batoff, “Re-envisioning the *Visitatio Sepulchri*,” 41–82.

⁷ Bjork, “On the Dissemination.”

⁸ The only exceptions to this placement are found in several eleventh- and twelfth-century manuscripts from St. Gall where the dialogue is placed within the procession. These include St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 391, pp. 37–38 (LOO 80); MS 339, pp. 106–7 (LOO 81); MS 387, pp. 57–58 (LOO 82); MS 376, pp. 196–97 (LOO 83); MS 374, pp. 100–101 (LOO 84); and MS 388, pp. 204–5 (LOO 85).

⁹ On the *Visitatio Sepulchri* at St. Mark’s in Venice, which in later years involved the Doge himself, see the studies by Rankin, “From Liturgical Ceremony to Public Ritual” and “*Quem queritis*’ en voyage in Italy,” and that by Petersen, “*Il Doge* and Easter Processions.” In an unpublished paper presented at the *Medieval/Renaissance Music Conference 2014* (Birmingham, UK), Ute Evers offered several new settings for the *Visitatio Sepulchri* at Venice that had not been previously identified that clarified the earlier history of the ceremony: “The *Quem queritis* in Venice.” On the use of music in the Holy Week liturgy at St. Mark’s during the late Renaissance, see Bettley, “The Office of Holy Week at St. Mark’s.”

¹⁰ The concentration of these settings in German convents was first noted in Norton, “Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri*,” 175–77 and 187.

¹¹ The *Quem quaeritis* tropes for Christmas are detailed in Jonsson, *Cycle de*

Noël, 173–74, with musical comparisons given in pp. 298–304. Three settings cited by Young are not included among the manuscripts considered in the Christmas volume of *Corpus Troporum*: Huesca, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS 4, 124r (Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:427), Volterra, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS L.3.39 (given by Young as MS 13 [5700]), 3v–4r (Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:427), and Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS lat. 10645, 52r (Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:427). Details for these and several other manuscripts not included in the *Corpus Troporum* are given by Planchart, “On the Nature of Change in Trope Repertories,” 225, n. 21. The *Officium Pastorum* for Christmas matins is treated in Gibson, “The Place of the ‘Quem Queritis in Presepe’ Trope” and in “*Quem queritis in presepe*.” The older treatment by Young, “*Officium Pastorum*” (1912), which is summarized in the second volume of *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, remains valuable.

¹² On the *Officium Peregrinorum*, see Kurvers, *Ad Faciendum Peregrinum*. These are given in LOO 5, 1611–58 (#808–820). See also Young, “A New Version of the *Peregrinus*” and Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:451–83. On the music of the ceremony, see Brockett, “Easter Monday Antiphons.”

¹³ In the use of Rouen, these were performed only occasionally. On the *Officium Prophetarum* and its sources, see Young, “*Ordo Prophetarum*” and *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:125–71. See also the more recent dissertation of Regula Meyer Evitt, “Anti-Judaism and the medieval Prophet Plays.” A Tours *officium* survives only as a description from a manuscript given by Martène, *Tractatus*, 106–7. Other settings of this text have survived in liturgical manuscripts that do not specify the liturgical use for these settings. These include manuscripts from Saint-Martial (if, indeed this is a separate representation—Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 1139, 55v–58r), Laon (Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 263, 147v–149r), Einsiedeln (Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 366, pp. 53–54—this version is incomplete), and Zagreb (Zagreb, Archbishop’s Archive, *Collectio Fragmentorum* No. 1—see Brockett, “A Previously Unknown *Ordo Prophetarum*”). See the discussion of “Ambiguously Situated Representations” below.

¹⁴ The *Officium Stellae* is treated in Morandi, *Officium Stellae*. The Latin settings are treated also in King, *Mittelalterliche Dreikönigsspiele*, 1–50. See also the older discussions in Young, “A New Text of the *Officium Stellae*” (1912); Young, *Ordo Rachelis* (1919); Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:29–101; and Anz, *Die lateinischen Magierspiele* (1905).

¹⁵ Rankin, “Ottonian Epiphanies.”

¹⁶ Kobialka, *This Is My Body*, 82. See also Bedingfield, *The Dramatic Liturgy*, 114–70 and Petersen, “The Representational Liturgy,” 111–14.

¹⁷ See Holliday, “Palmesel;” Lippsmeyer, “Devotion and Decorum;” and Lippsmeyer, “The *Liber Ordinarius* by Konrad von Mure.” See also the older study of Wiepen, *Palmsonntagsprozession und Palmesel* (1903).

¹⁸ Symons, *Regularis Concordia*, 42.

¹⁹ English translations for several of these rites are given in Bevington, *Medi-*

eval Drama. Included among these are the fourth-century Palm Sunday procession from Jerusalem (10–11), the Adoration of the Cross (*Adoratio Crucis*) from the *Regularis Concordia* (14–15), the Interment of the Cross (*Depositio Crucis*) from the *Regularis Concordia* (16), the Raising of the Host (*Elevatio Hostia*) from St. Gall, antiphons from Easter vespers (18), and the antiphons and responsories for the Easter Vigil (19–20). English translations for a similar range of rites are given by Meredith in his chapter on “Latin Liturgical Drama” in Tydeman, *The Medieval European Stage*, 60–76 as well. On the sequence of rites within which the *Visitatio Sepulchri* was embedded, see chapter 6, pp. 192–94.

²⁰ Hardison, *Christian Rite and Christian Drama*.

²¹ Petersen, “Representation in European Devotional Rituals,” 336–48.

²² Petersen, “The Representational Liturgy,” 111–14.

²³ Norton, “Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri*,” 189–248, esp. 239–48.

²⁴ “Finito evangelio, unus puer ad modum propheta indutus, stans in aliquo eminenti loco, cantet lectionem propheticam modo quo sequitur: ‘Hierusalem, respice ad orientem.’” *Processionale ad usum Insignis ac Praeclarae Ecclesiae Sarum*, 50–51. This is preserved in the printed editions of the Sarum processional of 1508 and 1517, but not in later editions. For an English translation, see Tyrer, *Historical Survey of Holy Week*, 58–59.

²⁵ Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 1213, 81r–v (Klosterneuburg ordinal, 1325): “sicut Iosye muros Iericho.”

²⁶ Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 3909, 153v: “unus senior ex presbyteris in vice Sancti Symeonis accipiat plenarium in ulnas, et portet in ecclesiam pro puero Christo.” Cited by Hoeynck, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Liturgie*, 203 and Young, “Dramatic Ceremonies of the Feast of the Purification,” 99.

²⁷ *Obsequiale secundum diocesis Augustensis morem* (1487), 6v. Cited by Young, “Dramatic Ceremonies of the Feast of the Purification,” 99.

²⁸ Essen, Münsterkirchenarchiv, MS 19, 18r–19r (ca. 1375). Cited by Arens, *Der Liber Ordinarius*, 33–35 and Young, “Dramatic Ceremonies of the Feast of the Purification,” 99. This ordinal survives also in a fifteenth-century copy: Düsseldorf, Universitätsbibliothek, MS C.47. The corresponding text from the Feast of the Purification is found on fols. 14r–15r.

²⁹ Hamilton, *The Practice of Penance*, 108–14.

³⁰ See the ceremonies given by Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:484–91 (Ascension and Pentecost) and 2:225–57 (Marian feasts). See also the so-called “Creed Play” of Wilton Abbey discovered by Alison Alstatt, “Remembering the Wilton Processional,” 712–13.

³¹ Isidore of Seville, *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* (trans. Knoebel), 51.

³² Isidore of Seville, *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* (trans. Knoebel), 56–57.

³³ Amalarius of Metz, *On the Liturgy* (*De ecclesiasticis officiis*), 591–97.

³⁴ Mazza, *The Celebration of the Eucharist*, 167. See also the essay on “Christus Victor: From Holy Saturday to Low Sunday” in Hardison, *Christian Rite and Christian Drama*, 139–77.

³⁵ I am grateful to Dr. Jennifer Roth-Burnette for bringing these passages to my attention. See Roth-Burnette, “Organizing Scripture,” 51. The reference to Bernard is from Bernard of Clairvaux, *In Vigilia Nativitatis Domini, Sermo II. De eo quod scriptum est, O Juda et Jerusalem, nolite timere; cras egrediemini, et Dominus erit vobiscum, II Par. Cap. XX. V. 17*; in *Sancti Bernardi Abbatis Carae-Valdensis Operum Tomus Tertius, Complectens Sermones de Tempore et de Sanctis, ac de Diversis* (PL 183:90–94).

³⁶ Roth-Burnette, “Organizing Scripture,” 51–52. The reference from is from Rupert of Deutz, *De Ordine Ecclesiastico ab Adventu Domini. Caput XII. De officio in vigilia natalis Domini* (PL 170:68).

³⁷ Orléans 201, pp. 176–243. See Huglo, “Analyse codicologique” well as the several essays given in Campbell and Davidson, *The Fleury Playbook*.

³⁸ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 16819, 49r–v. Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:53, n. 5.

³⁹ Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS lat. 6264a, 1r. Morandi, *Officium Stellae*, 68–80 and Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:91–99.

⁴⁰ Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS lat 6264, 27r. Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:117–22.

⁴¹ Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 574, 142v–144v. On the rediscovery of the *Ludis Paschalis* in this manuscript, see Pfeiffer, “Klosterneuburger Osterfeier und Osterspiel.”

⁴² Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 300, pp. 93–94. See chapter 1, n. 42 for Karl Young’s assessment of the irrelevance of the surrounding texts.

⁴³ Prague, Národní knihovna, MS I.B.12, 135v–137v. This setting of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* was edited by Hanuš, *Die lateinisch-böhmischen Oster-Spiele* (1863), 34–42 as *das zweite Drei-Marien-Spiel* and again by Máchal, *Staročeské skladby dramatické původu liturgického* (1908), 18–19 and 98–105 as *První hra tří Marií (Marienspiel)* III, who also provided a facsimile (plates 1–5). The texts and melodies were treated by Schuler, *Die Musik der Osterfeiern* (1951), 95, 385, and *passim* (as *Prager Osterspiel* II). The *Visitatio Sepulchri* from this manuscript is also treated in Amstutz, *Ludus de decem virginibus* (2002), *passim*, as *Prag O.C.*, and by Hennig, “Die lateinisch-liturgische Grundlage” (1977), 89–102. A comparison of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in this manuscript to others from German-speaking Europe is given in Loewen and Waugh, “Mary Magdalene Preaches through Song,” 595–641. Walther Lipphardt treated this setting in *Die Weisen der lateinischen Osterspiele* but did not include it in LOO.

⁴⁴ Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:359.

⁴⁵ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 1152, 173v (fragment on final flyleaf). Morandi, *Officium Stellae*, 84 and Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:443.

⁴⁶ Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS lat. 14477, 1r–v. The *Ordo Stellae* in this manuscript is copied over an erasure that precedes the *Bellum Catilinae*. The *Bellum Catilinae* is followed by the *Prologus in Tonarium* of Berno of Reichenau. Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:445.

⁴⁷ Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS lat. 8552, 1v. Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:443–44.

⁴⁸ A facsimile, edition, and German translation are given in Vollmann-Profe, ed., *Ludus de Antichristo* (1981). For an art-historical perspective on this text, see Carr, “Visual and Symbolic Imagery.” See also Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:369–96.

⁴⁹ Tours, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 927, 1v–8v (LOO 824). See Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:438–50. An analysis and musical edition of the *ludus* is given in my article, Norton, “Observations on the Tours *Ludus Paschalis*.” On the songs, see the article by Caldwell “*Pax Gallie*: The Songs of Tours 927.” A new edition of the *Jeu d’Adam* along with translation into modern French and commentary is provided by Chaguinian, *Le Jeu d’Adam*.

⁵⁰ Zwickau, Ratsschulbibliothek, MS XXXVI. I 24, 1r–6r (LOO 789). Linke and Mehler, *Die österlichen Spiele aus der Ratsschulbibliothek Zwickau*, 2–8 (manuscript descriptions), 29–46 (musical editions), and 140–45 (facsimile). See also Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:669–73. This manuscript includes also additional settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in mixed Latin and German (7r–17r). These latter settings are preserved also in Zwickau, Ratsschulbibliothek, MS I.XV.3, 56r–77v. Editions and facsimiles of the macaronic texts are given in Linke and Mehler, *Die österlichen Spiele aus der Ratsschulbibliothek Zwickau*, 40–108 (edition) and 118–37 and 146–56 (facsimiles).

⁵¹ Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MSS lat. 4660, 99r–104v (Christmas Play), 105v–106v (fragmentary Play of the King of Egypt), and 107r–112r (Greater Passion Play) and lat. 4660a, 3v–4v (Shorter Passion Play), 5r–6v (*Ludus Paschalis*), and 7r–v (*Ordo Peregrinorum*). This manuscript was first reported by Johann Christoph von Aretin in a series of letters describing the manuscripts he encountered while gathering the manuscripts from Bavarian monasteries for the Königliche Hof- und Central Bibliothek in Munich following the dissolution of Bavarian monasteries in 1803. These letters were published in Aretin, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Literatur* (1803), 1:75 and 78, where he notes an “alt satyrische Handschrift” in the monastic library of Benedictbeuern. Several Latin and German poems along with the Greater Passion Play were published by Docen in later volumes of the same journal: 7 (1806): 297–309 (Latin poems), 497–508 (Greater Passion Play) and 9 (1807):1304–22 (Latin love songs—Docen provides additional citations for treatments of this manuscript’s contents by others) and in Docen, *Miscellaneen zur Geschichte* (1807), 2:189–208. The Greater Passion Play was published again thirty years later by Hoffman von Fallersleben, *Fundgruben* (1837), 2:239–58. The Latin and German songs were published by Schmeller, *Carmina Burana* (1847). Schmeller was the first to use the title “*Carmina Burana*” to describe this manuscript. The supplement to the manuscript (now clm 4660a) was given in an edition and facsimile by Meyer, *Fragmenta Burana* (1901). More recent studies and editions include Bischoff, *Carmina Burana* (1967); Lipphardt, “Zur Herkunft der *Carmina Burana*” (1982); Steer, “*Carmina Burana* in Südtirol”

(1983); Hilka, Schumann, and Berndt, *Carmina Burana* (1991); and Lehtonen, *Fortuna, Money, and the Sublunar World* (1995).

⁵² On the setting of the *Danielis Ludus* in London, British Library, MS Egerton 2615 from the cathedral of Beauvais and other ambiguously placed texts, see the discussion of “Ambiguously Situated Representations” below. For a comprehensive study of the manuscript, see Arlt, *Ein Festoffizium des Mittelalters*.

⁵³ In her study of the role of Mary Magdalene in the *Visitatio Sepulchri* ceremonies of the Middle Ages, Susan Rankin noted musical connections between the Fleury *Ludus Paschalis* and those presented in liturgical manuscripts from the cathedrals of Rouen and Palermo as well as textual connections between that of Fleury and those presented in liturgical manuscripts from Rouen, Coutances, Mont-Saint-Michel, and Barking Abbey. Rankin, “The Mary Magdalene Scene,” 250–52. She lists the manuscripts consulted that contain musical notation on p. 234, n. 13. Karl Young observed a further connection with settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the church of St. John the Evangelist in Dublin as well. See Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:393–97.

⁵⁴ De Boor, *Die Textgeschichte*, 259–62.

⁵⁵ “Es ist ein . . . Leitgedanke der neuen Komposition von Fleury, dem Volk die Botschaft der Auferstehung immer wieder zu verkünden. Das ist eine völlig Umdeutung der alten Feier von Rouen, die die Frauen aus der Welt hinaus in den Raum des heiligen Geschehens versetzte . . . Hier wenden sich die Frauen nicht weniger als fünfmal nach außen, und zwar immer an die Gemeinde, nicht an einen in die Handlung einbezogenen Chor.” De Boor, *Die Textgeschichte*, 261.

⁵⁶ Boynton, “Performative Exegesis,” 44. A similar view is offered by Flanigan, “Rachel and her Children.”

⁵⁷ Boynton, “Performative Exegesis,” 47.

⁵⁸ Boynton, “Performative Exegesis,” 58.

⁵⁹ Boynton, “Performative Exegesis,” 60.

⁶⁰ Norton, “Sermo in Cantilena.”

⁶¹ Norton, “Sermo in Cantilena,” 96–97.

⁶² Norton, “Observations on the Tours *Ludus Paschalis*”.

⁶³ Norton, “Observations on the Tours *Ludus Paschalis*”.

⁶⁴ Carr, “Visual and Symbolic Imagery,” 230–31.

⁶⁵ Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:64–66 at 66, 93–97 at 96, and 110–13 at 111; and Ramsey, *Sallust’s Bellum Catilinae*, 38.

⁶⁶ Lipphardt discusses the notion of an *ordo minor* and an *ordo maior*, the *ordo minor* representing the usual liturgical usage for the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and the *ordo maior* representing an *Osterspiel* or *Ludus Paschalis* that would be performed occasionally in its stead. See, for example, LOO 7:453. This is explicitly called for in Herzogenburg, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 173 (LOO 589), a sixteenth-century breviary (see chapter 3, p. 102), and Nürnberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, MS 22923, a thirteenth-century antiphoner assigned by Lipphardt (LOO) to Chiemsee and by Evers/Janota to Gurk, which provides two versions of the *Visitatio Sep-*

ulchri, one shorter Type 2 version (LOO 543) and an expanded Type 2 setting with Magdalene amplification (LOO 782). The *Ludi Paschales* from Zwickau (Zwickau, Ratsschulbibliothek, LOO 789—Zwickau, Ratsschulbibliothek, MS XXXVI.I.24) and that from the *Carmina Burana* (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 4660a—LOO 830), are explicitly placed after the third responsory of Easter matins as well.

⁶⁷ On the structure of the *versarium* in Paris 1139, see Fuller, “The Myth of ‘Saint Martial’ Polyphony.” An outline of the structure of the *versaria* portion of the manuscript is given on p. 8. On the question as to whether this should be regarded as one or three representations, see chapter 2, n. 72.

⁶⁸ Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 366 [*olim* 179], pp. 53–56.

⁶⁹ Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 263. The *Visitatio Sepulchri* is given on fol. 145r with the *Ordo Prophetarum*, *Ordo Stellae*, and *Ordo Joseph* following later in fols. 147v–153v. For the latter three representations, see Lagueux, “Glossing Christmas,” who offers a structural outline of the manuscript in pp. 229–30 (drawn from the description given by Hussman, *Tropen- und Sequenzenhandschriften*, 104). On the *Ordo Prophetarum* in particular, see Lagueux, “Sermons, Exegesis, and Performance.” The *Ordo Joseph* is treated also by Harris, in *Sacred Folly*, 125–27. On the *Ordo Stellae*, see also Morandi, *Officium Stellae*, 74–76 (manuscript description) and 322–23 (textual edition); and King, *Mittelalterliche Dreikönigsspiele*, 39.

⁷⁰ London, British Library, MS Add. 23922, 8v–11r. See Morandi, *Officium Stellae*, 109–11 (manuscript description), 346–48 (textual edition), and 406–7 (musical edition); King, *Mittelalterliche Dreikönigsspiele*, 43; and Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:64–68.

⁷¹ London, British Library, MS Egerton 2615. The music for the feast of the Circumcision is given in fols. 1r–68v while that for the *Danielis Ludus* is given in fols. 95r–108r. These sections and the readings that follow the *Ludus*, all copied by the same scribe, surround several gatherings of polyphonic music. On the structure and content of this manuscript see Arlt, *Ein Festoffizium des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (*Darstellungsband*) and vol. 2 (*Editionsband*) and Hiley, “Sources.” This representation has received much attention in recent years. See especially Fassler, “The Feast of Fools” and Harris, *Sacred Folly*, 113–25.

⁷² Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 17330, 18r–24v. The procession is the last item in the manuscript. Preceding it are a sermon on the Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple, a letter and documents attesting to two miracles associated with the Presentation, the office for the feast of the Presentation of the Virgin, and the Mass for the feast. This dramatic procession was first noted by Sepet, “Les Prophètes du Christ,” 28:1–27 and 211–64; 29:105–39 and 261–93; and 38:397–443, at 229, n. 1 and first published by Young, “Philippe de Mézières’ Dramatic Office.” It has been more recently edited in Coleman, *Philippe de Mézières’ Campaign*, which also provides an account of the life of Philippe de Mézières, who served as ambassador for the King of Cyprus in the courts of the

Byzantine emperor and the Pope in Avignon among other assignments and activities. Haller, *Figurative Representation* provides both an edition and a translation into English. A more recent edition with English translation is given in Puchner, Conomis, and Coleman, *The Crusader Kingdom of Cyprus*. A second manuscript (Paris Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 14454) offers a copy of MS 17330, but does not include the dramatic procession (Coleman, *Phillipe de Mézières' Campaign*, 115).

⁷³ Brussels, Bibliothèque des Bollandistes, MS 299, 179v–180v. See Morandi, *Officium Stellae*, 53–56 (manuscript description), 305–8 (textual edition), and 360–63 (musical edition); King, *Mittelalterliche Dreikönigsspiele*, 41; and Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2:446–47.

⁷⁴ The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 71.J.70, 162v–170v (LOO 827).

⁷⁵ Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, MS Rheinau 18, 282–83 (LOO 797) and Wolfenbüttel, Niedersächsische Staatsarchiv, MS VII.B.203, 23r–27v (LOO 780).

⁷⁶ See, in particular, Fassler, “The Feast of Fools” and Harris, *Sacred Folly*, 113–25.

⁷⁷ David Bjork was the first to note that the distinction between *Quem quaeritis* trope and *Visitatio Sepulchri* was largely geographic, with the pre-Mass versions of the rite found predominantly in manuscripts from Italy, southern France, and Catalonia, with a few exceptions in Germany, while the matins versions are found in manuscripts stemming largely north of the Alps. Bjork, “On the Dis-simulation.”

⁷⁸ The Anglo/Norman traditions for liturgical drama are treated by Wright, *The Dissemination of the Liturgical Drama in France*; Dolan, *Le drame liturgique de Pâques*; and Rankin, *The Music of the Medieval Liturgical Drama*.

⁷⁹ Rankin, “Ottonian Epiphanies.”

⁸⁰ Young, for one, saw the connection between the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 300 and the sermons and other works of Peter Abelard that preceded it as “totally irrelevant” (Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:389–90).

⁸¹ See, for example, Fassler, “The Feast of Fools;” Norton, “*Sermo in Cantilena*;” Norton, “Observations on the Tours *Ludus Paschalis*;” Boynton, “Performative Exegesis;” and Lagueux, “Glossing Christmas.” See the discussion above, pp. 121–22.

⁸² Stevens, “Medieval Drama.”

⁸³ Emerson et al., “Plainchant,” 841–42.

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 per-

spective.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 Belet 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 Belet and Honorius Augustodienensis, 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 Belet 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 Poitiers (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 Générard (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 All 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 *Judith, drama comico-tragicum* (1539) and the several titles of Hieronymus Ziegler, including *Protoplastus: Drama comico-tragicum* (1543), *Cyrus maior, drama tragicum* (1547), *Ophiletis: Drama comico-tragicum* (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 “Iudus”) 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 pittie, 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*, enti-

tled “ordo trium personarum in die resurrectionis [*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 resurrectione [*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 milieu (or, in the case of the German *Osterspiele*, Catholic milieu within Lutheran towns), milieu 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 ecclesiasticis*: “officium nocturnale,” “officium matutunale,” “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 ecclesiasticis*. 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 circumcissione, 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, quandoque 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 Circumcissione 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 circumcissione* 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 pile, quamuis non ludere laudabilius sit, et dicitur hec decembrica libertas, eo quod mense decembris pastores, serui et ancille quadam libertate apud gentiles a dominis dominarentur et collectis messibus cum eis conuiuarentur. . . . Sed quod illi suis idolis exhibuerunt, cultores unius Dei ad ipsius preçonia conuerterunt. Nam populus de mari Rubro egressus, choream duxisse, et Maria cum timpano legitur preçinuisse et David ante archam totis uiribus saltauit et cum cithara psalmos cecinit et Salomon circa altare cantores instituit, qui uoce, tuba, cimbali, 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 faciunt, ut per hoc notent, quoniam illi inuicem se corrigere debent, ne tempore illo alter ab altero exigit 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 quibusdam 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 resurrectione 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 Chrysostom, 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 Kirchen 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 schriffen 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 Britannica*, 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 *Histrion-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 dramatické původu liturgického*, 149–75 as *Třetí hra tři 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 dramatické původu liturgického*, 175–86. This text opens with the following rubric: “Ludus pasce foeliciter” 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 dramatické původu liturgického*, 186–215. This text is introduced by the rubric “Incipit ludus de resurrectione 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.

Chapter 6

All that Glitters: Unravelling “Liturgical Drama”

THE NOTION THAT DRAMA originated within and later grew out of the ritual of the medieval western Church has become axiomatic in scholarly discourse, and despite several attempts to advance an alternative theory for drama’s medieval roots,¹ belief in the notion of “liturgical drama” has remained steadfast. However axiomatic it may seem, though, the story of liturgical drama’s transformation from a ritual with dramatic potential to a *Ding an sich* is, in fact, a story and nothing more. It was both the inspiration for and the product of a reimagining of medieval theater that saw some aspects of liturgical celebration—and in some cases the entire medieval liturgy—as drama, thus reframing the arc of medieval drama’s rise to accord with what was understood to be that of drama’s creation in ancient times.

This reframing was made possible by Magnin’s metaphor, and this metaphor was made possible by Magnin’s understanding of drama as a literary form that emanated from a faculty of the human mind that was distinct from those that produced lyric and epic poetry:

It is generally understood that poetry is divided into three principal genres: epic, lyric and dramatic. This division takes on three forms, or, if I may use that expression, three different guises that poetry can take and employ at will: narrative, song, and action. Although this classification is clear, obvious, and easily grasped, one may wonder if it is the best, if it is the most appropriate for understanding the nature of the whole by examining its parts. This I do not believe. . . . Under the three guises that I have mentioned, epic, lyric and dramatic, is there really one and only one poetry? Do the epic, ode, and drama emanate from the same psychological source of the same human faculty? Or are the epic genius, lyrical genius, and dramatic genius separate and distinct?²

Only when untethered from the poets could the boundaries within which drama flourished be extended to allow drama—now broadly construed—

to be sought in other venues. For Magnin, drama need not be labeled as such nor even intended as such, and this allowed him to find drama among those liturgical rites that would later form the genre “liturgical drama.” It also allowed him to find “the dramatic” within stained glass, in tapestries and statuary, in funeral orations, and in sundry other forms of medieval western Christian art and practice.³ For Magnin and his successors, claiming drama as a genus unto itself was enough to force a rethinking of the criteria by which a text or other artifact could be judged to be drama:

By what signs shall we recognize drama? We have seen that the dramatic genius stems primarily from the instinct of imitation; this is an index, but not sufficient in itself. Will we find the hallmark of this drama in dialogue form? No, because a monologue can be a wonderful drama, witness the *Magician* of Theocritus. Moreover, many dialogued works are not drama. Aside from the Dialogues of Plato and Lucian, Theophylactus opens his story of Maurice and Phocas with a remarkable dialogue between philosophy and history. A Polish chronicler, Kadlubek, wrote the history of Polish kings in dialogues during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Several ancient marbles and stones have engraved legends that offer short dialogues. All these things fall within the dramatic genius to some extent but are not drama. . . . What is drama? Any work where the poet, putting aside his personality, speaks and acts or makes actors act and speak on behalf of fictional characters in order to excite the curiosity and sympathy of an audience. Whenever I meet with these characters together, regardless of the place, the actors and the audience, I think myself sure to have met, if not a play, at least a product of dramatic genius, a drama . . . [Magnin’s ellipsis]⁴

A century later, Karl Young echoed Magnin’s formulation, observing with respect to representational aspects in the celebration of the Mass:

Dramatic externalities of this kind, however, must not be mistaken for genuine drama itself, in which the essential element is not forms of speech and movement, but *impersonation*. A play, that is to say, is, above all else, a story presented in action in which the speakers or actors impersonate the characters concerned. Dialogue is not essential, for a monologue is drama when the speaker impersonates the one from whom the utterance is represented as proceeding. Even spoken language may be dispensed with, for pantomime is a true, though limited, form of drama, provided a story is successfully conveyed, and provided the actors pretend to be the personages concerned in this story. [Young’s emphasis]⁵

As for what he meant by impersonation, Young saw this as had Magnin, albeit with greater precision:

As to the nature of impersonation in itself there can scarcely be any substantial disagreement. It consists in physical imitation. In some external and recognizable manner the actor must pretend to be the person whose words he is speaking, and whose actions he is imitating. The performer must do more than merely *represent* the chosen personage; he must also *resemble* him, or at least show his intention of doing so. It follows, then, that the dialogue and physical movements of those who participate in the liturgy will be transformed from the *dramatic* into *drama* whenever these persons convey a story and pretend to be the characters in this story. This pretence may be made apparent through realistic details of costume and gesture, through a trifling and suggestive rearranging of liturgical vestment, or, conceivably, through the conventional forms of the vestments themselves. [Young's emphasis]⁶

While Magnin's definition allowed for drama to be found in multiple venues, whether explicitly dramatic or not, Young's refinement narrowed the applicability of the term "drama" to those instances in which "actors . . . pretend to be the person whose words [they are] speaking," where the actor "must do more than merely *represent* the chosen personage" but "must also *resemble* him, or at least show his intention of doing so." This definition brought the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and other representational rites into the fold of drama while excluding other representational rites as well as other forms of non-textual mimesis. The definition also legitimized the extraction of these rites from the liturgical contexts within which they were preserved and within which they were celebrated.

Ontological Frames

In the essay that served as the basis for his 1991 article, "Medieval Latin music-drama,"⁷ C. Clifford Flanigan took his predecessors and contemporaries to task for having removed the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and its liturgically bound relations from the ritual contexts within which each was cast. In rebranding these ceremonies as "drama," scholars had detached them from the manuscripts that preserved them, thus excising the rites from the liturgical fabrics into which they had been woven. As Flanigan noted, scholars saw these as "plays or pieces of liturgical poetry which [had] their own history and which [had] no direct connection with the non-dramatic or

non-poetic pieces found elsewhere in the manuscripts from which they [were] excerpted.”⁸ In refusing to attend to the details of the liturgical manuscripts from which these were drawn, scholars circumvented the deep connections that bound the *Visitatio Sepulchri* to the liturgy of Holy Week and beyond, and in so doing they transformed the rite into something else altogether:

This practice of judicious excision is universally followed in all music drama scholarship, yet it seems authorized only by the assumptions about drama which these scholars and other students of the subject have allowed to determine their *modus operandi*. Save for a few exceptions, nothing in the medieval books which are the source of these “dramas” justifies this kind of excision. This practice of omission has prevented an even superficial consideration of the larger context of these “dramatic offices” from taking place; it is largely responsible for the fact that generations of students have become convinced that these texts belong in the same ontological category as Shakespeare’s tragedies and Ibsen’s realistic plays.⁹

Flanigan was not alone in this observation. Two decades later, Nils Holger Petersen similarly observed:

Assumptions about genre in the early—and even modern—history of “liturgical drama” scholarship constitute an important problem. One of these, encountered again and again in such interpretations of excerpts from a liturgical *ordo*, is that the “drama” only appears as an entity through its detachment from its original manuscript context and insertion into a new—anachronistic—context, in this case, theatre history. Sections of a liturgical ceremony labeled “liturgical drama” in scholarship are not always marked as standing out in any way from the surrounding ceremonial in the manuscript.¹⁰

For the most part this is a disciplinary issue, a product of a particular narrative native to the study of literature and theater that has resulted from an attempt by students of the drama to better understand how the theatrical forms of the modern era might have come to be. This narrative functions as an ontological frame that highlights those features that speak of drama or of the dramatic while masking those that speak of music, of liturgy, of codicology, and of much else. Representational rites are seen as a station on the way to modern drama, and whatever other attributes they may exhibit are obscured.¹¹ We are given little sense of how the so-called liturgical dramas might have been understood at the time they were copied or

how they might have been experienced by those tasked with their celebration (or by those who may have been on hand to observe). Moreover, we are given no sense of how these ceremonies might have been understood within the context of the liturgical feast being celebrated or within the broader liturgical complexes within which the feast itself was embedded.¹²

This framing of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and other rites as “drama” also sanctioned the use of concepts and terms drawn from the study of theater when discussing these rites, further removing them from the liturgical contexts within which they were celebrated. While many scholars have been careful to avoid applying theatrical terms to liturgical practices, not all have been dissuaded. Eli Rozik, for one, noted the *mise-en-scène*, gestures, facial expressions, costumes, props, and sound effects associated with the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the tenth-century *Regularis Concordia* in his 2008 study on *The Roots of Theatre*.¹³ In his *The Staging of Drama in the Medieval Church* from 2002, Dunbar Ogden similarly invoked the language of theater as he surveyed the technical details of space, costumes, acting, and properties in the “staging” of liturgical drama performance. Jody Enders, in her article on “Liturgical Plays” in the 2011 Supplement to the *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, continued to speak of stage directions, actors and their roles, and costumes when discussing the twelfth-century Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the Benedictine abbey of Moggio preserved in Udine, Biblioteca arcivescovile, MS 234, fols 1r–v (LOO 487).¹⁴

Such descriptions of liturgical practices using the language of theater are, as Petersen has noted, surely anachronistic. In applying a post-Renaissance understanding of drama onto the religious rites of an earlier age, scholars have imposed the frame of drama onto the practice of liturgy, and in so doing they have confused the frame for the picture, leaving us with only the frame’s distortion along with the residue of whatever the frame had masked, with no clear path forward.

The Frame for the Picture, the Mask for the Face

The ontological frame through which the representational rites of the medieval western Church are typically viewed was a byproduct of the metaphor that gave rise to Magnin’s epiphany over a century and three-quarters ago. This caused little problem in the beginning—the repertory was too sparse and, as Gilbert Ryle noted in a different context, such myths could “do a lot of theoretical good, while they are still new.”¹⁵ Over the next quarter-century, though, the one-time metaphor hardened into cat-

egory. Liturgical drama became drama, and this precipitated the dilemma that Flanigan and Petersen laid bare.

This dilemma was by no means limited to the study of what we would come to know as liturgical drama. Nor was its discovery of such recent vintage. George Eliot (Mary Ann Evans), for one, noted presciently in 1871 that: "For we all of us, grave or light, get our thoughts entangled in metaphors, and act fatally on the strength of them."¹⁶ Two years later, Friedrich Nietzsche observed in an unpublished essay that metaphors involved "the obligation to lie according to fixed convention."¹⁷ Some thirty years before Flanigan's entry, moreover, philosopher Colin Turbayne generalized the problem that Flanigan and Petersen would later describe:

There is a difference between using a metaphor and taking it literally, between using a model and mistaking it for the thing modeled. The one is to make believe that something is the case; the other is to believe that it is. The one is to use a disguise or mask for illustrative or explanatory purposes; the other is to mistake the mask for the face. Both the pretense and the mistake involve, in the words of Gilbert Ryle, "the presentation of the facts belonging to one category in the idioms appropriate to another." Both thus involve the crossing of different sorts. But while the former is to represent the facts of one sort as if they belong to another, the latter is to claim that they actually belong. While the former adds nothing obviously to the actual process, the latter involves the addition of features that are the products of speculation or invention instead of discovery.¹⁸

To be sure, Turbayne's study did not concern itself with liturgical drama specifically or with literary studies generally. Rather, his focus was directed toward the seventeenth-century theories of vision put forth by René Descartes and Isaac Newton. Turbayne maintained that these theories were governed by a mechanistic metaphor (or perhaps a simile in this instance) that their authors had taken literally, thus blurring the distinction between "the world is *like* a machine" and "the world *is* a machine." In Turbayne's view, these thinkers did not so much *use* the mechanistic metaphor as they were used *by* it. They took the implications of the metaphor and treated these as intrinsic to their understanding of the ways in which vision functioned.

This same process has infected studies of liturgical drama, particularly in their treatments of the representational rites now embraced by the expression. The removal of the rites from the liturgy, the recasting of reli-

gious clerics as characters portrayed by actors, the appointing of vestments as costumes, the translation of processions as staging, all treated the implications of the dramatic metaphor as essential to the rites considered. The elements of drama were overlaid onto liturgical rites, and the result was a confused and distorted jumble of genres, unrecognizable and to some extent unclaimable by either students of the drama or students of the liturgy.¹⁹ This elevation of a metaphor's implications to a status equal to the metaphor itself is troublesome, to say the least. As Max Black observed in his 1954 study on metaphor: "The implications of a metaphor are like the overtones of a musical chord; to attach too much 'weight' to them is like trying to make the overtones sound as loud as the main notes—and just as pointless."²⁰

While seeing representational rites as drama may offer little insight into how these were understood by their contemporaries, we should not conclude that seeing these as drama serves no useful purpose. Indeed, Petersen himself conceded that it did not necessarily follow that approaching these rites as drama was in itself problematic.²¹ From our contemporary view of the dramatic, there are many similarities between what we now understand drama to be and what we can see in some of the representational aspects of medieval liturgical practice. It is possible, and perhaps even desirable, to investigate the performative practices of our ancestors to better understand how the practices of our contemporaries came to be.²² But we err when we carry the implications of the metaphor too far, when we mistake the mask for the face. For many, the expression "liturgical drama" has become little more than a label applied to a particular grouping of medieval dramatic texts. But the terms "liturgical" and "drama" themselves, held as they are in a delicate stasis by their mutual attraction and repulsion, challenge any attempts to hollow out their metaphorical origins or to deflect their metaphorical associations. To accept the expression "liturgical drama" as a label with no metaphorical overtones requires that we ignore the historical incongruities of applying the label "drama" to liturgical acts celebrated at a time when no such label would have been conceivable. It requires that we ignore the problem of locating valid referents for the expression. And it requires that we ignore the meanings of the individual words that comprise it.

If not the literary/dramatic frame, then how should the representational rites included among the liturgical dramas be considered? Musicologists, for one, have adopted a different frame, accepting for the most part the dramatic claims of their literary colleagues, while offering a

narrative of what they also call liturgical drama within their discussions of liturgical chant, and in particular as a part of their discussion of liturgical tropes, sequences, and other so-called accretions to the medieval liturgy.²³ While the musicological frame might appear to provide a more appropriate fit for liturgical drama as a genre of plainchant, it too is problematic. The extracted rites may have settled in a more congenial neighborhood, but they remain extracted rites nonetheless. Indeed, neither the literary frame, which places the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and its ilk on the path to drama, nor the musicological frame, which sees these ceremonies as innovations in plainchant composition, offers a satisfactory explanation for the existence of these ceremonies or for the ways that they might have been understood by those involved in their celebration.

There is, in fact, a structural flaw in the nature of modern academic disciplines that hinders any efforts to understand what we now call “liturgical drama.” Not only, as Flanigan has noted, are the frames that govern the disciplines incompatible, they cover too small an area to represent fully that which we have come to know as liturgical drama. A quarter-century ago, Andrew Hughes observed that to deal adequately with the subject of “liturgical drama” requires expertise not only in medieval literature, drama, and liturgy, but also “in the music that is an essential part of the text; in the art and manuscript studies that support the work in those areas; in such matters as the oral and written transmission by which the texts and chants were passed from source to source; and in the practical considerations that arise when a drama is actually mounted”—a range of expertise that would surely tax the capabilities of most scholars.²⁴

I am a musicologist by training. I am neither liturgist nor liturgiologist, neither theater historian nor art historian, neither paleographer nor codicologist, neither philosopher nor theologian. I have dabbled in these and other fields of study, but I can claim only limited expertise in my own discipline. Even so, it is clear to me that to attempt to understand the *Visitatio Sepulchri* or any of the other liturgically-bound rites covered by the mantle of “liturgical drama” demands that we seek our understanding within the context of medieval western liturgical practice. And this requires yet another frame.

A Liturgical Frame

There was, of course, no such thing in the Middle Ages as “a liturgy.” While large swaths of the Church’s ritual were held in common by all, or at least

by most, each monastery, each cathedral, each church of any means had its own customs, its own way of observing its particular liturgical practice. Processions, in particular, varied considerably, not only in the selection and ordering of sung processional items, but in the feasts for which processions were required.²⁵ These in turn depended on which saints were honored by that church or within that diocese, and this might depend on which saints' relics were held locally or nearby. Processions were also governed by topography and by the presence or absence of destinations suitable for processional use. The observance of Holy Week and the celebration of Easter along with the celebration of other major feasts, particularly the Marian feasts, were also often locally rendered, with some elements held in common but with details that varied from one church to another.²⁶ Also specific to individual churches were the saints' feasts and rankings not to mention the particular antiphons and responsories selected for the singing of their respective offices.²⁷ Settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, *Officium Pastorum*, and other representational rites were typically specific to a particular church as well.

While the liturgical practice of any specific institution might be unique to that place and time, the framework of the liturgy as well as many of its particulars were commonly held. This liturgical framework incorporated two largely independent, and sometimes conflicting, cycles of observances that were interlaced over the course of a year: the commemoration of the events of Christ's life and ministry—the *Proper of the Time*—and the commemoration of the lives of the saints—the *Proper of the Saints*. Subsumed within these were seasonal units, such as Advent, Christmas, Lent, etc., and sub-seasonal segments, such as Holy Week or the week of Christmas and its octave, including the feasts of Sts. Stephen, John the Evangelist, and Holy Innocents. There were also daily cycles, including the daily order of Masses and the hours of the Divine Office, and cutting across the grain of these were the various concurrent cycles of which each was made, such as the individual offices of matins and vespers and the order of the Mass. The liturgical year was—and remains—a rich complex of observances that was both variable—with the observances of some feasts falling on different dates in successive years—and uniform—with the same cycle of feasts from both the proper of the saints and the proper of the time observed annually.²⁸

It is within this context that the representational rites were celebrated, and it is within this context, within the sequence of rites among which they were embedded, that the representational rites are best under-

[Ad] dominicum diem sanctum Pasche tropus:

Quem que - ri - tis in se - pul - chro___ Chris-ti___ co - le?

Ie - sum Na - za - re - num cru - ci - fi - xum, o__ ce - li - co - le.

Non - est hic,___ sur - re - xit__ e - nim si - cut pre - di - xe - rat. ___ I - te

nun - ci - a - - te, qui - a___ sur - re - xit di - cen - tes:

Al - le - lu - a. Re - sur - re - xit Do - mi - nus.

Ho - di - e re - sur - re - xit___ le - o for - tis___ Christ - us, Fi - li - us___ De - i___

De - o___ gra - ti - as, Di - ci - te,___ e - a, al - le - lu - ia:

Re - sur - re - xi___

Example 6.1: Type 1 *Visitatio Sepulchri* (Mass). Modena, Biblioteca e Archivio Capitolare, MS O.I.7, 104v (LOO 13). 11th/12th-century Forlimpopoli tropes.

stood. I focus here on the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, since this is the most widely distributed of the representational rites and the most widely studied. I am not the first to attempt such an analysis. In 1965, O. B. Hardison, Jr. offered an expansive vista for understanding the *Visitatio Sepulchri* within the context of the Lenten and Holy Week liturgies. Among other rites, he discussed the procession of Palm Sunday, the *Mandatum* (washing of the feet) of Holy Thursday, the reading of the Passion and Adoration of the Cross of Good Friday, and the baptismal ceremonies of the Easter Vigil

Post tertium responsorium fiat a tribus processio ad sepulchrum, et sint duo iuxta ita [d]icentes:

B
Quem que - ri - tis in se - pul - chro o - - - Chris - ti - co - le?

C
le - sum Na - za - re - num cru - ci - fi - xum, o - - ce - li - co - le.

D
Non est hic, sur - re - xit si - cut pre - di - xe - rat. I - - te, nun - ti - a - te,
qui - a sur - re - xit.

Al - le - lu - a. Re - sur - re - xit Do - mi - nus.

Ho - di - e re - sur - re - xit le - o for - tis. Chris - tus, Fi - li - us De - i

De - o gra - ti - as, Di - ci - te, e - a:

Te De - um lau - da - mus

Example 6.2: Type 1 *Visitatio Sepulchri* (Matins). Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 12044, 100r–v (LOO 155). 12th-century Saint-Maur antiphoner.

along with the so-called sepulcher ceremonies themselves: the *Depositio* and *Elevatio Crucis/Hostiae* and *Visitatio Sepulchri*.²⁹ C. Clifford Flanigan offered liturgical interpretations for several settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*,³⁰ and Nils Holger Petersen provided his own takes on the liturgical contexts of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and other rites.³¹ To some extent, I am offering more of the same. I will provide a broad view of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, situating the rite as one of a series of rites observed between Palm Sunday and Easter Sunday, as well as a narrow view, focusing on a

twelfth-century revision of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* that was widespread in German-speaking Europe and that is more easily understood within the context of liturgical observance than as an incipient form of theater.

Most settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* were cast in one of two textual and melodic forms. The first to emerge was what has come to be known as the Type 1 *Visitatio Sepulchri*.³² Built on a dialogue between clerics representing an angel or angels and the Marys at the empty sepulcher of Christ, this rite survives in multiple liturgical placements. In Italy, southern France, Catalonia, and Switzerland, this rite was performed prior to Easter Mass, either as a trope to the Easter Introit or as a part of the procession preceding Mass. In northern France, England, the Low Countries, Germany, and Eastern Europe, conversely, the rite was typically performed at the end of Easter matins.³³ While much has been made of these diverging placements, the gulf seen by most scholars between the Mass and matins settings of this ceremony may well be illusory.

Few variations attributable to differences in liturgical placement, for example, are evident in the texts and music of the exchange between the Marys and the angels in the Type 1 *Visitatio Sepulchri*. Example 6.1 offers a transcription of a Type 1 *Visitatio Sepulchri* observed before the Mass of Easter Sunday in Forlimpopoli (northern Italy), while example 6.2 offers a transcription of the rite from the end of matins at the Benedictine monastery of Saint-Maur (near Paris). While their liturgical placements differ, the two settings are nearly identical textually and the melodies of the dialogues themselves are more similar than not. Such correspondence, though, is hardly typical. The texts accompanying the dialogue can vary widely according to the placement and provenance of the dialogue. Despite the claims of some musicologists, the melodies for the dialogue itself can vary in significant ways, although the patterns of variation do not correspond to differences in liturgical placement.³⁴ The texts accompanying the dialogue can vary according to the placement and provenance as well. The textual variations, moreover, tend to fall into patterns that are either locally or regionally definable.³⁵

Additionally, few distinctions are evident in the types of books preserving the Mass and matins versions of the rite. Examples of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in both of its placements, in fact, may be found within virtually every type of liturgical book known to medieval scribes. Pre-Mass settings from St. Gall, for example, are preserved in antiphoners (books containing music for the Divine Office),³⁶ while several matins settings are preserved in tropers (books containing soloist's music for Mass).³⁷

Prior to the thirteenth century, in fact, the greatest concentration of settings of both the pre-Mass *Visitatio Sepulchri* and the Type 1 version of the matins *Visitatio Sepulchri* were copied into manuscripts intended for use at Mass, i.e., in tropers, graduals, missals, and sacramentaries. Of the sixty-two manuscripts antedating the thirteenth century that preserve the pre-Mass *Visitatio Sepulchri*, fifty-one were destined for use at Mass (including thirty-three tropers), while of the sixty-one preserving the Type 1 version of the matins *Visitatio Sepulchri*, twenty-seven were intended for use at Mass (twelve tropers). Several of the manuscripts preserving the later Type 2 version of the matins *Visitatio Sepulchri* were also intended for use during Mass (three of seventeen pre-thirteenth-century manuscripts).

Similarities between the Mass and matins versions of the Type 1 *Visitatio Sepulchri* are evident in the manuscript rubrics as well. Although rubrics are rare in the pre-Mass settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, those rubrics that have survived assign the words of the dialogue to particular clerics, the number of clerics for each sentence generally corresponding in both the pre-Mass and matins settings to the numbers given in the Gospel accounts (one or two angels, one to three Marys). The choice of cleric was largely a matter of local or regional preference. Among the pre-Mass settings and those Type 1 settings originating west of the Rhine and south of the Alps, the combinations vary widely. In an eleventh-century manuscript from Fruttuaria, for example, the sentences of the Marys and the angels were sung by cantors.³⁸ At Benevento, the Marys' sentences were sung by a deacon, while those of the angel were sung by a priest.³⁹ In Chalons-sur-Marne, the Marys were also represented by deacons, while the sentences of the angels were assigned to boys.⁴⁰ Within German-speaking Europe, such variety was the exception. In sources originating east of the Rhine, the connection between biblical figure and cleric was close. In over two-thirds of the German Type 1 and the Type 2 settings, the words of the Marys were assigned to priests, while those of the angel(s) were assigned to deacons. With regard to garments, liturgical vestments were typically required, with the choice of vestment tied to the rank of the cleric and to the celebration of Easter Mass or the procession that preceded. Priests, whether representing the Marys or the angel(s), were normally instructed to wear copes or chasubles. Deacons were to wear white dalmatics or albs and white stoles. Boys were normally vested in albs. Superhumeral, worn about the head, were additionally specified in many sources for one or both sets of clerics.⁴¹

The documents preserving the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, the concern for clerical position evident within the rubrics, and the revesting of clerics according to the requirements for Mass suggest that, wherever placed, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* was sacramental in nature, and that, even in its matins placement, the Marys' visit to the empty tomb was more closely allied with the celebration of Mass than with the observance of the nocturnal office. In recent studies, Nils Holger Petersen has argued for a sacramental interpretation of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and other rites on theological grounds as well. After examining a number of treatises on the Eucharist and the sacraments from the mid-ninth through the mid-twelfth centuries, Petersen showed that, prior to the mid-twelfth century, the notion of sacrament had connotations that were more broadly understood in terms that were both spiritual and figurative.⁴² He saw the early *Quem quaeritis* illuminated by the same principles:

A sacrament may represent the divine figuratively, in reality, or both. This corresponds well with the understanding of *Quem quaeritis* ceremonies referred to above where the importance lies in the congregation's spiritual witnessing of the Resurrection through a material (bodily) representation in a ceremony carried out on Easter morning before a congregation. The spiritual understanding of the ceremony in no way stands in conflict with the physical act; in such an understanding, what the representation does may be interpreted spiritually as reality. Physically, this act may at the same time be seen as a figurative representation of the divine miracle of the historical Resurrection.⁴³

Moreover, the liturgical context for the *Visitatio Sepulchri* is often revealed in the layout of the medieval manuscripts themselves. When preserved in Mass books, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* is often embedded within a series of rites for Holy Week, a series that includes in its fullest form: the procession of Palm Sunday; the *Mandatum* of Holy Thursday; the *Adoratio Crucis* and the *Depositio Crucis/Hostiae* of Good Friday; the Easter Vigil and Vigil Mass of Holy Saturday; and the *Elevatio Crucis/Hostiae*, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and the procession to Mass on Easter Sunday. Early examples of this distribution are found in manuscripts containing the Type 1 *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the cathedral of Minden and the Benedictine monastery of St. Emmeram in Regensburg. A gradual from the cathedral of Minden dating from between 1024 and 1027 includes in sequence, music for items from the *Mandatum* of Holy Thursday, the Adoration of the Cross of Good Friday, the Easter Vigil and Vigil Mass of Holy Saturday, and the

Visitatio Sepulchri and the procession to Mass of Easter.⁴⁴ A similar pattern is found in an eleventh-century proper from the Benedictine monastery of St. Emmeram in Regensburg, where items associated with the Palm Sunday procession, the Adoration of the Cross, Easter Vigil and Vigil Mass, *Visitatio Sepulchri* and the procession to Easter Mass are included within a section containing tropes for the Mass Propers, between the tropes for the feast of the Purification of Mary and those for Easter Sunday.⁴⁵ This series of rites is included in numerous rituales dating from the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries as well, where the ceremonies co-exist with the various sacraments of the Christian liturgy, sacraments such as marriage, extreme unction, and exorcism.⁴⁶

As the ceremony concluding the sequence of rites marking the historical events of Holy Week, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* (representing revelation) counterbalanced the Adoration of the Cross of Good Friday (representing crucifixion). Both were public ceremonies and for both rites the cross (or its absence) served as focal point. While the cross was central to the rite of Adoration, it was the cross's absence and the linens that marked its absence that distinguished the *Visitatio Sepulchri*. The three-sentence dialogue beginning the *Visitatio Sepulchri* (*Quem quaeritis—Jesum Nazarenum—Non est hic*) was foreshadowed on Good Friday with the exchange between Christ and his captors (*Quem quaeritis—Jesum Nazarenum—Ego sum*), chanted as a part of the St. John Passion that preceded the Adoration.⁴⁷ The Good Friday *Improperia* were recalled in the poetic declaration: *Prima quidam suffragia* (with its intrastanzaic exclamations from the *Trisagion*), sung by the cleric portraying Christ in several of the Magdalene versions of the Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri*.⁴⁸ The *Depositio* and *Elevatio*, when present, shared with the *Visitatio Sepulchri* both the same setting (i.e., the sepulcher) and the same liturgical properties (i.e., the cross and/or Host).

Parallels between the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and the sacramental rites of Holy Week are also common. I alluded earlier to the placement of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* within Mass books and to the revesting of clerics in vestments appropriate to the celebration of Easter Mass or its procession. As O. B. Hardison, Jr. demonstrated, further parallels are evident between the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and the Vigil Mass of Holy Saturday, parallels including the participation in the *Visitatio Sepulchri* by a bishop or abbot in festive vestments, the use of collects associated with the Easter Vigil, the singing of the hymn *Ad coenam agni*, and the inclusion of references to holy water (from the newly blessed font) and to the Paschal candle.⁴⁹

Furthermore, a number of settings of both the Type 1 and Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri* include antiphons drawn from the procession before Easter Mass, antiphons such as *In resurrection tua* (CAO 3280), *Sedit angelus* (CAO 4858), and *Christus resurgens* (CAO 1796).⁵⁰

The *Visitatio Sepulchri* may be regarded as a discrete liturgical ceremony that served as the juncture between the historical and the sacramental rites of the Holy Week liturgy, joining at one moment within the ever-recurring liturgical cycle the salvation offered by Christ through the sacraments of baptism and Eucharist with the long-past, and ever-recurring, events of Christ's passion, death, and resurrection. The *Visitatio Sepulchri* bound the events of salvation history with the manifestation of those events. It became the means by which the reality of Christ's resurrection was transmitted to the religious community and the adhesive that bonded Christ's victory over sin and death with its sacramental manifestations.

This is, of course, but one way to look at this peculiar rite, and given the absence of more compelling evidence, there is little reason to presume that anyone actually understood the rite in this particular way over the centuries of its use. It is clear, as Flanigan observed, that individual celebrations of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* were likely understood differently by their celebrants and by those who may have been on hand to observe, and this understanding was likely different from one church to another, from one order to another, and from one region to another. It is clear also that this understanding would likely have changed over time. Kobialka's observation on the several revisions in the medieval understanding of "representation" certainly makes this clear, as does the coexistence of representational rites and actual drama over the course of the sixteenth century and beyond. However, the very fact that *Visitatio Sepulchri* lends itself to such a sacramental interpretation is sufficient to minimize the import of whatever theatrical features Magnin's followers may have claimed to discern. This becomes even more evident when we examine the more clearly theatrical Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri*.

Case Study: The Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri*

At some point in the late eleventh or early twelfth century, somewhere in the southern part of German-speaking Europe, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* was recast and expanded.⁵¹ Building on the incipits for the Type 1 dialogue (see examples 6.1 and 6.2, sentences B–D), the new rite provided a complete reworking of the earlier text and music. While the incipits for the

earlier dialogue remained intact, the texts were filled out differently and given new melodies. The rite was also extended with four additional sentences, one sung by the clerics representing the Marys on their approach to the sepulcher and three concluding sentences detailing the announcement by the Marys of their encounter with the angel and the ensuing visit to the sepulcher by the apostles Peter and John.

For Hardison, the new version of the rite marked a step closer to theatrical representation. Concerning the dialogue from a manuscript then assigned to Aquileia he noted that “the Aquileia [Type 2] form realizes more fully the implications of the representational mode. Instead of identifying the Marys as *Christocolae* before they have spoken, the angels call them *mulieres* and comment on the fact that they appear fearful and sad. In other words, the nexus between action and dialogue, a fundamental condition of the representational mode, is tightened.”⁵² A similar view was offered by De Boor, who observed that “[the Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri*] is, in its overall tone, individualized and characterized. It delivers the timeless message of spiritual salvation in the vestment of biblical events. It is not only in its formal construction a unified new composition; it is based also on a new inner conception. . . . The new text form shows a move toward realism. . . . We are closer to biblical truth and further from its ritual predecessor.”⁵³

To view the new Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri* as either a more dramatic or a more realistic reading of the Marys’ visit to the sepulcher, however, is to misread its intent. The structure of its text and melodies and the alignment of the clerics involved in its celebration work together to allow us to see this as a rite that underscores the clerical and celestial hierarchies and that more tightly connects the events of the Gospel accounts with the sacraments of the Church. In addition, it offers an early attempt to harmonize the Gospel accounts of the resurrection, as Melanie Batoff has shown.⁵⁴

Example 6.3 offers a transcription of a Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the cathedral of Salzburg. I have drawn the melodies from a fourteenth-century antiphoner now in Udine,⁵⁵ and I have supplemented the sparse rubrics from the antiphoner with those of a late-twelfth-century ordinal now in Salzburg.⁵⁶ The rite has as its framework seven sentences that are common to nearly all settings of the Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri*. This is preceded here by the choral *Maria Magdalena et alia Maria* and followed by the antiphon *Surrexit enim sicut* (CAO 5081) and the vernacular hymn *Christ ist erstanden*. These sentences divide into three sec-

Visitatio Sepulchri [*Post 'Gloria Patri' repetatur responsorium a principio. Et omnis clerus portans cereos accensos procedit ad visitandum sepulchrum. Diaconus vero qui legerat evangelium, acturus officium angeli precedat, sedeatque in dextera parte coopertus stola candida. At ubi chorus cantare inceperit:*]

Ma-ri - a_ Mag-da - le - na et al - te - ra Ma - ri - a fe - re - bant di - lu - cu - lo
a - ro - ma - ta Do - mi - num que - ren - tes in mo - nu - men - to.

Marie [*Tres presbiteri induti cappis cum todidem thuribulis <in margin: figuram mulierum tenentes> et incenso, procedunt versus sepulchrum et stantes cantant:*]

A Quis re - vol - vet. no - bis_ ab hos - ti - o_ la - pi - dem
quem te - ge - re_ sanc - tum cer - ni - mus se - pul - chrum?

Angelus [*Angelus:*]

B Quem_ que - ri - tis o tre - mu - le mu - li - e - res in hoc tu - mu - lo plo - ran - tes

Mulieres [*Mulieres:*]

C Ihe - sum na - za - re - num cru - ci - fi - xum que - ri - mus.

Angelus [*Angelus*]

D Non est_ hic_ quem que - ri - tis sed_ ci - to_ e - un - tes nun - ci - a - te_
di - sci - pu - lis e - ius et pe - tro qui - a sur - re - xit_ ihe - sus.

Mulieres [*Et cum ceperit cantare angelus 'Sed cito euntes', mulieres thurificent sepulchrum, et festinanter redeunt et versus chorus stantes cantant mulieres:*]

E Ad mo - nu - men tum ve - ni - mus ge - mentes an - ge - lum Do - mi - ni se - dentem
vi - dimus et di - centem qui - a sur - re - xit_ Ihe - sus

Apostoli [*Tunc chorus imponat antiphonam:*]

F Cur - re - bant du - o si - mul et il - le a - li - us di - sci - pu - lus_ pre - cu - cur - rit
ci - ci - us_ Pe - tro_ et_ ve - nit pri - or ad_ mo - nu - men tum Al - le - lu - ia.

Apostoli [*Et cantores quasi Petrus et Johannes currant; precurratque Iohannes sequente Petro, et ita veniunt ad monumentum, et auferant lineamina et sudarium quibus involuta erat Ymago Domini, et vertentes se ad chorum ostendendo ea cantant:*]

d' *e'*

G Cer-ni-tis o__ so - ci - i ec - ce__ lin - the - a - mi - na et su - da - ri - um

et__ cor - pus non est in - ven - tum in se - pul - chro.

[Chorus:]

Sur - re - xit__ e - nim si - cut di - xit Do - mi - nus pre - ce - det vos in Ga - ly - le - am__

a - le - lu - ia. I - bi__ e - um vi - de - bi - tis. Al - le - lu - ia. Al - le - lu - ia.

Turba [*Populus:*]

Christ ist er - stan - den

Chorus [*Et ita clericus redeat in chorum. Tunc pontifex sive prepositus incipiat:*]

Te De - um lau - [da - mus]

Example 6.3 (opposite and above): Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri*.

Udine, Biblioteca arcivescovile, MS 94, 132v–133v (LOO 697).

14th-century Salzburg antiphoner. (Rubrics from Salzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, MS II. 6, fol. 67r (LOO 694), 12th-century Salzburg ordinal)

tions that follow a pattern of progressive revelation from the angels to the Marys (*Non est hic*), the Marys to the apostles (*Ad monumentum venimus*), the apostles to the chorus (*Cernitis o socii*), and the chorus to the people (*Surrexit enim sicut*), with the people responding in German (*Christ ist erstanden*).

This structure is reinforced by the clerical ranks of those charged with the several announcements. The resurrection is first announced by a deacon, and specifically the “the deacon who reads the Gospel.” From the deacon, the news is passed to the priests, who, in their search for the body of Christ, are also in search of the Word. Having received the news of salvation through the Word (as delivered by the deacon), the priests transmit the news first to the lesser clergy (the chorus), whose representatives enter the sepulcher and display the gravecloths to their brethren, who then pass the news to the people who respond in turn.

This textual division is reinforced by the modal divisions of the several melodies. The first section comprises the four sentences that follow

the introductory *Maria Magdalena* (sentences A–D). These sentences are set in ‘e’ mode and transposed ‘e’ mode. The three-sentence dialogue (sentences B–D) is prefaced by *Quis revolvat nobis* (sentence A), which functions as a biblical link between the liturgy of Easter matins and the sentences to follow as well as exposition, placing both viewers and participants at the scene and, by implication, the time of the Marys’ discovery.⁵⁷ The establishment of time and place and the juxtaposition of the emotions of sadness and helplessness initiate the catharsis to follow, drawing viewers and participants alike toward the ritual reactualization of the women’s visit to the tomb. Although corresponding in its text incipits to the Type 1 dialogue, the Type 2 dialogue, as both Hardison and De Boor noted, displays a greater degree of internal logic with respect to the historical events being represented. The three sentences are more than a simple revision, however. The sentences have been rewritten, retaining just enough of a semblance to the original Type 1 dialogue to maintain a link to what had become by the late eleventh century a liturgical tradition. The final sentence of the dialogue (*Non est hic*) serves as the conclusion to the first part of the form. The Marys are informed of the resurrection and are instructed to inform the disciples and Peter. This opening section is unified also by the use of recurring melodic motives in the first three sentences, a pattern reminiscent of the opening sentences of the Type 1 *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Saint-Maur (see example 6.2). The motivic pattern of sentences B and C, in particular, correspond closely. Of particular interest here is the exact repetition of motive ‘a’ from the word *queritis* on the word *querimus*. If the two sentences are considered a single unit, then the literal repetition of the motive at the beginning and end of the unit serves as a reflection of the textual *epanalepsis* found at the same points.⁵⁸ With sentence D, a shift is evident. Although the sentence is still set in ‘e’ mode, the melodic structure and contour varies. The sentence is set apart from that which had come before and introduces two new motives that recur at the end of the second section.

The second section (sentences E–G) details the encounter between the Marys and the apostles and is set in ‘d’ mode. With the sentence *Ad monumentum venimus gementes* (sentence E), the Marys turn toward the choir to inform them of the events having taken place. To some extent, the sentence is structurally ambiguous. It could be considered, in its fulfillment of the angel’s instructions, as the culmination of the preceding section. If viewed within the context of progressive revelation, however, particularly with the change in focus from the angel to the choir (repre-

senting the apostles), the sentence is more properly associated with the sentences that follow. *Ad monumentum* also shows a marked shift in character and, in most cases, mode. Although the melody is normally set in 'd' mode, the final has been raised to 'e' in the Salzburg setting, demonstrating modally the same structural ambiguity evident in the text. The melody is distinguished by the rising fifth at the beginning and is similar in its musical incipit to the sentence *Non est hic* of the Type 1 *Visitatio Sepulchri* (see examples 6.1 and 6.2). This recapitulatory sentence is followed by the antiphon *Currebant duo* (sentence F, CAO 2081). The antiphon, sung by the chorus, accompanies the movement of the clerics representing the two apostles from the chorus to the place of the sepulcher. Motive 'a' from the first three sentences recurs on the word *discipulus*. This is followed by the singing of *Cernitis o socii* (sentence G) by the two clerics, during which the empty gravecloths are displayed to the assembled religious. Like *Ad monumentum*, this is a pivotal sentence that links the second and final sections of the rite. The two motives that were introduced in *Non est hic*, the final sentence of the preceding dialogue (sentence D), are repeated here as well, the motivic relationships corresponding to the similarities in functions between the sentences. Both serve as boundaries within the form, and both include announcements of Christ's resurrection to the assembled clerics. The Salzburg *Visitatio Sepulchri* culminates with a liturgical antiphon *Surrexit enim sicut* (CAO 5081) that is typically intoned by the cantor or ranking cleric and completed by the choir. Here, the fact of the resurrection is revealed to the people, the last stage in the sequence of revelation. This is followed in the Salzburg setting by the acclamation of the people in German (*Christ ist erstanden*).⁵⁹

The shifts in focus, the directions for movement, and the changes in location correspond with the textual and musical structure and reinforce the progressive revelation implicit within the text. With each section of the ceremony, the focus shifts, and as the news of Christ's resurrection passes from the Marys to the apostles to the choir and to the people, the physical space required for the rite enlarges. Initially, the rite is restricted to the immediate area of the sepulcher (in the nave, often adjacent to the Holy Cross altar). With the entry of the clerics representing the apostles, the ritual space enlarges to include the area occupied by the choir, who stand at some distance from the sepulcher. With the announcement by the chorus to the people and the people's response, the ceremony expands to nearly the entire area of the church. This passage of the news of salvation through the clerical ranks is analogous to the structure of the Mass itself,

where the liturgy of the Word, the province of the deacon and subdeacon, is followed by the dispensation by the priest of the means of salvation (the Eucharist). The ceremony thus reinforces in both its theme and its structure the role of the priesthood as intermediary between the Word and Salvation. The Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri* serves not only to strengthen the role of the clergy in the transmission of the events of salvation history and to bolster the position of the priesthood within the celestial hierarchy, but also to relate the sacramental rites to the events of salvation history they signify.

* * *

This emphasis on the ranks of the clergy as the instruments of salvation, not to mention the placement of the ceremony among those rites of Holy Week that mark the very core of salvation history, is of an altogether different cast from what we see in the larger religious plays.⁶⁰ While one might argue for an exegetical component among some representational rites,⁶¹ the depth and range of such exegesis pales in comparison to what many have observed among the religious plays. Susan Boynton's characterization of the Fleury *Ordo Rachelis* as "performative exegesis"⁶² and my own description of the Fleury *Iconia Sancti Nicolai* as a "sermon in song"⁶³ are a response to the overlapping themes, the adoption of liturgical elements from multiple feasts, and the free use of new poetic and musical techniques in framing these works. While musical, poetic, and performative analyses are lacking in the literature for many of the religious plays, those that have been closely scrutinized demonstrate in their scope, in their range of poetic and musical forms, and in their use of numerical and rhetorical devices as theological signs, that these were understood differently than the representational rites woven into the liturgies of their respective feasts. This is particularly evident in the *Ludus Paschalis* of Tours, as I have argued elsewhere, which combined numerical and rhetorical devices to underscore theological points and cast these within a biblical harmonization on a scale that eclipsed by far the more focused harmony that Batoff observed in the liturgical Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri*.⁶⁴

Conclusion

The expression "liturgical drama" began as metaphor, a metaphor that held for a quarter-century following the *Cours* of Magnin. As is often the way with such things, the metaphor evaporated, leaving behind the resi-

due of category that we know today. The transformation from ritual to drama, therefore, was not so much an historical reality as it was rhetorical alchemy—not the transformation of a liturgico-musico-literary form from one genre to another—but the metamorphosis of a metaphor with rich associations to the crystallized husk of category. But it is not so much the application of the metaphor “liturgical drama” to the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and other liturgical actions that has proven most disruptive. Rather, it is the ongoing hold that the supposedly dead (or dormant) metaphor continues to assert over students of medieval music and drama as they seek to understand how these liturgical rites and religious plays functioned within the religious cultures that spawned them. Seeing the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in particular as drama has made it all the more difficult to recognize this ceremony as a ritual act that served a ritual function within a particular liturgical framework at a particular instant.

Settings of *Quem quaeritis* or of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* did not exist in isolation among a group of tropes, or within a procession to Mass, or as a conclusion to matins. No matter when or where situated, this ceremony formed an integral part of a sequence of Holy Week rites that extended from Palm Sunday to Holy Thursday, to Good Friday, to Holy Saturday, and to Easter Sunday. This sequence in turn was incorporated within a larger sequence that began with Lent and carried forth to the Ascension and on to Pentecost. This then was cast within a yet broader sequence, the liturgy of the time, which was interwoven with the liturgy of the saints to form a unique liturgical fabric for a particular religious community at a particular moment in time. Indeed, stripped of its dramatic cloak, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* was but one of hundreds of rites celebrated within a particular liturgical practice, significant within its limited context perhaps, but only one strand among many when seen against the rich tapestry of that particular liturgy as a whole.

But were we to remove the notion of “liturgical drama” from our consideration of what Magnin called that “long interval of decay and social reconstruction which [we] must call, like everyone else, the Middle Ages,”⁶⁵ what might be left? Does the study of medieval drama depend upon our having embraced the notion of liturgical drama at the outset? Ultimately, this is a metaphysical question, a question whose answer depends upon which ontological stake we are inclined to hold. We can, of course, choose to see “drama” as a universal that springs from an innate human instinct for mimesis and whatever else those who struggle over such definitions might want to include, a “génie dramatique” (in the words of Magnin)

that exists and persists even in the absence of any deliberate intent to create individual acts of theater.⁶⁶ This was the view championed by Magnin, and this is the view generally adhered to today. The noun “drama” and the adjective “dramatic” are fused so that whatever is “drama” becomes “dramatic” by definition while whatever is “dramatic” becomes “drama” by metaphorical transfiguration. Alternatively we can choose to see the word “drama” as requiring at least some temporal connection to what that word might have meant at the time that the events being described as such were celebrated, performed, or written down. “Drama” and “dramatic” are here separable. An event can be seen as dramatic without necessarily implying that it is also drama or that it would have or could have been seen as such.

The issues are surely subtler and richer than I have attempted to describe, and to argue over which, if any, of the approaches just outlined might from an ontological standpoint actually be correct would likely send us into an infinite spiral. What I can and will claim, however, is that an ontological commitment that allows for the “dramatic” without necessarily entailing “drama,” a view that recognizes “liturgical drama” as the metaphor it was once understood to be, is ultimately more satisfying and decidedly more useful should our objective be to recognize how these rites, plays, and other things might themselves have been understood during the long centuries of their use. To be sure, seeing the medieval liturgy as “dramatic,” whether in the particular sense of Magnin or the more general sense of Clément, likely does little harm. For those seeking to understand how drama emerged (or re-emerged) in modern times, finding dramatic potential within realms not self-consciously theatrical has proven quite illuminating,⁶⁷ while for those focusing on the liturgy itself, such a projection has at least not gotten in the way. To project “drama” as an ontological actuality onto the liturgy of the medieval western Church, however, is not only demonstrably anachronistic, it ultimately fails once we recurse to the level where the actual rites called “liturgical drama” dwell. We may call these rites “drama,” but we can only claim them *as* drama by ignoring the palpable contexts within which they present themselves. The *Visitatio Sepulchri* and its siblings were liturgical rites, and they were known as liturgical rites (and only as liturgical rites) from the time of their earliest celebration through many centuries of use and for several centuries thereafter. To see these rites as drama is to see them as we might wish for them to have been, not as they were, and in so doing we divert our attention away from the liturgical ceremonies themselves and toward our own image of what we need for them to be.

The more significant question, however, is what happens now to the ritual/drama matrix that hovers over most studies of medieval drama in the absence of evidence that places drama within the ritual of the medieval Church in the first place? Indeed, without the anchor that “liturgical drama” provides, there is little to moor this matrix to the items we might wish it to assess. While a progression from ritual to drama may yet hold for the theater of the ancients, it is an illusion when applied to the rites and plays of medieval Europe. By affixing this matrix to the liturgical and literary relics of the European Middle Ages, we have merely brought the story of drama’s ancient origin forward to the present and then projected it back to a point between, thereby validating the concern expressed by Hardison in a different context by having “attributed present concepts and attributes to a culture of the past.”⁶⁸ The notion of ritual and drama as opposing forces that could balance the individual instances of what we call “liturgical drama” at their intersection is thus quite meaningless, as is the false dichotomy that has for too long served as backdrop to our study of this odd collection of liturgical rites, religious plays, and whatever else we might be inclined to include.

* * *

The rites, plays, and possibly other things that have settled within the category of liturgical drama have engaged a great many scholars of singular brilliance and erudition over the past century and three-quarters. While I can appreciate the thrill that Magnin must have felt when he first saw drama within the liturgy of the medieval Church, a liturgy that he knew only through the crumbs left by the liturgical aggregators of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, I can also sympathize with the disappointment that likely followed the efforts of Hardison, of Drumbl, and of Flanigan, as their challenges to the orthodox view fell on deaf ears. To be sure, the merger of “liturgical” and “drama” has proven its mettle in some ways. The merger has served to bring these rites, plays, and others to the attention of a wider range of scholars in a wider array of disciplines than might otherwise have been, allowing what Amelia Carr has noted as an objectification and universalization of both liturgy and drama that has made the study of liturgy and the appreciation of the Middle Ages generally more palatable to the increasingly secular culture of the post-Enlightenment west.⁶⁹ More importantly, it has provided a vehicle for investigating and understanding the phenomenon of the “dramatic” more broadly than could be achieved by focusing on “plays” alone. But in so doing, it

has also redirected our gaze away from these rites, plays, and other things, thus inhibiting our ability to make sense of the ways that the individual instances of “liturgical drama” might have been understood at the time they were written down. In the end, the notion “liturgical drama” remains an illusion, an improbable fiction that has likely done as much harm as it has good. While it may well continue to serve as a useful fiction, it can only do so if we can redirect our gaze to a level of abstraction that renders moot the difficulties that this classificatory quagmire has engendered. Coming to terms with the disparate kinds that have settled under the banner of “liturgical drama” requires that we reimagine medieval drama once again, and this requires that we abandon the banner altogether. If we can reset our focus to settle on the individual liturgical ceremonies and on the individual religious plays and on the individual instances of whatever other kind of thing we might be inclined to consider, we will find ourselves better able to appraise both the nature of these rites, plays, and others as well as the circumstances within which each was written and within which each was celebrated or performed.

NOTES

¹ See the studies of Manly, Cargill, Stumpff, and Hunningher discussed in chapter 2, pp. 55–61. See also Enders, *Rhetoric and the Origins of Medieval Drama* for a decidedly different take on the origin of medieval drama.

² “C’est une division généralement reçue que celle de la poésie en trois principaux genres, épique, lyrique et dramatique. Cette division répond à trois formes, ou, si l’on me permet cette expression, à trois différens costumes que la poésie revêt et emploie à sa guise, le récit, le chant, l’action. Bien que cette classification soit claire, évidente, aisément saisissable, on peut pourtant se demander si elle est la meilleure possible, c’est-à-dire la plus propre à nous faire bien connaître la nature de l’objet total par l’examen de ses parties. Je ne le crois pas. . . . Sous les trois costumes dont je viens de parler, c’est-à-dire, sous la robe épique, lyrique ou dramatique, n’y a-t-il qu’une seule et même poésie? L’épopée, l’ode, le drame, émanent-ils d’une même source psychologique, d’une même faculté humaine? ou bien au contraire, y a-t-il un génie épique, un génie lyrique, un génie dramatique, séparés et distincts?” Charles Magnin, “Études sur les origines,” 13:681–82. See also the notes to his Sorbonne lectures: “Cours Publics,” 4/16: 75.

³ See the discussion of Magnin’s contribution in chapter 1, pp. 19–26.

⁴ “A quels signes alors reconnâitrons-nous le drame? Nous venons de voir que le génie dramatique découle principalement de l’instinct d’imitation; c’est un indice, mais qui seul ne serait pas suffisant. Trouverons-nous dans la forme dialoguée le signe distinctif du drame? Non; car un monologue peut être un admirable drame, témoin la *Magicienne* de Théocrite. D’ailleurs, beaucoup d’ouvrages dialogués ne sont pas des drames. Sans parler des Dialogues de Platon et de Lucien, Théophylacte ouvre son histoire de Phocas et de Maurice par un dialogue remarquable entre la philosophie et l’histoire. Un chroniqueur polonais, Kadlubek, a écrit en dialogues, aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles, l’histoire des rois de Pologne. Plusieurs marbres et pierres gravées antiques offrent pour légendes de courts dialogues. Toutes ces choses relèvent bien quelque peu du génie dramatique, mais ne sont pas le drame. . . . Qu’est-ce donc que le drame? J’appelle ainsi tout ouvrage où le poète, mettant de côté sa personnalité, parle et agit ou fait agir et parler des acteurs au nom de personnages fictifs, dans le but d’exciter la curiosité et la sympathie d’un auditoire. Toutes les fois que je rencontrerai ces caractères réunis, quels que soient le lieu, les acteurs et l’assemblée, je me croirai sûr d’avoir rencontré, sinon une pièce de théâtre, du moins un produit du génie dramatique, un drame. . . .” [Magnin’s ellipsis]. Magnin, “Études sur les origines,” 13:686–87.

⁵ Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:80.

⁶ Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:80–81.

⁷ Flanigan, “Medieval Latin music-drama.”

⁸ Flanigan, “Quid Quaeritis,” 48. This essay appeared with several other of Flanigan’s previously unpublished papers along with essays honoring Flanigan’s life and legacy and several papers from a pair of memorial sessions honoring Fla-

nigan's legacy at the 31st International Medieval Congress in 1995.

⁹ Flanigan, "Quid Quaeritis," 49.

¹⁰ Petersen, "The Concept of Liturgical Drama: Cousse-maker and Scholarship," 69.

¹¹ Surveys of medieval drama invariably include a discussion of the "drama of the Church" that precedes any treatment of the vernacular plays of the later Middle Ages. See, for example, Tydeman, *The Medieval European Stage*, where the sections proceed from a discussion of the classical inheritance to that of Latin liturgical drama, to what the authors' call extra-liturgical Latin and early vernacular drama, to discussions of the vernacular dramas of Europe, and concluding with a discussion of local customs and folk drama. This plan is ubiquitous in contemporary approaches to medieval drama, so much so that to provide even a representative listing would require a volume of its own.

¹² The Institut für Musikforschung at the University of Würzburg is currently working on several volumes that will contain the music of representational rites from manuscripts containing rites not included in Evers/Janota. Their approach will include all such texts from each manuscript (including those in Evers/Janota) and will provide the extended context within which each is placed. Elaine Stratton Hild discussed the issues in this strategy in her paper, "Editing a disappearing genre." I thank Dr. Hild for allowing me access to this carefully considered presentation.

¹³ Rozik, *The Roots of Theatre*, 102–3. See also chapter 2, pp. 70–71.

¹⁴ Enders, "Liturgical Plays," 488–89.

¹⁵ Ryle, *Concept of Mind*, 23.

¹⁶ Eliot, *Middlemarch*, 1:146.

¹⁷ "What then is truth? A mobile army of metaphors, metonyms, and anthropomorphisms—in short, a sum of human relations, which have been enhanced, transposed, and embellished poetically and rhetorically, and which after long use seem firm, canonical, and obligatory to a people: truths are illusions about which one has forgotten that is what they are; metaphors which are worn out and without sensuous power; coins which have lost their pictures and now matter only as metal, no longer as coins. We still do not know where the urge for truth comes from; for as yet we have heard only of the obligation imposed by society that it should exist: to be truthful means using the customary metaphors—in moral terms, the obligation to lie according to fixed convention, to lie herd-like in a style obligatory for all. . . ." [Nietzsche's ellipsis]. Nietzsche, "On Truth and Lie," 46–47. I thank James Ward for bring this passage to my attention.

¹⁸ Turbayne, *Myth of Metaphor*, 3–4. Turbayne's citation is drawn from Ryle, *Concept of Mind*, 8. The study of metaphor has engaged a number of philosophers and linguists over the last half-century and more. Among the more important early studies are those of Black, "Metaphor" and Turbayne's book cited above. The recent upsurge in interest in what is called conceptual metaphor was sparked by the publication of Lakoff and Johnson's small, but influential book, *Metaphors*

We Live By. They collaborated again in *Philosophy in the Flesh*. Each has produced individual studies as well, including Lakoff, *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things* and Johnson, *The Body in the Mind*. For a more recent take on the approach of Lakoff and Johnson, see Kövecses, *Metaphor*. Many of the more important studies on the philosophical, linguistic, and psychological aspects of metaphor (at least up to about 1980) are reproduced in Sacks, *On Metaphor*; Ortony, *Metaphor and Thought*; and Johnson, *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. Since these collections were published, the field has expanded greatly, particularly among cognitive linguists, and the bibliography has grown too large to list here. On the processes by which linguistic structures are transformed from metaphorical to literal (or from active to dead metaphors), see especially the classic treatments by Black, "More about Metaphor" and Turbayne, *Myth of Metaphor*, 21–27 (what he calls "being used by metaphor"). This is also treated in Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 73–78.

¹⁹ The problem of transferring one's own conceptual frame onto the experiences of others, whether contemporaneously or retroactively, extends beyond the issues presented here. This problem is particularly acute in studies of comparative religion. In his book, *Religious Experience*, for example, Wayne Proudfoot maintains (p. 193): "In identifying the experience, emotion, or practice of another, I must restrict myself to concepts and beliefs that have informed his experience. I cannot ascribe to him concepts that he would not recognize or beliefs he would not acknowledge." I thank James Ward for bringing this work to my attention. Nils Holger Petersen makes much the same point in his article, "The Representational Liturgy," 111: "It is no longer clear at all that what is found in the *quem queritis* texts is something that can adequately be dealt with by using the concept of drama, which is not a concept found in the manuscripts themselves and which it seems difficult to use without anachronistic connotations."

²⁰ Black, "Metaphor," 290.

²¹ Petersen, "Concept of Liturgical Drama: Cousse-maker and Scholarship," 69.

²² We could, for example, choose to view the metaphor "liturgical drama" as a form of *catechesis*, where the expression is used to fill a gap in the vocabulary. See Black, "Metaphor," 280–81: "Metaphor plugs the gaps in the literal vocabulary (or, at least, supplies the want of convenient abbreviations). So viewed, metaphor is a species of catachresis which I shall define as the use of a word in some new sense in order to remedy a gap in the vocabulary. Catachresis is the putting of new senses into old words. But if a catachresis serves a genuine need, the new sense introduced will quickly become part of the *literal* sense. 'Orange' may originally have been applied to the colour by catachresis; but the word is now applied to the colour just as "properly" (and unmetaphorically) as to the fruit. 'Osculating' curves don't kiss for long, and quickly revert to a more prosaic mathematical contact. And similarly for other cases. It is the fate of catachresis to disappear when it is successful."

²³ In Yudkin, *Music in Medieval Europe*, for example, the topics move from the chants for the Mass and Divine Office, to tropes for the Mass and Divine

Office, to sequences, proses, and other Latin songs, to rhymed offices, and to Church drama. Similar treatments are given in the article on “Plainchant” in the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* by Emerson, et al., where the discussion of liturgical drama is placed in the section on “Expansion of the Repertory” (19:841–42). In Taruskin, *Music from the Earliest Notations*, 93–94, liturgical drama is treated in the chapter on “Rethorizing Music” that focuses on new Frankish conceptions of musical organization, while the more extended treatment in Hiley, *Western Plainchant*, 250–73, is placed near the end of the chapter on “Chant Genres,” along with sequences, tropes, liturgical songs, and rhymed offices.

²⁴ Hughes, “Liturgical drama,” 42–43. See also the similar quote from Flanigan from the same collection, given in chapter 2, p. 68.

²⁵ See Bailey, *The Processions of Sarum* and Huglo, *Les manuscrits du processional*. See also the overview provided by Hiley, *Western Plainchant*, 30–32.

²⁶ For an overview of Holy Week liturgical practices, see Hiley, *Western Plainchant*, 32–39 and Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office*, 245–68. The older treatment by John Walton Tyrer, *Historical Survey of Holy Week: Its Services and Ceremonial* (1932) remains useful as well.

²⁷ See, for example, Wright, *Music and Ceremonial*, Boynton, *Shaping a Monastic Identity*, and Norton and Carr, “Liturgical Manuscripts,” for the liturgical practices for three institutionally and geographically diverse medieval institutions.

²⁸ This complexity was spawned by the variable dates for liturgical seasons required for the liturgy of the time. The date of Christmas was fixed on December 25, and the season of Advent began on the fourth Sunday before Christmas, thus lasting anywhere from four weeks and a day to five weeks, depending on which day of the week Christmas fell. The date for Easter, however, was variable, and fell on the first Sunday after the first full moon following the vernal equinox. The Lenten season was calculated backward from that and the feasts of Ascension and Pentecost were calculated forward. Saints’ days, conversely, were fixed, although the specific dates might sometimes vary from one church to another. The feast of St. Agnes, for example, was typically celebrated on January 21, that for Mary Magdalene on July 22, and that for St. Catherine on November 25.

²⁹ Hardison, *Christian Rite and Christian Drama*. See especially “Essay III: The Lenten Agon: From Septuagesima to Good Friday,” 80–138, and “Essay IV: *Christus Victor*: From Holy Saturday to Low Sunday,” 139–77.

³⁰ In “Medieval Liturgy and the Arts,” C. Clifford Flanigan offered interpretive comments on the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the tenth-century *Regularis Concordia*, a late twelfth-century *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the cathedral of Soissons, and a thirteenth-century *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the convent of Sainte-Croix in Poitiers.

³¹ Among other studies, Nils Holger Petersen has written about Scandinavian fragments containing settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in “Another *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Scandinavia,” and “A Newly Discovered Fragment;” about the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the tenth-century *Regularis Concordia* in “The Representational Liturgy;” about the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the cathedral at Soissons in “Repre-

sensation in European Devotional Rituals;” and about the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of St. Mark’s in Venice in “*Il Doge* and Easter.”

³² On the distinction between the Type 1 and Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri*, see Norton, “Of ‘Stages’ and ‘Types.’”

³³ For alternative placements of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, see table 4.1B in chapter 4.

³⁴ See, for example, Rankin, “Musical and Ritual Aspects,” 190: “*Quem queritis* survives in fifty-one notated sources datable before 1100, always with the same melodies for the first three sentences.” As Melanie Batoff has shown, however, the melodies for the three sentences of the dialogue, particularly those of the first and third sentences, can vary in significant ways. Batoff, “Re-envisioning the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, 45–54 (tables 2.1a–c and 2.2a–c especially).

³⁵ While his categories were overly simplistic, De Boor, *Die Textgeschichte*, 67–80 identified five regional forms for the Type 1 *Visitatio Sepulchri*. Further distinctions can be seen in vol. 9 of LOO and in the commentary volumes of Evers/Janota.

³⁶ St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 387, pp. 57–58 (LOO 82, St. Gall antiphoner, 1034–1047), MS 388, pp. 204–5 (LOO 85, St. Gall antiphoner, 12th c.), and MS 391, pp. 37–39 (LOO 80, St. Gall antiphoner, ca. 1000).

³⁷ See table 4.1A in chapter 4 above.

³⁸ Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Lambac. CVI, 30v–31r (LOO 9, Frutuarua Customary, ca. 1090).

³⁹ Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS VI.39, 28r–29r (LOO 2, Benevento Graduale, late 11th c.); Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS VI.38, 47v–49v (LOO 3, Benevento Graduale, 11th–12th c.); Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS VI.34, 122v–123v (LOO 4, Benevento gradual-troper, 12th c.) indicates *duo clerici*.

⁴⁰ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 10579, 76r–77r (LOO 102, Chalons-sur-Marne ordinal, 13th c.).

⁴¹ Ogden, *Staging*, 123–29 provides an overview of the vestments used in the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, although he treats both representational rites and religious plays.

⁴² Petersen, “Biblical Reception,” 174–81. See also the discussion by Batoff, “Re-envisioning the *Visitatio Sepulchri*,” 34–36.

⁴³ Petersen, “Biblical Reception,” 182.

⁴⁴ Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August Bibliothek, MS Helmst. 1008, 110v–132r (LOO 273, Minden gradual, 1024–1027). Similar patterns are found in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek preußischer Kulturbesitz, MS theol. qu. 15 (LOO 271, Minden gradual, ca. 1020) and Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellonská, MS Berol. theol. lat. 11 (LOO 272, Minden troper, 1124–1127).

⁴⁵ Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 14083, 84r–92r (LOO 321, St. Emmeram troper, 1031–37). A similar sequence is given in Modena, Biblioteca e Archivio Capitolare, MS O.I.7, 86v–104v (LOO 13, Forlimpopoli troper, 11th–12th c.).

⁴⁶ A fourteenth-century rituale used by the canons of the Augustinian monastery at Klosterneuburg, just outside of Vienna, for example, includes the rites for Ash Wednesday, the Palm Sunday procession, the *Mandatum* of Holy Thursday, the *Adoratio Crucis* and *Depositio Crucis* of Good Friday, and the *Elevatio Crucis*, *Visitatio Sepulchri*, blessings, and procession of Easter Sunday. Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 629, 10v–108r. The same sequence, beginning with Palm Sunday, is found in MS 628, 1r–88v, while MS 1021, 12r–62v, includes the sequence without the procession before the Mass of Easter.

⁴⁷ St. John 18:1–9.

⁴⁸ Included among the representational rites (see chapter 4, table 4.1C) are Nürnberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, MS 22923, 105v–107v, at 106v (LOO 782, Gurk antiphoner, 13th c.); St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 448, p. 105 (LOO 789, Hersfeld/St. Gall Ordinal, 1432); Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 28947, 64v–65v (LOO 794, Nottuln gradual, ca. 1420); and Münster, Archiv und Bibliothek des Bistums Münster, BAM PFA MS 113, 112r–113v, at 113r–v (LOO 795, Nottuln antiphoner, ca. 1500). Possibly also intended for liturgical use (see chapter 4, table 4.3) are Wolfenbüttel, Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv, MS VII.B.203, 23r–27v, at 26v–27r (LOO 780, Braunschweig Lectionary); Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 314, 75v–78v, at 78r–v (LOO 784, Engelberg Cationale, late 14th c.); Hildesheim, Stadtarchiv, MS Mus. 383, 125v–127v, at 127r (LOO 792, Medingen bei Lüneburg Orationale, ca. 1320); and Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, MS Rheinau 18, pp. 282–83 (LOO 797, Rheinau Lectionary, 13th c.). Among the religious plays (see chapter 4, table 4.2) is Zwickau, Ratsschulbibliothek, MS XXXVI.I.24, 1r–6v, at 4r–v (LOO 789, Zwickau Play Collection, ca. 1520).

⁴⁹ Hardison, *Christian Rite*, 210–14.

⁵⁰ See, for example, the entries in LOO 9 for *Christus Resurgens* (pp. 903–4), *In resurrectione tua* (p. 931), and *Sedit angelus* (p. 1017).

⁵¹ In my 1983 dissertation, I argued for a late eleventh-century origin at the cathedral of Augsburg. Norton, “Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri*,” 140–88. More recently, Melanie Batoff has argued for an early twelfth-century origin at the cathedral of Salzburg. Batoff, “Re-envisioning the *Visitatio Sepulchri*,” 182–210.

⁵² Hardison, *Christian Rite and Christian Drama*, 232–33. The manuscript, more recently assigned to the Benedictine abbey of Moggio, is held in Udine, Biblioteca arcivescovile, MS 234. The *Visitatio Sepulchri* is found on fols. 1r–v (LOO 487, Moggio gradual, ca. 1100).

⁵³ “Er wird in seinem ganzen Tenor individualisierend und charakterisierend. Er bietet das zeitlose heilsgeschichtliche Geschehen im Gewande des biblischen Geschehens. Er ist nicht nur im formale Aufbau eine geschlossene Neuschöpfung, er ist aus einer neuen inneren Konzeption gestaltet. . . . Die neue Textform zeigt einen Zug zur Realistik. . . . Wir sind der biblischen Wirklichkeit näher, dem heilsgeschichtlichen Vorgang ferner.” De Boor, *Die Textgeschichte*, 148.

⁵⁴ Batoff, “Re-envisioning the *Visitatio Sepulchri*,” esp. 172–210.

⁵⁵ Udine, Biblioteca arcivescovile, MS 94, 132v–133v (LOO 697, Salzburg antiphoner, 14th c.).

⁵⁶ Salzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, MS II.6, 67r (LOO 694, Salzburg ordinal, late 12th c.).

⁵⁷ The text for *Quis revolvat nobis* is drawn from the Gospel of St. Mark 16:3 (“Et dicebant ad invicem: Quis revolvat nobis lapidem ab ostio monumenti?”).

⁵⁸ “*Epanalepsis*: Repetition at the end of a clause or sentence of the word or phrase with which it began.” Enos, *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition*, 228.

⁵⁹ For the history of *Christ ist erstanden*, see Lipphardt, “Christ ist erstanden.”

⁶⁰ See the discussion in chapter 4 (“Religious Plays”), pp. 119–24.

⁶¹ See, for example, Batoff, “Re-envisioning the *Visitatio Sepulchri*,” esp. 173–210, who argues that the Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri* was created as a Gospel harmonization, and that this was particularly resonant among the Augustinian canons who proliferated in Bavaria and Austria in the wake of the reforms of Archbishop Konrad I of Salzburg during the first half of the twelfth century.

⁶² Boynton, “Performative Exegesis.”

⁶³ Norton, “Sermo in Cantilena.”

⁶⁴ Norton, “Observations on the Tours *Ludus Paschalis*.” See also the summary given in chapter 4, p. 122.

⁶⁵ See chapter 1, p. 4.

⁶⁶ In an altogether rare, and even bold, acknowledgment of this point, Eli Rozik argues with regard to ritual drama that “all these qualifications that contemporary people did or did not see their activities as drama and that it was an integral part of the liturgy are irrelevant.” Rozik, *The Roots of Theatre*, 104.

⁶⁷ Roger Reynolds, for example, shows that the criteria often cited for the “dramatic,” if not for “drama” itself, can be seen also in the processions that have marked much of liturgical life from early Christian times to the present. Reynolds, “The Drama of Medieval Liturgical Processions,” 127–42.

⁶⁸ Hardison, *Christian Rite and Christian Drama*, 33.

⁶⁹ Private communication from Amelia Carr (Dec. 30, 2011).

Glossary

Adoratio Crucis—A ceremony on Good Friday consisting of the unveiling of a cross followed by the adoration (kissing) of the cross by the celebrant, the lesser clergy, and the faithful. This ceremony includes several musical items, including the antiphon *Ecce lignum* (CAO 2522), sung as the cross was unveiled, the *Improperia* (CAO 8450–53), and the Fortunatus hymn *Pange lingua* (RH 14481).

Agenda—A liturgical book used by priests, usually small to medium in size, containing sacramental rites, such as those for marriage, the rites for the sick and dying, and for baptism along with blessings for various occasions. Many contain the texts and music for the rites of Holy Week as well. Sometimes called *Benedictionale*, *Obsequiale*, or *Rituale*.

Antiphon—A short chant sung before, after, and sometimes between Psalm verses.

Antiphoner—A liturgical book used by the chorus, usually large in format, containing music for the antiphons, responsories, and sometimes hymns for the celebration of the *Divine Office*.

Asperges—A brief rite preceding the procession to *Mass* where the holy water is blessed.

Benedictionale—See *Agenda*.

Breviary—A liturgical book, usually small to medium in format, containing the texts and rubrics for the celebration of the *Divine Office*. Sung texts are generally given as incipits. Musical notation is sometimes given in the form of unheighted *Neumes* in manuscripts from before about 1300.

Canticle—Texts from the Gospel of St. Luke sung after several of the hours of the *Divine Office*. These include the Canticle of Mary (*Magnificat*),

from Luke 1:46–55, which concludes *Vespers*; the Canticle of Zacharia (*Benedictus*), from Luke 1:68–79, which concludes *Lauds*; and the Canticle of Symeon (*Nunc dimittis*), from Luke 2:29–32, which concludes *Compline*. The *Te Deum*, which concludes *Matins*, is technically neither a *Canticle* nor a *Hymn*, although it is often called a *Hymn*.

Compline (Latin: *Completorium*)—The hour of the *Divine Office* at the end of the day.

Danielis Ludus—The “Play of Daniel.” This survives in two versions: one without music in a manuscript containing the works of Hilarius, the other with music in a manuscript containing the liturgy for the feast of the Circumcision. The relationship between the two is unclear.

Depositio Crucis (and/or *Hostiae*)—A brief ceremony held on Good Friday either after the *Adoratio Crucis* or in conjunction with *Vespers* where the cross and/or Host is ritually buried in a representation of the Holy Sepulcher.

Divine Office (*Office*)—The round of eight prayer services (offices) sung each day in a monastic, cathedral, or collegiate church. These are typically referred to as “hours.” The liturgical day began with the hour of *Vespers* of the previous evening followed by *Compline* before bed. Upon awakening in the middle of the night (the eighth hour according to the Rule of St. Benedict), *Matins* was sung followed by *Lauds*, either directly or after some interval depending on the time of year. During the day, the hours of *Prime*, *Terce*, *Sext*, and *None* were sung, each named according to the hour of the day (first, third, sixth, and ninth hours). These are usually divided between the greater hours (*Vespers*, *Matins*, and *Lauds*), which are the longest and most splendid, and the lesser hours (*Compline*, *Prime*, *Sext*, and *None*).

Elevatio Crucis (and/or *Hostiae*)—A brief ceremony held before *Matins* on Easter Morning where the cross and/or Host is removed from the representation of the Holy Sepulcher and taken to the High Altar.

Ember Days—Three days in a week set aside for fasting and prayer. These occur four times over the course of a year (during Advent and Lent, after Pentecost, and during September) and take place on the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday of the week set aside for this.

Evangelary—A liturgical book containing the passages from the four Gospels that are read at *Mass*.

Gradual—A liturgical book used by the chorus containing music for the *Mass*. Typically large in format, graduals are normally divided into sections, with the major part of the book containing the music for the *Proper of the Mass* for each day of the liturgical year. Other sections contain the music for the *Ordinary of the Mass*, for sequences, and for tropes. Sequences and tropes are often copied into separate books. See *Sequentiary* and *Troper*.

Hymn—A strophic, non-biblical, poem set to a strophic melody. There is a *Hymn* associated with each of the hours of the *Divine Office* for each feast of the liturgical year.

Hymnal—A liturgical book, typically small to medium in format, containing the *Hymns* for the *Divine Office*.

Improperia—A series of antiphons sung during the *Adoratio Crucis* on Good Friday, beginning with *Popule meus* (CAO 8450–53) and punctuated with the singing of the *Trisagion*.

Lauds (Latin: *Laudes*)—The morning office celebrated around daybreak, following the hour of *Matins*. Like *Vespers*, this office consists of a *Hymn*, five psalms with their *Antiphons*, a short reading and *Responsory*. The office concludes with the *Benedictus* (see *Canticle*) with its *Antiphon*.

Matins (Latin: *Matutinum*)—The night office. According to the Rule of St. Benedict, this office begins at the eighth hour of the night. *Matins* has the most complex musical structure of the hours of the *Divine Office*. After some opening items, including a *Hymn*, the office comprises three nocturns, each of which includes three or four Psalms with their *Antiphons* followed by three or four readings with with a concluding sung *Responsory*. The office ends with the chanting of the *Te Deum* (see *Canticles*). Easter *Matins* typically includes only a single nocturn.

Mass (Latin: *Missa*)—The sacrament of the Eucharist, consisting of an entrance ceremony, readings from the Epistle and Gospel, offering, and Eucharist. Musical items are generally divided among those whose texts change with the feast (see *Proper of the Mass*) and those whose texts do not change with the feast (see *Ordinary of the Mass*).

Missal—A book for priests, usually small or medium in format, containing the texts and instructions necessary for the celebration of *Mass* over the course of the liturgical year.

Neume—A music notational sign that stands in place of one or more pitches. *Neumes* may be unheighted, written in a line above the text and providing no information about the intervals between or within individual *Neumes*, or heighted, where intervallic information is given, sometimes relatively and sometimes precisely.

Obsequiale—See *Agenda*.

Officium Pastorum—A ceremony celebrated before the third *Mass* of Christmas or at the conclusion of *Matins* on Christmas morning. Modeled on the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue of Easter Sunday, this ceremony represents the shepherds at the manger.

Officium Peregrinorum—A ceremony celebrated at *Vespers* usually on the Monday after Easter that represents the encounter between Christ and the apostles on the road to Emmaus.

Officium Prophetarum—A ceremony drawn from the pseudo-Augustinian sermon, *Contra Judeos, Paganos, et Arianos*, typically celebrated before the third *Mass* of Christmas, depicting a procession of Old Testament prophets.

Officium Stellae—A ceremony celebrated in conjunction with either *Matins* or the *Mass* of the Epiphany that represents the visit by the wise men to the manger.

Ordinal—A liturgical book containing the rubrics and texts for the celebration of the *Divine Office* and *Mass* over the course of the liturgical year. Usually small in format, ordinals typically provide detailed instructions for the celebration of the various rituals. Sung texts are generally given as text incipits.

Ordinary of the Mass—The unchanging texts for the sung portions of the *Mass*, consisting of Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Agnus Dei, and *Ite missa est*. Multiple melodies for each text are typically provided in a separate section of most *Graduals*.

Ordo Rachelis—A representation depicting the slaughter of the Innocents that includes a lament by Rachel “crying for her children.”

Prime, Terce, Sext, and None—The hours of the Divine Office between *Lauds* and *Vespers*, named after the hour of the day that they are celebrated (first, third, sixth, and ninth). Each consists of a *Hymn*, three psalms with their *Antiphons*, and prayers.

Processional—A liturgical book consisting of the music for the *Antiphons*, *Responsories*, and *Hymns* sung during liturgical processions, particularly the processions before the *Mass* and those for the *Rogationtide* processions.

Proper of the Mass—The variable texts for the sung portions of the *Mass* that are specific to the feast being celebrated. Included are the Introit, Gradual, Alleluia or Tract, Offertory, and Communion.

Proper of the Saints—The sequence of feasts for the saints over the course of the liturgical year. This begins with the saints of the Advent season (Nicholas or Lucy) and ends with those in the last Sundays post Pentecost (Catherine or Andrew). The dates for the feasts of saints are fixed for any particular church, although the dates for some saints may vary between churches.

Proper of the Time—The sequence of feasts celebrating the life of Christ. Some dates are fixed, while others are moveable. The dates of Christmas and Epiphany are fixed (December 25 and January 6). The start of Advent is moveable; beginning on the fourth Sunday before Christmas, thus between four weeks and a day before (should Christmas fall on a Monday) and five weeks before (should Christmas fall on a Sunday). The date for Easter Sunday is moveable, and other feasts are calculated from that date. Easter was typically calculated as the first Sunday after the first full moon following the vernal equinox, thus between March 22 and April 25. The start of Lent was calculated backward from Easter Sunday (forty days plus six Sundays to Ash Wednesday), while the feasts of the Ascension and Pentecost were calculated forward from the date of Easter (forty and fifty days respectively).

Quem quaeritis dialogue—A three-line dialogue between the Marys and the angel at the empty tomb of Christ that serves as the core for the *Visitatio Sepulchri*. The expression is often applied to the *Trope* or processional versions of the rite. For the most part, the dialogue survives in two forms, Type 1 and Type 2. These are treated below as *Type 1 Visitatio Sepulchri* and *Type 2 Visitatio Sepulchri*.

Responsory—An office chant consisting typically of a solo *Respond* followed by a choral *Verse* and an abbreviated repetition of the *Respond*. Some *Responsories* (e.g., those ending each of the Nocturns of *Matins*) include also a concluding choral *Gloria patri* with another repetition of the abbreviated *Respond*. *Responsory* melodies are typically more elaborate than those of *Antiphons*.

Rituale—See *Agenda*.

Rogation Days (*Rogationtide*, *Minor Rogation*)—The three days before the feast of the Ascension. Includes processions each day seeking divine protection from floods, famine, war, etc. or blessings for crops or for peace. The major rogation was held April 25 in conjunction with the feast of St. Mark.

Sequentiary—A liturgical manuscript, or a portion of a liturgical manuscript (usually a *Gradual*), that contains the texts and (usually) the music for the sequences sung following the Alleluia of the Mass.

Trisagion—Greek and Latin exclamation used to punctuate the antiphons of the *Improperia* during the *Adoratio Crucis* of Good Friday.

Trope—The addition of new text to a pre-existing chant, either before the chant (introductory *Trope*) or interlinearly (interpolated *Trope*), or both.

Troper—A liturgical book containing the music for tropes for the Mass designed for use by cantors.

Type 1 Visitatio Sepulchri—The earliest form of the *Quem quaeritis dialogue*, dating probably from the late-ninth or early tenth century, that begins with the question: *Quem quaeritis in sepulchro, o christicole?* This is found in liturgical manuscripts stemming primarily from Europe west of the Rhine (including the British Isles) and south of the Alps.

Type 2 Visitatio Sepulchri—A modified version of the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue, dating from the late eleventh or early twelfth century, that begins with the question: *Quem quaeritis o tremule mulieres plorantes?* This is found in liturgical manuscripts stemming primarily from German-speaking Europe and further east.

Utraquist/Utraquism—An early fifteenth-century religious movement in Bohemia taken up by the followers of Jan Hus that required in part that Christians take communion in both species (bread and wine, *sub utraque specie*). Utraquist liturgical practices relied on that of the Latin Church for the most part, although the Divine Office was reduced to *Vespers* and *Matins* only.

Vespers (Latin: *Vespere*)—The first hour of the liturgical day, held in the early evening. Consists of a *Hymn*, five psalms with their *Antiphons*, a short reading and *Responsory*. The office concludes with the *Magnificat* (see *Canticle*) with its *Antiphon*.

Visitatio Sepulchri—A ceremony celebrated before the *Mass* of Easter Sunday or at the conclusion to Easter *Matins* representing the visit by the Marys to the empty tomb of Christ.

Bibliography of Works Cited

- Acta Apostolicae Sedis: Commentarium officiale*. Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1908–.
- Albrecht, Otto. *Four Latin Plays of St. Nicholas from the Twelfth-Century Fleury Playbook*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1935.
- Alstatt, Alison. “Re-membering the Wilton Processional,” *Notes: The Quarterly Journal of the Music Library Association* 72 (2016): 690–732.
- Amalarius of Metz. *Amalarii Episcopi opera liturgica omnia*. Edited by Jean-Michel Hannsens. 3 vols. Vatican City: Vatican Apostolic Library, 1948–1950.
- . *On the Liturgy (De ecclesiasticis officiis)*. Edited and translated by Eric Knibbs, 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Ambrosius, Aurelius (St.). *De Officiis: Introduction, Text, and Translation*. Edited by Ivor J. Davidson. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Amstutz, Renate. *Ludus de decem virginibus: Recovery of the Sung Liturgical Core of the Thuringian Zehnjungfrauenspiel*. Studies and Texts 140. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2002.
- Anz, Heinrich. *Die lateinischen Magierspiele. Untersuchung und Texte zur Vorgeschichte des deutschen Weihnachtsspiels*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1905.
- Arens, Franz. *Der Liber Ordinarius der Essener Stiftskirche*. Paderborn: A. Pape, 1908.
- Aretin, Johann Christoph von. *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Literatur vorzüglich aus den Schätzen der pfälzbaierischen Centralbibliothk zu München*, 9 vols. Munich: Scherer, 1803–1807.
- Arlt, Wulf. *Ein Festoffizium des Mittelalters aus Beauvais in seiner liturgischen Bedeutung*. 2 vols. Cologne: Volk, 1970.
- Aubry, Pierre. *La musicologie médiévale: Histoire et méthodes. Cours professée à l'Institut catholiques de Paris (1898–99)*. Paris: H. Welter, 1900.
- Bailey, Terence. *The Processions of Sarum and the Western Church*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1971.
- Baker, Augustine. *Apostolatus Benedictinorum in Anglia*. Edited by Clement Reyner. Douai: Kellanus, 1626.
- Bassi, Karen. Review of *The Roots of Theatre: Rethinking Ritual and other Theories of Origin* by Eli Rozik. *Comparative Drama* 38 (2004/2005): 462–67.
- Batoff, Melanie. “Re-envisioning the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in Medieval Germany:

- The Intersection of Plainchant, Liturgy, Epic, and Reform." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 2013.
- Bazelaire, Édouard de. "Le dernier des mystères," *L'Austrasie, revue du nord-est de la France* 5 (1839): 13–26.
- Beard, Thomas. *The theatre of God's judgment: Wherein is represented the admirable Justice of GOD against all notorious sinners, both great and small, but especially against the most eminent Persons of the World*. London: Islip, 1597.
- Beauchamps, Pierre-François Godard de. *Recherches sur les théâtres de France depuis l'année onze cens soixante-un, jusques à present*. 3 vols. Paris: Prault, 1735–40. Reprint Geneva: Slatkin, 1968.
- Bedingfield, M. Bradford. *The Dramatic Liturgy of Medieval England*. Woodbridge, Suffolk UK: Boydell, 2002.
- . "Ritual and Drama in Anglo-Saxon England: The Dangers of the Diachronic Perspective." In *The Liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, edited by Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield, pp. 291–317. Woodbridge, Suffolk UK: Boydell, 2005.
- Beleth, John. *Iohannis Beleth Summa de Ecclesiasticis Officiis*. Edited by Herbert Douteil. 2 vols. CCCM 41–41a. Turnhout: Brepols, 1976.
- Bellotte, Antoine. *Ritus ecclesiae Laudunensis redivivi: Illustrissimi Laudunens, episcopi ac venerabilis matricis ecclesiae capituli consensione*. 2 vols. Paris: Savreux, 1662.
- Bergeron, Katherine. *Decadent Enchantments*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Bergman, Rolf. *Katalog des deutschsprachigen geistlichen Spiele und Marienklagen des Mittelalters*. Munich: Beck, 1986.
- Bernard of Clairvaux. *Sancti Bernardi Abbatis Clarae-Vallensis Operum Tomus Tertius, Complectens Sermones de Tempore et de Sanctis, ac de Diversis* (PL 183).
- Bettley, John. "The Office of Holy Week at St. Mark's, Venice, in the Late 16th Century and the Musical Contributions of Giovanni Croce." *Early Music* 22 (1994): 45–60.
- Bevington, David. *Medieval Drama*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975.
- Birck, Sixt. *Iudith, drama comicotragicum; Exemplum Reipublicae recte institutae; unde discitur, quomodo arma contra Turcam sint accipienda*. Augsburg: P. Ulhart, 1539.
- Bischoff, Bernhard. *Carmina Burana. Faksimile-Ausgabe der Handschrift Clm 4660 und Clm 4660a*. Brooklyn, NY: Institute of Medieval Music, 1967.
- Bjork, David. "On the Dissemination of *Quem quaeritis* and the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and the Chronology of their Early Sources." *Comparative Drama* 14 (1980): 46–69.
- Black, Max. "Metaphor," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 19 (1954): 273–94. Reprinted in Max Black. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and*

- Philosophy*, pp. 25–47. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962.
- . “More about Metaphor.” In *Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Andrew Ortony, pp. 19–43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Bona, Giovanni Cardinal. *Rerum liturgicarum libri duo*. Rome: N. A. Tinassij, 1671.
- The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Translated by Theodore G. Tappert. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959.
- Borgerhoff, Joseph L. *Le théâtre anglais à Paris sous la Restauration*. Paris: Hachette, 1912.
- Boynton, Susan. “Performative Exegesis in the Fleury *Interfectio Puerorum*.” *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 29 (1998): 39–64.
- . *Shaping a Monastic Identity: Liturgy and History at the Imperial Abbey of Farfa, 1000–1125*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.
- Boys, John. *An Exposition of Al the Principall Scriptures Used in our English Liturgie Together with a Reason why the Church did chuse the same*. London: Aspley, 1609.
- Brandt, Joseph A. “Literary Landmarks of 1937.” *Books Abroad* 12 (1938): 28–35.
- Breviarium Parisiensis. Pars hiemalis*. Paris, 1736.
- Breviarium Parisiensis. Pars hiemalis*. Paris, 1836.
- Brisac, Catherine and Jean-Michel Léniaud, “Adolphe-Napoléon Didron ou les media au service de l’art chrétien.” *Revue de l’Art* 77 (1987): 33–42.
- Brockett, Clyde W. “Easter Monday Antiphons and the ‘Peregrinus’ Play.” *Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch* 61/62 (1977–1978): 29–46.
- . “A Previously Unknown *Ordo Prophetarum* in a Manuscript Fragment in Zagreb.” *Comparative Drama* 27 (1993): 114–27.
- Brooks, Neil C. “Eine liturgisch-dramatische Himmelfahrtsfeier.” *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 62 (1925): 91–96.
- . “German Hymns before the Reformation.” *Modern Language Notes* 25 (1910): 105–8.
- . “The Lamentation of Mary in the Frankfort Group of Passion Plays.” *The Journal of English and German Philology* 3 (1900–1901): 415–30.
- . “Liturgical Easter Plays from Rheinau Manuscripts.” *The Journal of English and German Philology* 10 (1911): 191–96.
- . “Neue lateinische Osterfeiern.” *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 50 (1908): 297–312.
- . “Osterfeiern aus Bamberger und Wolfenbüttler Handschriften.” *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 55 (1914): 52–61.
- . Review of *Drama and Liturgy* by Oscar Cargill. *The Journal of English and German Philology* 30 (1931): 433–39.
- . Review of *Kultspiele der Germanen als Ursprung des mittelalterlichen Dramas* by Robert Sumpff. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 37 (1938): 300–305.
- . “A Rheinau Easter Play.” *The Journal of English and German Philology* 26

- (1927): 226–36.
- . *The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy*. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 7/2. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1921.
- . “The *Sepulchrum Christi* and its Ceremonies in Late Mediaeval and Modern Times.” *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 27 (1926): 147–61.
- . “Some New Texts of Liturgical Easter Plays.” *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 8 (1909): 463–88.
- Bunzel, Joseph H. Review of *The Origin of the Theater* by Benjamin Hunnigher. *Books Abroad* 31 (1957): 86.
- Bynner, Witter. “Karl Young.” *The Yale University Library Gazette* 23 (1949), 145–47.
- Caldwell, Mary C. “*Pax Gallie*: The Songs of Tours 927.” In *The Jeu d’Adam: MS Tours 927 and the Provenance of the Play*, edited by Christophe Chaguin-ian. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, forthcoming 2017.
- Campbell, Oscar James. “Karl Young.” *College English* 5 (1944): 222.
- Campbell, Thomas and Clifford Davidson, eds. *The Fleury Playbook: Essays and Studies*. Early Drama, Art, and Music Monograph Series 7. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, 1985.
- Cargill, Oscar. “The Authorship of the *Secunda Pastorum*.” *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 41 (1926): 810–31.
- . “Carl Sandburg, Crusader and Mystic.” *The English Journal* 39 (1950): 177–84.
- . “The Date of the A-Text of *Piers Ploughman*.” *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 47 (1932): 354–62.
- . *Drama and Liturgy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1930.
- . *Intellectual America; Ideas on the March*. New York: Macmillan, 1941.
- . “The Langland Myth.” *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 50 (1935): 36–56.
- . *The Novels of Henry James*. New York: Macmillan, 1961.
- . *O’Neill and His Plays: Four Decades of Criticism*. New York: New York University Press, 1961.
- . *The Social Revolt: American Literature from 1888 to 1914*. New York: Macmillan, 1933.
- . *Thomas Wolfe: Three Decades of Criticism*. New York: New York University Press, 1968.
- . *Toward a Pluralistic Criticism*. Carbondale IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965.
- Carlson, Marvin A. *Theories of the Theatre: A Historical and Critical Survey from the Greeks to the Present*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984.
- Caron, Auguste-Pierre. *Notice historique sur les rites de l’Église de Paris*. Paris: Le Clere, 1846.
- Carr, Amelia J. “Visual and Symbolic Imagery in the Twelfth-century Tegernsee *Ludus de Antichristo*.” Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1984.

- Cassander, Georg. *Liturgica de ritu et ordine dominicae coenae celebrandae, quam celebrationem Graeci Liturgian [sic], Latini Missam appellarunt, ex variis monumentis & prebatis scriptoribus collecta*. Cologne: Birkmann, 1558.
- Castellani, Alberto de. *Liber sacerdotalis*. Venice: Rabanis, 1523.
- . *Liber sacerdotalis*. Venice: Rabanis, 1537.
- Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the Years 1882–1887*. London: British Museum, 1889.
- Cattin, Giulio and Anna Vildera. *Il “Liber Ordinarius” della Chiesa Padovana*, 2 vols. Padua: Istituto per la Storia Ecclesiastica Padovana, 2002.
- Chaguinian, Christophe. *Le Jeu d’Adam: Introduction, édition, traduction et commentaire*. Orléans: Éditions-Paradigme, 2014.
- Chailley, Jacques. “Le drame liturgique médiéval à Saint-Martial de Limoges.” *Revue de l’histoire du théâtre* 7 (1955): 127–44.
- Chambers, Edmond K. *The Mediaeval Stage*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Champollion-Figeac, Jacques Joseph. *Hilarii Versus et Ludi*. Paris: Société des bibliophiles français, 1838.
- Charnage, François-Ignace Dunod de. *Histoire de l’église, ville et diocèse de Besançon*. 2 vols. Besançon: Daclin, 1750.
- Chevalier, Ulysse. *Ordinaire et coutumier de l’église cathédrale de Bayeux*. Paris: Picard, 1902.
- . *Repertorium Hymnologicum*, 2 vols. Louvain: Polleunis & Ceuterick, 1892–1897.
- Chupungco, Anscar J. *Handbook for Liturgical Studies: Fundamental Liturgy*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1988.
- . *What, Then is Liturgy?* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2010.
- Church of England. *The Book of Common-Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies Of the Church, According to the Use of the Church of England, Together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, Pointed as they are to be Sung or said in Churches: And the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, & Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*. Cambridge: John Field, 1662.
- . *Liturgia Anglicana, Seu Liber precum publicarum, Seu Ministerii Ecclesiasticae administrationis Sacramentorum, atiorum que Rituum et Caeremoniarum in Ecclesia Anglicana*. London: Thomas Vautrotterius, 1574.
- Cibber, Colley. *The History of the Stage. In which is included, The Theatrical Characters of the most celebrated Actors who have adorn’d the Theatre, Together with the Theatrical Life of Colly Cibber*. London: J. Miller, 1742.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Officiis*. Edited by M. Winterbottom. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- . *On Duties (De officiis)*. Translated by Walter Miller. Loeb Classical Library 21, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Library, 1913.
- . *On Obligations (De officiis)*. Translated by Patrick Gerard Walsh. Oxford:

- Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Clark, Robert L. A. "From Cultic to Cultural Practice: The Human Sciences in the Work of C. Clifford Flanigan." *ROMARD* 52/53 (2014): 5–16.
- . ed. *The Ritual Life of Medieval Europe: Papers by and for C. Clifford Flanigan*. *ROMARD* 52/53 (2014).
- Clément, Félix. *Histoire générale de la musique religieuse*. Paris: Le Clere, 1860.
- . "Liturgie, musique et drame du Moyen Âge." *Annales archéologiques* 7 (Dec. 1847): 303–20—"L'Avent et Noël"; 8 (Jan. 1848): 36–48—"Circoncision—Épiphanie"; (Feb. 1848): 77–87—"Mercredi des cendres—Carême"; continued as "Le drame liturgique" (Sep.–Dec. 1848): 304–11—"Dimanche des rameaux"; 9 (Jan.–Feb. 1849): 27–40—"La Semaine sainte"; (May–Jun. 1849): 162–74—"Le jour de Pâques"; 10 (May–Jun. 1850): 154–60—"Semaine de Pâques"; 11 (Jan.–Feb. 1851): 6–15—"L'Ascension—La Pentecôte."
- Clopper, Lawrence. *Drama, Play, and Game: English Festive Culture in the Medieval and Early Modern Period*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- . Review of *The Medieval European Stage 500–1500* edited by William Tydeman, et al. *Speculum* 79 (2004): 848–51.
- . and Claus Clüver. "Memorial Resolution: Professor C. Clifford Flanigan (August 2, 1941 – October 27, 1993)." Indiana University Bloomington Faculty Council Circular B05-1995 (4 October 1994). URL: <http://webapp1.dlib.indiana.edu/bfc/view?docId=B05-1995> (accessed August 17, 2013).
- Clüver, Claus. "In Memoriam C. Clifford Flanigan." *ROMARD* 52/53 (2014): 23–26.
- Coffman, George R. Review of *Drama and Liturgy* by Oscar Carghill [sic]. *Speculum* 6 (1931): 610–17.
- , George La Piana, and J. S. P. Tatlock. "Memoir of Karl Young." *Speculum* 20 (1945): 382–83. Reprinted in Wilmarth Lewis et al., *A Memoir of Karl Young*, pp. 11–14. New Haven: Privately Published, 1946.
- Coldeway, John C. "From Roman to Renaissance in Drama and Theatre." *The Cambridge History of British Theatre: Origins to 1660*, edited by Jane Milling and Peter Thomson, pp. 3–69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . "'Plays' and 'Play' in Early English Drama." *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 29 (1986): 181–88.
- Coleman, William E. *Philippe de Mézières' Campaign for the Feast of Mary's Presentation*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981.
- Collier, Jeremy. *A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage: Together with The Sense of Antiquity upon this Argument*. London: S. Keble, 1698. Reprint New York: Garland, 1972.
- Combe, Pierre, OSB. *Histoire de la restauration du chant grégorien d'après les documents inédits: Solesmes et l'Édition Vatican*. Solesmes: Abbaye de Solesmes,

1969. Translated. by Theodore Marier and William Skinner as *The Restoration of Gregorian Chant: Solesmes and the Vatican Edition*. Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1983.
- Congreve, William. *Amendments of Mr. Collier's False and Imperfect Citations*. London: J. Tonson, 1698. Reprint New York: Garland, 1972.
- Corpus Reformatorum*. 101 vols. Halle: C. A. Schwetschke, 1834–.
- Coussemaeker, Charles Edmond de. *Chant populaires des Flamands de France*. Ghent: F. et E. Gyselynck, 1856.
- . “Drame liturgique.” *Annales archéologiques* 11 (1851): 197–212.
- . *Drames liturgiques du Moyen Âge*. Rennes: Vatar, 1860. Reprint New York: Broude Bros., 1964.
- . *Histoire de l'harmonie au Moyen Âge*. Paris: Didron, 1852. Reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1966.
- . *Les harmonistes des XIIe et XIIIe siècle*. Lille: Lefebvre-Ducrocq, 1864.
- . *Les harmonistes des XIVe siècle*. Lille: Lefebvre-Ducrocq, 1869.
- . *Hucbald moine de St.-Amand et ses traités de la musique*. Douai: Société d'agriculture, sciences et arts, 1841.
- . *Oeuvres complètes du trouvère Adam de la Halle*. Paris: Durand et Pédone-Lauriel, 1872.
- . *Office du sépulcre selon l'usage de l'abbaye d'Origny-Sainte-Benoîte*. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1858.
- . *Scriptorum de musica mediæ aevi novam seriem a Gerbertina alteram collegit nuncque primum*. 4 vols. Paris: Durand, 1864–1876.
- . *Troubles religieux du XVIe siècle dans la Flandre maritime (1560–1570)*. 4 vols. Bruges: Zuttere, 1876.
- Coussemaeker-Robais, Solange de. “Comité flamand de France. Une société frontalière et régionaliste 1853–1940. Ph.D. dissertation, Sorbonne/University of Leiden, 2010.
- Creizenach, Wilhelm. *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*. 1st ed. 5 vols. Halle: Niemayer, 1893.
- Crocker, Richard. *An Introduction to Gregorian Chant*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Crombach, Hermann. *Primitæ Gentium, seu Historia SS. Trium Regum Magorum Evangelicorum et Encomium*. 3 vols. Cologne: Kinchius, 1654.
- D'Ancona, Allassandro. *Origini del Teatro italiano*. 2 vols. Turin: Loescher, 1891.
- Dainat, Holger and Lutz Dannenberg. *Literaturwissenschaft und Nationalsozialismus*. Tübingen: Niemayer, 2003.
- Danjou, Félix. “Découverte d'un exemplaire complet et authentique de l'antiphonaire grégorien.” *Revue de musique religieuse* 3 (1847): 385–97.
- . “Le théâtre religieux et populaire au XIIIe siècle: Mystère de Daniel.” *Revue de musique religieuse* 4 (1848): 65–78, edition after p. 81.
- Darwin, Charles. *On the Origin of Species. Or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. London: John Murray, 1859.

- Davis, Lisa Fagin. *The Gottschalk Antiphonary: Music and Liturgy in Twelfth-Century Lambach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Davril, Anselm. "Johann Drumbl and the Origins of the *Quem Queritis*: A Review Article." *Comparative Drama* 20 (1986): 65–75.
- Dawes, Gregory. *The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Interpretation of Ephesians 5: 21–33*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- De Bartholomaeis, Vincenzo. *Origini della poesia drammatica italiana*. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1924.
- De Boor, Helmut. *Die Textgeschichte der lateinischen Osterfeiern*. Tübingen: Niemayer, 1967.
- Dehaines, l'Abbé. "Notice sur la vie et les travaux de M. E. de Coussemaker." Preface to Coussemaker, *Troubles religieux*, vol 1, i–xxv.
- Deitl, Cora. *Die Dramen Jacob Locher und Humanistenbühne in süddeutschen Raum*. Berlin, De Gruyter, 2005.
- De la Baume le Blanc, Louis César, duc de la Vallière. *Bibliothèque du théâtre François, depuis son origine*. Paris: Laurent-François Prault, 1733. Revised edition in 3 vols., 1768.
- De la Croix, Jean François. *Dictionnaire historique des cultes religieux, établis dans le monde depuis son origine jusqu'à présent*. 3 vols. Paris: Vincent, 1770.
- Delisle, Léopold. *Bibliotheca Bigotiana manuscripta. Catalogue des manuscrits rassemblés au XVIIe siècle par les Bigot*. Rouen: H. Boissel, 1877.
- . *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque impériale; étude sur la formation de ce dépôt comprenant les éléments d'une histoire de la calligraphie de la miniature, de la reliure, et du commerce des livres à Paris avant l'invention de l'imprimerie*. 3 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1868–1881. Reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1978.
- Dennis, John. *The Usefulness of the Stage, To the Happiness of Mankind, To Government, and to Religion. Occasioned by a late Book, written by Jeremy Collier, M.A.* London: Richard Parker, 1698.
- D'Ortigue, Joseph Louis. *Dictionnaire liturgique, historique et théorique de plainchant et de musique d'Église, au Moyen Âge et dans les temps modernes*. Nouvelle encyclopédie théologique, ou deuxième série de dictionnaires sur toutes les parties de la science religieuse 29, edited by J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1854. Reprint New York: Da Capo, 1971.
- De Vries, Hugo. *Die Mutationstheorie. Versuche und Beobachtungen über die Entstehung von Arten im Pflanzenreich*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Von Veit, 1901–1903. Translated by J. B. Farmer and D. D. Darbishire as *The Mutation Theory. Experiments and Observations on the Origin of Species in the Vegetable Kingdom*. 2 vols. Chicago: Open Court, 1909–1910.
- Didron, Adolphe-Napoléon. *Histoire de Dieu*. Iconographie chrétienne 1. Paris: Didron, 1843 (only 1 volume published).
- . *Manuel d'iconographie chrétienne grecque et latine*. Paris: Imprimerie royale, 1845.

- . *Manuel des oeuvres de bronze et d'orfèvrerie*. Paris: Didron, 1859.
- . and William Burges. *Venise: Iconographie des chapiteaux du palais ducal de Venise*. Paris: Didron, 1857.
- Diller, Hans-Jürgen. *Redeformen des englischen Misterienspiels*. Munich: Fink, 1973. Translated by Frances Wessels as *The Middle English Mystery Play: A Study in Dramatic Speech and Form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Dix, Gregory. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. 2nd ed. Glasgow: University Press, 1945.
- Docen, Bernhard Joseph. *Miscellaneen zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur, neu- aufgefundenene Denkmäler der Sprache, Poesie und Philosophie unsrer Vor- fahren enthaltend*. 2 vols. Munich: Scherer, 1807.
- Dolan, Diane. *Le drame liturgique de Pâques en Normandie et en Angleterre au Moyen-Âge*. Publications de l'Universitaire de Poitiers Lettres et sciences humaines 16. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1975.
- Donovan, Richard. *The Liturgical Drama in Medieval Spain*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1958.
- Douhet, Jules comte de. *Dictionnaire des mystères, ou collection générale des mys- tères, moralités, rites figurées et cérémonies singulières*. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1854. Reprint Turnhout: Brepols, 1989.
- Dox, Donnalee. *The Idea of the Theater in Latin Christian Thought*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.
- Dreves, Guido, Clemens Blume, and Henry Bannister, eds., *Analecta hymnica medii aevi*, 55 vols. Imprint varies, 1854–1919.
- Drumbl, Johann. *Quem Quaeritis: Teatro Sacro dell'Alto Medioevo*. Rome, Bul- zoni, 1981.
- Du Cange, Charles de Fresne. *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinita- tis*, 3 vols. Paris: Billaine, 1678.
- . and Pierre Carpentier. *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinitatis: ex magnis Glossariis Caroli Du Fresne, Domini Du Cange, et Carpentarii in compendium redactum*, 6 vols. Halle: Gebauer, 1772–1784.
- Du Méril, Édélstand. *Origines latines du théâtre moderne*. Paris: Franck, 1849.
- Durand, William. *Guillemi Duranti Rationale divinatorum officiorum*. Edited by Anselm Davril and Timothy M. Thibodeau. 3 vols. CCCM 140, 140a, and 140b. Turnhout: Brepols, 1995–2000.
- . *The Rationale divinatorum officiorum of William Durand of Mende. A new translation of the prologue and Book 1*. Translated by Timothy M. Thibodeau. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
- . *William Durand on the Clergy and their Vestments. A New Translation of Books 2–3 of the Rationale divinatorum officiorum*. Translated by Timothy M. Thibodeau. Chicago: University of Scranton Press, 2010.
- . *Rationale IV. On the Mass and Each Action Pertaining to it*. Translated by Timothy M Thibodeau. Corpus Christianorum in Translation 14. Turn- hout: Brepols, 2013.

- . *Rationale V. Commentary on the Divine Office*. Translated by Timothy M Thibodeau. Corpus Christianorum in Translation 23. Turnhout: Brepols, 2015.
- Duranti, Jean Étienne. *De ritibus ecclesiae catholicae libri tres*. Rome: Typographia Vaticana, 1591.
- Eckart, Wolfgang, Volker Selin, and Elke Wolgast, eds. *Die Universität Heidelberg im Nationalsozialismus*. Heidelberg: Springer, 2006.
- Edwards, Cyril. "Censoring Sigfried's Love Life: The *Nibelungenlied* in the Third Reich." In *Mythos—Sage—Erzählung: Gedenkschrift für Alfred Ebenbauer*, edited by Johannes Keller and Florian Kragl, pp. 87–103. Vienna: Vienna University Press, 2009.
- Eisenberg, Michael. "Performing the Passion: Music, Ritual, and the Eastertide Labyrinth." *Trans. Revista Transcultural de Música* 13 (2009). Available online at <http://www.sibetrans.com/trans/articulo/59/performing-the-passion-music-ritual-and-the-eastertide-labyrinth>.
- Eliot, George (Mary Ann Evans). *Middlemarch: A Study of Provincial Life*. 8 vols. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1871–1872.
- Elliott, John R., Jr. "The Shakespeare Berlioz Saw." *Music and Letters* 57 (1976): 292–308.
- Ellis, Katherine. *Interpreting the Musical Past*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Emerson, John, Kenneth Levy, and David Hiley. "Plainchant" In *New Grove Dictionary*, 19:825–87.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 3rd ed. 18 vols. Edinburgh: A. Bell and C. Macfarquhar, 1788–97.
- Enders, Jody. "Liturgical Plays," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 2nd ed. Supplement 2011. Farmington Hills, MI: Gale, 2011, 2:488–89.
- . *Rhetoric and the Origins of Medieval Drama*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Engelhardt, Christian Moritz. *Herrad von Landsperg, Aebtissin zu Hohenburg, oder St. Odilien, im Elsaß im zwölften Jahrhundert; und ihr Werk: Hortus Deliciarum. Ein Beytrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften, Literatur, Kunst, Kleidung, Waffen und Sitten des Mittelalters*. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1818.
- Enos, Theresa, ed., *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition: Communication from Ancient Times to the Information Age*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Virginis Matris apud Lauretum cultae Liturgia*. Basel: Ioan-nem Frobenium, 1523. Translated in *Spiritualia and Pastoralia*, edited by John W. O'Malley and Louis A. Perraud. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.
- Eveillon, Jacques. *De processionalibus ecclesiasticis liber. In quo earum institutio, significatio, ordo & ritus, ex sacris Scripturis, Conciliis, & variorum Aucto-rum scriptis, explicantur*. Paris: M. Guillemot, 1641.
- Evers, Ute. "The *Quem queritis* in Venice." Paper presented at the *Medieval/Re-*

- naissance Music Conference*. Birmingham, UK, July 2014.
- . and Johannes Janota. *Die Melodien der lateinischen Osterfeiern. Editionen und Kommentare*. 2 vols. in 4. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.
- Evitt, Regula Meyer. "Anti-Judaism and the Medieval Prophet Plays: Exegetical Contexts for the 'Ordines Prophetarum.'" Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1992.
- Fassler, Margot. "The Feast of Fools and *Danielis Ludus*: Popular Tradition in a Medieval Cathedral Play," In *Plainsong in the Age of Polyphony*, edited by Thomas Forrest Kelly, pp. 65–99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Fauriel, Claude-Charles. *Histoire de la Gaule méridionale sous la domination des conquérants Germains*. 4 vols. Paris, Paulin, 1836.
- . *Histoire de la poésie provençale*. 3 vols. Paris: Paulin, 1846. Vol. 1 and part of vol. 2 translated by G. C. Adler as *History of Provençal Poetry*. New York: Haskell House, 1860.
- Feillée, François de la. *Méthode nouvelle pour apprendre parfaitement les règles du plain-chant et de la psalmodie*. Poitiers: J. Faulcon, 1748.
- Fichte, Jörg A. *Expository Voices in Medieval Drama: Essays on the Mode and Function of Dramatic Exposition*, Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft 53. Nürnberg: Hans Karl, 1975.
- Flanigan, C. Clifford. "The Fleury Playbook and the Traditions of Medieval Latin Drama." *Comparative Drama* 18 (1984–1985): 348–72.
- . "From Popular Performance Genre to Literary Play and Back Again: The Literary Appropriation of Medieval Vernacular Drama." *ROMARD* 52/53 (2014): 103–9.
- . "Karl Young and *The Drama of the Medieval Church*: An Anniversary Appraisal." *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 27 (1984): 157–66.
- . "The Liturgical Context of the *Quem Queritis* Trope." *Comparative Drama* 8 [Studies in Medieval Drama in Honor of William L. Smoldon on his 82nd Birthday] (1975): 46–62.
- . "Liturgical Drama and Its Tradition: A Review of Scholarship 1965–1975." *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 18 (1975): 81–102 and 19 (1976): 109–36.
- . "Medieval Latin Music-drama." In *The Theatre of Medieval Europe: New Research in Early Drama*, edited by Eckehard Simon, pp. 21–41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- . "Medieval Liturgy and the Arts: Visitatio Sepulchri as Paradigm," In *Liturgy and the Arts in the Middle Ages. Studies in Honor of C. Clifford Flanigan*, edited by Eva Louise Lillie and Nils Holger Petersen, pp. 9–35. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 1996.
- . "*Quid Quaeritis, O Clerici?* A Review of Some Recent Scholarship on the Medieval Latin Music Drama." *ROMARD* 52/53 (2014): 35–60.

- . “Rachel and her Children: From Biblical Text to Music Drama.” In *Metamorphosis and the Arts: Proceedings of the Second Lilly Conference held at Indiana University February 22–24*, edited by Breon Mitchel, pp. 31–52. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1979.
- . “The Roman Rite and the Origins of Liturgical Drama.” *University of Toronto Quarterly* 43 (1974): 263–84.
- . Kathleen Ashley, and Pamela Sheingorn, “Liturgy as Social Performance.” In *The Liturgy of the Medieval Church*, 2nd ed., edited by Thomas J. Heffernan and E. Ann Matter, pp. 635–52. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, 2005.
- Foley, Edward B. *The First Ordinary of the Royal Abbey of St.-Denis in France. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 526*. Fribourg: The University Press, 1990.
- Fosbroke, Thomas Dudley. *British Monachism: or, Manners and Customs of the Monks and Nuns of England*. 2nd ed. London: John Nichols, Son, and Bentley, 1817.
- Frank, Grace. Review of *Drama and Liturgy* by Oscar Cargill. *Modern Language Notes* (1931): 62–64.
- Franklin, R. W. *Nineteenth-Century Churches: The History of a New Catholicism in Württemberg, England, and France*. New York: Garland, 1987.
- Frisi, Antonio Francesco. *Memorie storiche di Monza e sua corte*. 3 vols. Milan: Gaetano Motto, 1794.
- Fuller, Sarah. “The Myth of ‘Saint Martial’ Polyphony: A Study of the Sources.” *Musica Disciplina* 33 (1979), 5–26.
- Gastoué, Amédée. *Les anciens chants liturgiques des églises d’Apt et du Comtat*. Grenoble: Brotel, 1903.
- Gautier, Léon. *Histoire de la poésie liturgique au Moyen Âge—les tropes*. Paris: V. Palmé et A. Picard, 1886. Reprint Ridgewood, NJ: Gregg, 1966.
- . “Origines du théâtre moderne.” *Le monde* 13/195 (16–17 Aug. 1872): 1–2; 13/204 (28 Aug. 1872): 1; 13/206 (30 Aug. 1872): 1–2; and 13/210 (4 Sep. 1872): 1–2.
- Génébrard, Gilbert. *Traicté de la liturgie ou S. messe selon l’usage et forme des apostres, & de leur disciple Sainct Denys, apostre des François*. Paris: Jean Le Blanc, 1594.
- Gerbert, Martin. *Monumenta veteris liturgiae Alemannicae*. 2 vols. St. Blasien: Typis San-Blasianis, 1777–1779.
- . *Vetus liturgia Alemannica*. 3 vols. St. Blasien: Typis San-Blasianis, 1776.
- Gibson, James M. “The Place of the ‘Quem Queritis in Presepe’ Trope in Medieval Liturgical Drama.” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1976.
- . “*Quem queritis in presepe*: Christmas Drama or Christmas Liturgy?,” *Comparative Drama* 15 (1981/1982): 343–65.
- Gosson, Stephen, *The ephemerides of Phialo: deuided into three bookes. The first, a method which he ought to follow that desireth to rebuke his freend, when he seeth him swarue: without kindling his choler, or hurting himselfe. The*

- seconde, a canuazado to courtiers in foure pointes. The thirde, the defence of a curtezan ouerthrowen. And a short apologie of the Schoole of abuse, against poets, pipers, players, & their excusers.* London: Thomas Woodcocke, 1579.
- Gottlieb, Theodor. *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Österreichs: Niederösterreich*. 2 vols. Vienna: A. Holzhausen, 1915.
- Green, Rosalie, ed. *Hortus Deliciarum of Herrad of Hohenbourg (Landsberg, 1176–96): A Reconstruction*. 2 vols. London: Warburg Institute, 1979.
- Griffiths, Fiona. *The Garden of Delights: Reform and Renaissance for Women in the Twelfth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Haller, Robert S. *Figurative Representation of the Presentation of the Virgin Mary in the Temple*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1971.
- Halliwell, Stephen. *Aristotle's Poetics*. London: Duckworth, 1998.
- Hamilton, Sarah. *The Practice of Penance, 900–1050*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: Boydell, 2001.
- Hanuš, Ignác Jan. *Die lateinisch-böhmischen Oster-Spiele des 14–15. Jahrhunderts*. Prague: C. Bellmann, 1863.
- Hardison, O. B. Jr. *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages: Essays in the Origin and Early History of Modern Drama*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1965.
- Harris, Jesse H. *John Bale: A Study in the Minor Literature of the Reformation*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1940.
- Harris, Max. *Sacred Folly: A New History of the Feast of Fools*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011.
- Hase, Karl. *Das geistliche Schauspiel: Geschichtliche Uebersicht*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1858. Translated by A. W. Jackson as *Miracle Plays and Sacred Dramas: A Historical Survey*. London: Trübner, 1880.
- Hawkins, Thomas. *The Origin of the English Drama*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1773.
- Heiserman, Arthur. Review of *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages*, by O. B. Hardison, Jr. *Modern Philology* 65 (1968): 241–44.
- Hennig, Ursula. "Die lateinisch-liturgische Grundlage der tschechnischen Marienspiele." *Zeitschrift für deutschen Philologie* 96 (1977): 89–102.
- . Review of *Quem Quaeritis: Teatro Sacro dell'Alto Medioevo* by Johann Drumbl. *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 113 (1984): 60–67.
- Hesbert, René-Jean. *Corpus Antiphonalium Officii*. 6 vols. Rome: Herder, 1963–1969.
- Hild, Elaine Stratton. "Editing a Disappearing Genre: Challenges and Possibilities for Current Collections of 'Liturgical Drama.'" Paper presented at *Ars edendi: The Arts of Editing: Past, Present, and Future*, Stockholm University, 17–19 August 2016.
- Hiley, David. "Neo-Gallican Chant." In *New Grove Dictionary*, 17:755–56.
- . "Sources, MS, IV: Organum and Discant." In *New Grove Dictionary*, 23:871–72.

- . *Western Plainchant: A Handbook*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Hilka, Alfons, Otto Schumann, and Günter Berndt, eds. *Carmina Burana: die Lieder der Benediktbeuer Handschrift*, 5th ed. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch-Verlag, 1991.
- Hoeynck, F. A. *Geschichte der kirchlichen Liturgie des Bistums Augsburg*. Augsburg: Huttler, 1889.
- Hoffman von Fallersleben, Heinrich. *Fundgruben für Geschichte deutscher Sprache und Litteratur*. 2 vols. Breslau: Grass, Bart, und Conf., 1830–1837.
- Holliday, Joan A. “Palmesel,” In *Medieval Germany: An Encyclopedia*, edited by John M. Jeep, pp. 631–33. New York, Garland, 2001.
- Honders, A. C., ed. *Valerandus Pollanus Liturgia Sacra (1551–1555)*. *Opnieuw Uitgegeven en van een Inleiding Voorzien*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Hone, William. *Ancient Mysteries Described*. London: W. Hone, 1823.
- Hughes, Andrew. “Liturgical Drama: Falling between the Disciplines.” In *The Theatre of Medieval Europe: New Research in Early Drama*, edited by Eckhard Simon, pp. 42–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- . *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- Huglo, Michel. “Analyse codicologique des drames liturgiques de Fleury (Orléans, Bibliothèque municipale, 201).” In *Calames et cahiers: Mélanges de codicologie et de paléographie offerts à Léon Gilissen*, edited by Jacques Lemaire and Émile van Balberghe, pp. 61–78. Brussels: Centre d’étude des manuscrits, 1985.
- . *Les manuscrits du processionnal*. 2 vols. *Repertoire International des Sources Musicales*, vol. BXIV-2. Munich: Henle, 1999–2004.
- Hunningher, Benjamin. *The Origin of the Theater*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1955.
- Hussman, Heinrich. *Tropen- und Sequenzenhandschriften*. *Repertoire International des Sources Musicales*, vol. BVI. Munich: Henle, 1964.
- Imbert, M. *Nouvelle méthode, ou Principes raisonnés du plein-chant*. Paris: Ballard, 1780.
- Isidore of Seville, *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*. Edited by Christopher M. Lawson. Turnhout: Brepols, 1989.
- . *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*. Translated by Thomas L. Knoebel. Mahwah, NJ: Newman Press, 2008.
- Iversen, Gunilla. “Aspects of the Transmission of the *Quem Quaeritis*.” *Text 3* (1987): 155–82.
- . *Corpus Troporum 7, Tropes de l’ordinaire de la messe, Tropes du Sanctus*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990.
- . “Music as *Ancilla verbi* and Words as *Ancilla musicae*. On the Interpretation of the Musical and Textual Forms of the Two Tropes to *Osanna in excelsis: Laudes deo* and *Trinitas, unitas, deitas*.” In *Liturgische Tropen. Referate zweier Colloquien des Corpus Troporum in München [1983] und Canterbury [1984]*, edited by Gabriel Silagi, pp. 45–66. Münchener Beiträge zur

- Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung 36. Munich: Arbeo, 1985.
- . Gunilla Björkvall, and Ritva Jonnson. *Corpus Troporum 3: Tropes du propre de la messe 2. Cycles de Pâques*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1982.
- John of Avranches. *Le "De officiis ecclesiasticis" de Jean d'Avranches, archevêque de Rouen (1067–1079). Étude liturgiques et publication du text inédit du manuscrit H. 304 de la Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Montpellier*. Edited by René Delamare. Paris: Picard, 1923.
- Johnson, Mark, ed. *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981.
- . *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reasoning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Joigny, Jacques de (Pamelius). *Liturgica latinorum*. 2 vols. Cologne: Calenium, 1571. Reprint Farnborough: Gregg, 1970.
- Jones, D. Mervyn. Review of *The Origin of the Theater* by Benjamin Hunningher. *The Classical Review* 6 (1956): 316.
- Jones, David. *A theatre of wars, between England and France, in all the king's reigns, from the time of William the Conqueror to the conclusion of the peace of the 10th. of September 1697*. London: W. Whitehood, 1698.
- Jonnson, Ritva. *Corpus Troporum 1, Tropes du propre de la messe, Cycle de Noël*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1975.
- Jouve, l'Abbé. "Du Théâtre et de ses diverse conditions, durant le Moyen Âge." *Revue de l'art chretien recueil mensuel d'archéologie religieuse* 5 (1861): 352–69.
- . "Histoire de l'harmonie au Moyen Âge." *Annales archéologiques* 10 (1850): 186–99.
- Jubinal, Achille. "Cours de M. Charles Magnin sur les origines du théâtre en Europe." *Le Mond dramatique* 1 (1835): 313–15 and 334–36; and 2 (1835): 133–36 and 225–28.
- Julian, John. *A Dictionary of Hymnology: Setting Forth the Origin and History of Christian Hymns of All Ages and Nations*. London: J. Murray, 1892.
- Jungmann, Joseph Andreas. "The Liturgies." In *Encyclopedia of Theology. A Concise Sacramentum Mundi*, edited by Karl Rahner, pp. 851–65. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- King, Norbert. *Mittelalterliche Dreikönigsspiele: Ein Grundlagenarbeit zu den lateinischen, deutschen und französischen Dreikönigsspielen und -spielszenen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg, 1979.
- Klein, David. "A Contribution to a Bibliography of the Medieval Drama." *Modern Language Notes* 20 (1905): 202–5.
- Klugseder, Robert. *Quellen des gregorianischen Chorals für das Offizium aus dem Kloster St. Ulrich und Afra Augsburg*. Tutzing: Schneider, 2008.
- Kobialka, Michal. "Holy Space and Representational Space in the Tenth Century." In *Theatre and Holy Script*, edited by Shimon Levy, pp. 11–21. Brighton and Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 1999.

- . *This Is My Body: Representational Practices in the Early Middle Ages*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002; 2nd ed. 2010.
- Kretzmann, Paul Edward. *The Liturgical Element in the Earliest Forms of the Medieval Drama with Special Reference to the English and German Plays*. University of Minnesota Studies in Language and Literature 4. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1916.
- Kühlmann, Wilhelm, "Germanistik und Deutsche Volkskunde." In *Die Universität Heidelberg im Nationalsozialismus*, edited by Wolfgang U. Eckart, Volker Sellin, and Eike Wolgast, pp. 351–70. Heidelberg: Springer, 2006.
- Kurvers, Robert G. A. *Ad Faciendum Peregrinum: A Study of the Liturgical Elements in the Latin Peregrinus Plays in the Middle Ages*. European University Studies: Series 23 (Theology), vol. 564. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996.
- Kurz, Franz. *Oesterreich unter Herzog Albrecht IV*. 2 vols. Linz: Fink, 1830.
- Lagueux, Robert. "Glossing Christmas: Liturgy, Music, Exegesis, and Drama in High Medieval Laon." Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 2004.
- . "Sermons, Exegesis, and Performance: The Laon *Ordo Prophetarum* and the Meaning of Advent." *Comparative Drama* 43 (2009): 197–220.
- Lakoff, George. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- . and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980 (2nd ed. 2003).
- . and Mark Johnson. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenges to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books, 1999.
- Lange, Carl. *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern: Untersuchungen über den Ursprung und die Entwicklung der liturgisch-dramatischen Auferstehungsfeier: mit Zugrundelegung eines umfangreichen, neuaufgefundenen Quellenmaterials*. Munich: E. Stahl, 1887.
- . *Programmabhandlung über die lateinischen Osterfeiern*. Halberstadt: C. Doelle, 1881.
- Lebeuf, l'Abbé Jean. *Dissertation sur l'histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Paris*. 3 vols. Paris: Lambert et Durand, 1739–1743.
- . "Lettre d'un solitaire à M.D.L.R., au sujet des nouveaux Livres sur les anciennes Représentations Théâtrales," *Mercure de France* (1735): 698–708.
- . "Remarques envoyée d'Auxerre, sur les Spectacles que les Ecclésiastiques ou les Religieux Donnaient anciennement au Public hors le temps de l'Office." *Mercure de France* (1729): 2981–93.
- . *Traité historique et pratique sur le chant ecclésiastique*. Paris: Herissant, 1741.
- Le Brun des Marettes, Jean-Baptiste (as "Le Sieur de Moleon"). *Voyages liturgiques de France, ou, Recherches faites en diverse villes du royaume, Contenant plusieurs particularitez touchant les Rits et les Usages des Églises: Avec des Décou-*

- vertes sur *l'Antiquité Ecclésiastique & Payenne*. Paris, F. Delaulne, 1718. Reprint Farnborough: Gregg, 1969.
- Lehtonen, Thomas M. S. *Fortuna, Money, and the Sublunar World: Twelfth-Century Ethical Poetics and the Satirical Poetry of the "Carmina Burana"*. Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society, 1995.
- Leighton, Alexander. *A Shorte Treatise against Stage-Playes*. Amsterdam: Successors of Giles Thorpe, 1625.
- Le Prévôt, Jean. *Joannis Abricensis Episcopi, diende Rotamagensis, Archiepiscopi: Liber de officiis ecclesiasticis*. Rouen: Le Brun, 1642.
- . *Joannis Abricensis Episcopi, diende Rotamagensis, Archiepiscopi: Liber de officiis ecclesiasticis*. Edited by Jean-Baptiste Le Brun des Marettes. 2nd ed. Rouen: Le Brun, 1679.
- Lescat, Philippe. *Méthodes et traités musicaux en France, 1660–1800: Réflexions sur l'écriture de la pédagogie musicale en France, suivies de catalogues systématique et chronologique, de repères biographiques et bibliographiques*. Paris: Institut de pédagogie musicale et chorégraphique, 1991.
- Lesure, François. "L'affaire Fétis." *Revue belge de musicologie/Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Muziekwetenschap* 28 (1974): 214–21.
- Lewis, Wilmarth et al. *A Memoir of Karl Young*. New Haven: Privately Published, 1946.
- Lingard, Thomas. *The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*. Newcastle: Keating, Brown, and Keating, 1806.
- Linke, Hans Jürgen and Ulrich Mehler. *Die österlichen Spiele aus der Ratsschulbibliothek Zwickau: Kritischer Text und Faksimilie der Handschrift*. Alt-deutsche Textbibliothek 103. Tübingen: Neimayer, 1990.
- Lipphardt, Walther. "Christ ist erstanden: Zur Geschichte des Liedes." *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 5 (1960): 96–114.
- . "Ein lateinisch-deutsches Osterspiel aus Augsburg (16. Jhd.) in der Bibliothek des Kapuzinerklosters Feldkirch." *Jahrbuch des Voralberger Landesmuseums-Verein* 116 (1972 [1975]): 14–29.
- . *Lateinischen Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*. 9 vols. Berlin, De Gruyter, 1976–1990.
- . *Die Weisen der lateinischen Osterspiele des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1948.
- . "Zur Herkunft der *Carmina Burana*." In *Literatur und Bildende Kunst im Tiroler Mittelalter*, edited by Egon Kühbacher, pp. 209–23. Innsbruck: Institut für Germanistik der Universität Innsbruck, 1982.
- Lippsmeyer, Elizabeth. "Devotion and Decorum: Intention and Quality in Medieval German Sculpture." *Gesta* 34 (1995): 20–27.
- . "The *Liber Ordinarius* by Konrad von Mure and Palm Sunday Observance in Thirteenth-Century Zurich." *Manuscripta* 32 (1988): 139–45.
- Lodge, Thomas. *A Reply to Stephen Gosson's Schoole of Abuse in Defence of Poetry, Musick, and Stage Plays*. Glasgow: Robert Anderson, 1579 or 1580.

- Loewen, Peter and Robin Waugh. "Mary Magdalene Preaches through Song: Feminine Expression in the Shrewsbury *Officium Resurrectionis* and in the Easter Dramas from the German Lands and Bohemia." *Speculum* 82 (2007): 595–641.
- The Lutheran Hymnal: Authorized by the synods constituting the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1941.
- The Lutheran Service Book*. St. Louis: Concordia, 2006.
- Luzarche, Victor. *Adam: Drame Anglo-Normand du XIIe siècle*. Tours: J. Bouserez, 1854.
- . *Office de Pâques ou de la resurrection*. Tours: J. Bouserez, 1856.
- Mabillon, Jean. *De liturgia Gallicana libri III.; in quibus veteris Missae, quae ante annos mille apud Gallos in usu erat, forma ritusque eruuntur ex antiquis monumentis, Lectionario Gallicano hactenus inedito, & tribus Missalibus Thomasianis, quae integra referuntur. Accedit Disquisitio de Cursu Gallicano, seu de divinorum Officiorum origine & progressu in ecclesiis Gallicanis*. Paris: Montalant, 1685.
- Máchal, Jan. *Staročeské skladby dramaticke původu liturgického*. Rozpravy České Akademie Císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, slovesnost a umění 3.23. Prague: Česká Akademie, 1908.
- Macy, Gary. *Treasures from the Storeroom: Medieval Religion and the Eucharist*. Colledgeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Magnin, Charles. *Causeries et méditations historiques et littéraires*. 2 vols. Paris: Duprat, 1843.
- . "Cours Publics. Faculté des lettres. Cours de littérature étrangère.—M. Magnin, Professeur," *Journal général de l'Instruction publique*, "Premier semestre" 4/10 (4 Dec. 1834): 45–46; 4/16 (25 Dec. 1834): 75; 4/19 (4 Jan. 1835): 90–91; 4/21 (11 Jan. 1835): 99; 4/23 (18 Jan. 1835): 106–7; 4/26 (29 Jan. 1835): 119–20; 4/29 (8 Feb. 1835): 134–35; 4/31 (15 Feb. 1835): 145; 4/33 (22 Feb. 1835): 153–54; 4/35 (1 Mar. 1835): 162; 4/39 (15 Mar. 1835): 178–79; 4/42 (26 Mar. 1835): 190–91; 4/43 (29 Mar. 1835): 194–95; 4/46 (9 Apr. 1835): 208–9; 4/48 (16 Apr. 1835): 222–23; 4/52 (30 Apr. 1835): 245–47; 4/54 (7 May 1835): 256–57; 4/57 (17 May 1835): 275–76; 4/66 (18 Jun. 1835): 328–29; "Second semestre" 4/70 (2 Jul. 1835): 351–52; 4/73 (12 Jul. 1835): 370–72; 4/77 (26 Jul. 1835): 395–96; 4/81 (9 Aug. 1835): 418–19; 4/87 (30 Aug. 1835): 455–56; 4/88 (3 Sep. 1835): 461–62; 4/91 (13 Sep. 1835): 478–80; 4/97 (4 Oct. 1835): 514–16; 4/101 (18 Oct. 1835): 539; 4/102 (22 Oct. 1834): 546–47; 5/1 (1 Nov. 1835): 4–5; 5/4 (12 Nov. 1835): 28–30; 5/6 (19 Nov. 1835): 43–45; 5/10 (29 Nov. 1835): 67–69; 5/13 (13 Dec. 1835): 99–101; 5/19 (3 Jan. 1836): 150–51; 5/22 (14 Jan. 1836): 172–73; 5/26 (28 Jan. 1836): 202–4; 5/37 (6 Mar. 1836): 292–96.
- . "Des origines du théâtre en Europe." *Revue des deux mondes*, séries 3, t. 4 (1834): 578–97.
- . "Études sur les origines du théâtre antique, pour servir d'introduction à

- l'histoire des origines du théâtre moderne," *Revue des deux mondes* séries 4, t. 13–14 (1838), 13: 681–88; and 14: 40–70
- . *Histoire des marionnettes en Europe depuis l'antiquité jusqu'à nos jours*. Paris: Michel Lévy Frères, 1862.
- . "La comédie au IV^e siècle," *Revue des deux mondes*, séries 4, t. 2 (1835): 633–73.
- . *Les origines du théâtre moderne, ou histoire du génie dramatique depuis le I^{er} jusqu'au XVI^e Siècle*. Paris: Hachette, 1838.
- . Review of *Drames liturgiques du Moyen Âge* by Edmond de Coussamaker." *Journal des savants* (1860): 309–19; and 521–40, (1861): 481–503.
- . Review of *Résumé de l'histoire littéraire du Portugal, suivi de Résumé de l'histoire littéraire du Brésil* by Ferdinand Denis. *Le Globe* 5/37 (1827): 194–96.
- . Review of *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* by Louis-Jean Nicolas Monmerqué and Francisque Michel. *Journal des savants* (1846): 5–16, 76–93, 449–65, 544–58 and 626–37; and (1847): 36–53 and 151–62.
- . *Théâtre de Hrosvitha: Religieuse allemande du Xe siècle*. Paris: Duprat, 1845.
- Manly, John M. "Literary Forms and the New Theory of Origin of the Species," *Modern Philology* 4 (1907): 577–95.
- Marnix van St. Adielgonde, Philipe van (as Isaac Robboneu van Louen), *De Biënkorf der H. Roomsche Kercke: Welck is een clare ende grondelicke wlegginghe des Sendbriefs M. Gentiani Heruit, nu corts wtbegeaen int Fransoys end int Duytsch: Ghescreven aen de afgedwaelde van het Christen gheloove*. Emden, 1569. Translated into English by George Gilpin, the Elder (1514?–1602) as *The Beehive of the Romish Church. A Comentarie upon the sixe principall pointes of Master Gentian Heruit, a Romish Catholike his booke, which is divided into sixe partes, as in the Argument doth appeare*. London: Thomas Dawson, 1579.
- Marshall, Mary. "The Dramatic Tradition Established by the Liturgical Plays." *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 56 (1941): 962–91.
- Martène, Edmond. *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus*. 4 vols. 2nd ed. Antwerp: Jean Baptiste de la Bry, 1736–1738.
- . *De antiquis monachorum ritibus*. Lyons: Anisson, Posuel et Rigaud, 1690.
- . *Tractatus de antiqua ecclesiae disciplina in divinis celebrandis officiis*. Lyons: Posuel, 1706.
- Martimort, Aimé-Georges, ed. *Principles of the Liturgy*. The Church at Prayer 1. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1987.
- . *La documentation liturgique de dom Edmond Martène. Étude codicologique*. Studi e Test 279. Vatican City: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1978.
- Mazza, Enrico. *The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of its Interpretation*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- McDonald, William A. Review of *The Origin of the Theater* by Benjamin Hunnigher. *The Classical Journal* 52 (1958): 95–96.
- Meredith, Peter. "Latin liturgical drama." In *The Medieval European Stage*:

- 500–1500, ed. William Tydeman, pp. 51–134. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Mews, Constant J. “Liturgists and Dance in the Twelfth Century: The Witness of John Belet and Sicard of Cremona.” *Church History* 78 (2009): 512–48.
- Meyer, Kathi. “Über die Melodiebildung in den geistlichen Spielen des frühen Mittelalters.” In *Beethoven-Zentenarfeier: Wien, 26. bis 31. März 1927. Veranstaltet von Bund und Stadt, unter dem Ehrenschatz des Herrn Bundespräsidenten Dr. Michael Hainisch. Internationaler Musikhistorischer Kongress*, pp. 145–48. Vienna: Universal-Edition, 1927.
- Meyer, Wilhelm. *Fragmenta Burana*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1901.
- Meyerson, Daniel. *The Linguist and the Emperor: Napoleon and Champollion’s Quest to Decipher the Rosetta Stone*. New York: Ballentine, 2005.
- Michael, Wolfgang F. *Das deutsche Drama der Reformationszeit*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1984.
- Migne, Jacques Paul, ed. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*. Series Latina. 221 vols. Paris: Migne, 1841–1864.
- Milchsack, Gustav. *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern*. Die Oster- und Passionsspiele: Literarhistorische Untersuchungen ueber den Ursprung und die Entwicklung derselbe bis zum Siebebzehnten Jahrhundert vornehmlich in Deutschland 1. Wolfenbüttel: J. Zwissler, 1880 (only 1 volume published).
- Minnis, Alastair and A. B. Scott, eds. *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism c. 1100–1375*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Mone, Franz Josef. *Schauspiele des Mittelalters aus Handschriften herausgegeben und erklärt*. 2 vols. Karlsruhe: C. Macklot, 1846.
- Monmerqué, Louis-Jean Nicolas. “Mysteria et miracula, ad scenam ordinata, in coenobiis olim, a monachis repraesentata, ex codice membranaceo XII^{mi} saeculi, in Aurelianensi Bibliotheca servato, desumpta.” In *Li jus Saint Nicolai, par Jehan Bodel*, pp. 87–213. Paris: Société des bibliophiles français, 1834.
- . and Francisque Michel. *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge*. Paris: H. Delloye, 1839.
- Monsabert, P. de. “Documents inédits pour servir à l’histoire de l’abbaye de Sainte-Croix de Poitiers.” *Revue Mabillon* 9 (1913–1914): 373–95.
- Morandi, Nausica. *L’Officium Stellae: Studio comparativo e trascrizione dei testimoni liturgico-musicali*. Florence: Edizione del Galluzzo, 2016.
- Morrison, Stanley. *English Prayer Books: An Introduction to the Literature of Christian Public Worship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Moulinet, D. “Un réseau ultramontain en France au milieu du 19^e siècle,” *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 112 (1997): 70–125.
- Muir, Lynette R. “Extra-liturgical Latin and early vernacular drama.” In *The Medieval European Stage: 500–1500*, edited by William Tydeman, 135–201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Naogeorgus, Thomas (Thomas Kirchmayer). *Regnum Papisticum*. Basel: Oporin, 1553. Translated by Barnebe Googe as *The Popish Kingdome, or reign of*

- Antichrist, written in Latine verse by Thomas Naogeorgus, and englyshed by Barnabe Googe.* London, 1570; reprint Cambridge: Chadwick-Healey, 1992.
- National Cyclopaedia of American Biography.* 63 vols. New York: James T. White, 1891–1984.
- New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed. 29 vols. ed. Stanley Sadie et al. London: Grove, 2001.
- Niceron, Jean-Pierre, Jean-Baptiste Bonardi, Joseph Bougerel, and François Oudin. *Mémoires pour servir a l'histoire des hommes illustrés dans la republique des lettres.* 43 vols. Paris: Briasson, 1729–1745.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense" In *The Portable Nietzsche*, edited by Walter Kaufmann, pp. 42–47. New York: Penguin, 1976.
- Nivers, Guillaume-Gabriel. *Dissertation sur le chant grégorien.* Paris: l'Auteur, 1683.
- . *Méthode certaine pour apprendre le plein-chant de l'Église.* Paris: Ballard, 1666.
- Norton, Michael L. "Observations on the Tours *Ludus Paschalis*." In *The Jeu d'Adam: MS Tours 927 and the Provenance of the Play*, edited by Christophe Chaguinian. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, forthcoming 2017.
- . "Of 'Stages' and 'Types' in *Visitacione Sepulchri*." *Comparative Drama* 21 (1987): 34–61 and 127–44. Reprinted in Clifford Davidson and John H. Stroupe, eds., *Drama in the Middle Ages: Comparative and Critical Essays: Second Series*, pp. 61–105. New York: AMS Press, 1991.
- . "*Sermo in Cantilena: Structure as Symbol in Imago Sancti Nicolai*." *Comparative Drama* 27 (1993): 83–99. Reprinted in Clifford Davidson and John H. Stroupe, eds., *Medieval Drama on the Continent of Europe*, pp. 83–99. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, 1993.
- . "The Type 2 *Visitatio Sepulchri: A Repertorial Study*." Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1983.
- . and Amelia J. Carr. "Liturgical Manuscripts, Liturgical Practice, and the Women of Klosterneuburg." *Traditio* 66 (2011): 67–169.
- Obsequiale secundum diocesis Augustensis morem.* Augsburg: Ratdolt, 1487.
- O'Connor, Sarah Hardison, "Exiled: A Memoir of O. B. Hardison, Jr." *The Virginia Quarterly Review* (Spring 1993), 329–43.
- Officium hebdomadae sanctae secundum consuetudinem ducalis ecclesiae Sancti Marci Venetiarum.* Venice: Antonio Bortol, 1736.
- Ogden, Dunbar. *The Staging of Drama in the Medieval Church.* Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2002.
- Operin, Johannes, ed. *Dramata sacra: Comoediae atque tragoediae aliquot e Veteri Testamento desumptae, quibus praecipuae ipsius historiae ita eleganter in scenam producuntur, ut vix quicquam in hoc argumenti genere, iuuentuti Christianae proponi utilius possit: magna parte nunc primum in lucem*

- editae: Earum vero Catalogum statim a Praefatione invenies.* 2 vols. Basel: Operin, 1547.
- Ortony, Andrew, ed. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979 (2nd ed. 1993).
- Oudoux, l'Abbé. *Méthode nouvelle pour apprendre facilement le plain-chant*. Paris: Augustin-Martin Lottin, 1772.
- Palazzo, Éric. "Performing the Liturgy." In *Early Medieval Christianities, c. 600–c. 1100*, edited by Thomas F. X. Noble and Julia M. H. Smith, pp. 472–88. *The Cambridge History of Christianity* 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Parfaict, Claude and François Parfaict. *Histoire du théâtre françois, depuis son origine jusqu'à présent*. 15 vols. Paris: Le Mercier et Saillant, 1734–1749. Reprint Geneva: Slatkin, 1967.
- Paris, Paulin. "Discours de M. Paulin Paris, vice-président de cette académie, prononcé aux funérailles de M. Magnin, le samedi 11 octobre 1862." *Bulletin de bibliophile et du bibliothécaire* 5 (1862): 1286–90.
- Parkinson, John. *Theatrum botanicum: The theatre of plants. Or, An herball of a large extent: containing therein a more ample and exact history and declaration of the physicall herbs and plants that are in other authours, encreased by the accesse of many hundreds of new, rare, and strange Plants from all the parts of the world, with sundry Gummes, and other physicall materials, than hath beene hitherto published by any before; and a most large demonstration of their Natures and Vertues. Shewing withall the many errors, differences, and oversights of sundry authors that have formerly written of them; and a certaine confidence, or most probable conjecture of the true and genuine Herbes and Plants. Distributed into sundry Classes or Tribes, for the more easie knowledge of the many Herbes of one nature and property, with the chiefe notes of Dr. Lobel, Dr. Bonham, and others inserted therein. Collected by the many yeares travaille, industry, and experience in this subject, by John Parkinson Apothecary of London, and the Kings Herbarist. And Published by the Kings Majestyes especial priviledge*. London: Cotes, 1652.
- Pascal, R. "On the Origins of the Liturgical Drama of the Middle Ages." *The Modern Language Review* 36 (1941): 369–87.
- Paululus, Robert, *De officiis ecclesiasticis*. This is given among the works of Hugh of St. Victor in PL 177:381–456.
- Pearson, Karl. *The Chances of Death and Other Studies in Evolution*. 2 vols. London: E. Arnold, 1897.
- "Personalnotizen." *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 74 (1937): 145–46.
- Petersen, Nils Holger. "Another *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Scandinavia." *Early Drama, Art, and Music Review* 14 (1991): 10–21.
- . "Biblical Reception, Representational Ritual, and the Question of 'Liturgical Drama.'" In *Sapientia et Eloquentia: Meaning and Function in Liturgical Poetry, Music, Drama, and Biblical Commentary in the Middle Ages*, edited

- by Gunilla Iversen and Nicholas Bell, pp. 163–201. Disputatio 11. Turnhout, Brepols, 2009.
- . “The Concept of Liturgical Drama: Charles-Edmond de Coussemaker and Charles Magnin.” *Études grégoriennes* 36 (2009): 305–14.
- . “The Concept of Liturgical Drama: Coussemaker and Modern Scholarship.” In *Ars Musica septentrionalis: De l’interprétation du patrimoine musical à l’historiographie*, edited by Barbara Haggh et al., pp. 59–73. Paris: Paris-Sorbonne, 2011.
- . “*Danielis Ludus* and the Latin Music Dramatic Traditions of the Middle Ages.” In *The Past in the Present: Papers Read at the IMS Intercongressional Symposium and the 10th Meeting of the CANTUS PLANUS, Budapest & Visegrád, 2000*. 2 vols. Budapest: Liszt Ferenc Academy of Music, 2003, 2:291–307.
- . “*Il Doge* and Easter Processions at San Marco in Early Modern Venice.” *Ritual Dynamics and the Science of Ritual*, edited by Gita Dharampal-Frick, Robert Langer and Nils Holger Petersen, pp. 301–11. Transfer and Spaces 5. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.
- . “Introduction.” In *Resonances: Historical Essays on Continuity and Change*, edited by Nils Holger Petersen, Eyolf Østrem, and Andreas Bückner, pp. 1–17. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011.
- . “Liturgical Drama: New Approaches.” *Bilan et perspectives des études médiévales (1993–1998), Euroconférence (Barcelone, 8–12 juin 1999)*, edited by Jacqueline Hamesse, pp. 625–44. Textes et études du Moyen Âge 22. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- . “Medieval Latin Performative Representation: Re-evaluating the State-of-the-Art.” Paper given at the 2016 Colloquium of the Société Internationale pour l’étude du théâtre medieval, Durham, UK (7–12 July).
- . “A Newly Discovered Fragment of a *Visitatio Sepulchri* in Stockholm.” *Comparative Drama* 30 (1996): 32–40.
- . “Representation in European Devotional Rituals: The Question of the Origin of Medieval Drama in Medieval Liturgy.” In *The Origins of Theater in Ancient Greece and Beyond: From Ritual to Drama*, edited by Eric Csapo and Margaret C. Miller, pp. 329–60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- . “The Representational Liturgy of the *Regularis Concordia*,” *The White Mantle of Churches. Architecture, Liturgy, and Art around the Millennium*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003): 107–17.
- Pez, Bernhard. *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*. 6 vols. Augsburg: Philippi, Martini, & Veith Brüder, 1721–1729.
- Pfeiffer, Hermann. “Klosterneuburger Osterfeier und Osterspiel.” *Jahrbuch des Stiftes Klosterneuburg* 1 (1908): 1–56
- Planchart, Alejandro Enrique. “On the Nature of Change in Trope Repertories.” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 42 (1988): 215–49.

- Poisson, l'Abbé Léonard. *Nouvelle méthode, ou Traité théorique et pratique du plain-chant*. Paris: Lottin et Butard, 1745.
- Poll, Joseph. "Ein Osterspiel enthalten in einem Prozessionale der Alten Kapelle Regensburg." *Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch* 34 (1950): pp 35–40 and 108. *Processionale ad usum Insignis ac Praeclarae Ecclesiae Sarum*. Leeds: McCorquodale, 1888.
- Pröhl, Robert. *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*. 3 vols. in 6. Leipzig: B. Schlicke, 1880–1883.
- Proudfoot, Wayne. *Religious Experience*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Prynne, William. *Histrion-mastix: The players scourge, or, actors tragedie, divided into two parts*. 2 vols. London: Sparks, 1632. Reprint New York: Garland, 1984.
- Puchner, Walter, Nicos C. Conomis, and William Coleman. *The Crusader Kingdom of Cyprus—A Theatre Province of Medieval Europe?* Athens: Academy of Athens, 2006.
- Pullain, Valérand. *Liturgia sacra, seu ritus ministerii in ecclesia peregrinorum profugorum propter Euangelium Christi Argentinae*. London: S. Mierdmann, 1551.
- . *Liturgia sacra: sive ritus ministerii in Ecclesia Peregrinorum Francofordia ad Moenum*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Brubach, 1554.
- Rainold, John. *The overthrow of Stage-Playes, By way of the controversie betwixt D. Gager and D. Rainoldes*. No publisher, 1599.
- Ramsey, J. T. *Sallust's Bellum Catilinae*. 2nd. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Rankin, Susan K. "From Liturgical Ceremony to Public Ritual: *Quem queritis* at St. Mark's Venice." In *Da Bisanzio a San Marco. Musica e Liturgia*, edited by Giulio Cattin, pp. 137–91. Quaderni di "Musica e Storia" 2. Venice: Il Mulino, 1998.
- . "Liturgical Drama." In *The Early Middle Ages to 1300*, edited by Richard Crocker and David Hiley, pp. 310–56. 2nd ed. New Oxford History of Music 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- . "The Mary Magdalene Scene in the 'Visitatio Sepulchri' Ceremonies." *Early Music History* 1 (1981): 227–55.
- . *The Music of the Medieval Liturgical Drama in France and England*. 2 vols. New York: Garland, 1989.
- . "Musical and Ritual Aspects of *Quem queritis*." In *Liturgische Tropen: Referat zweier ColloquiSmolen des Corpus Troporum in München [1983] und Canterbury [1984]*, edited by Gabriel Silagi, pp. 181–92. Munich: Arbeo, 1985.
- . "A New English Source of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*." *Journal of the Plainsong and Medieval Music Society* 4 (1981), 1–11.
- . "Ottonian Epiphanies: Liturgical Drama as Political Allegory." Unpublished paper delivered at the Royal Music Association Annual Conference

- (March 1998).
- . “‘*Quem queritis*’ en voyage in Italy.” In *Itenerari e stratificazioni dei tropi: San Marco, l’Italia settentrionale e le regioni transalpine; Testi d’un convegno e di sessioni de studio negli anni 1992–1995 presso la Fondazione Ugo e Olga Levi*, edited by Wulf Arlt and Giulio Cattin, pp. 178–207. Venice: Edizioni Fondazione Levi, 2008.
- Raynouard, François-Just-Marie. *Choix des poésies originales des troubadours*. 3 vols. Paris: Didot, 1816–1821.
- Reidt, Heinrich. *Das geistliche Schauspiel des Mittelalters in Deutschland*. Frankfurt am Main: C. Winter, 1868.
- Reynolds, Roger. “The Drama of Medieval Liturgical Processions.” *Revue de musicologie* 86 (2000): 127–42.
- Ridpath, George. *The Stage Condemn’d, and The Encouragement given to the Immoralities and Profaneness of the Theatre, by the English Schools, Universities and Pulpits, Censur’d. King Charles I. Sundays Mask and Declaration for Sports and Pastimes on the Sabbath, Largely Related and Animadverted upon. The Arguments of all the Authors that have Writ in Defence of the Stage against Mr. Collier, Consider’d. And the Sense of the Fathers, Councils, Antient Philosophers and Poets, and of the Greek and Roman Stages, and of the First Christian Emperours concerning the DRAMA Faithfully Deliver’d*. London: John Salusbury, 1698.
- Rock, Daniel. *The Church of Our Fathers as Seen in St. Osmund’s Rite for the Cathedral of Salisbury with Dissertations on the Belief and Ritual in England before and after the Coming of the Normans*. 3 vols. London: C. Dolman, 1849–1853.
- Roeder, Anke. *Die Gebärde im Drama des Mittelalters: Osterfeiern, Osterspiele*. Munich: Beck, 1974.
- Rokseth, Yvonne. “La liturgie de la passion vers la fin du Xe siècle.” *Revue de Musicologie* 32 (1950): 32–52.
- Roth-Burnette, Jennifer. “Organizing Scripture: Organum Melos, Composition, and Memoria in a Group of Notre-Dame Responsories.” Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 2010.
- Rowden, Clair. “Choral Music and Music-Making in France.” In *Nineteenth-Century Choral Music*, edited by Donna M. Di Grazia, pp. 205–12. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Rozik, Eli. *The Roots of Theatre: Rethinking Ritual and Other Theories of Origin*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2002.
- Rupert of Deutz. *De Ordine Ecclesiastico ab Adventu Domini* (PL 170).
- . *Ruperti Tuitiensis Liber de divinis officiis*, CCCM 7. Edited by Hrabanus Haack. Turnhout: Brepols, 1967.
- Ryle, Gilbert. *The Concept of Mind*. London: Hutchinson’s University Library, 1949.
- Sacks, Sheldon, ed. *On Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Sandbach, F. E. Review of *Kultspiele der Germanen als Ursprung des mittelalterli-*

- chen Dramas* by Robert Stumpff. *Modern Language Review* 32 (1937): 317–22.
- Sainte-Beuve, Charles Augustin. “Écrivains critiques et historiques et historiens littéraire de la France—Charles Magnin.” *Revue des deux mondes*, Nouvelle série, t. 4 (1843): 245–61.
- . “Un Érudit écrivain: M. Charles Magnin.” *Revue des deux mondes*, Seconde période, t. 45 (1863): 299–320.
- Schechner, Richard. *Performance Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1977.
- . and Victor Turner. *Between Theater and Anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.
- Schlager, Karlheinz. “Trinitas, unitas, deitas—A Trope for the Sanctus of Mass.” *Journal of the Plainsong and Mediaeval Music Society* 6 (1983): 8–14.
- Schmeller, Johann Andreas. *Carmina Burana: lateinische und deutsche Lieder und Gedichte einer Handschrift des XIII. Jahrhunderts aus Benedictbeuern auf der k. Bibliothek zu München*. Stuttgart: Literarischer Verein, 1847. Reprint Chicago: Argonaut, 1967.
- Schmelzeisen, Volker. “Schmackostern—Wort, Brauch und Volksglaube.” *Jahrbuch für ostdeutsche Volkskunde* 16 (1973): 104–36.
- Schmid, Toni. “Das Osterspiel in Schweden.” *Kyrkohistorisk Arsskrift* 1 (1952): 1–14.
- Schoch, Jürg. “Ein Nazi auf dem Germanistik-Lehrstuhl: Als Helmut de Boor nach dem Krieg ausgewiesen wurde, stellte sich Berns geistige Elite wie ein Mann hinter den Professor.” In *In den Hinterzimmern des Kalten Krieges: die Schweiz und ihr Umgang mit prominenten Ausländern 1945–1960*, edited by Jürg Schoch, pp. 71–93. Zurich: Orell Füssli, 2009.
- Schröder, Edward. “Schmackostern.” *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 76 (1939): 303–4.
- Schubiger, Anselm. *Musikalische Spicilegien über das liturgischen Drama, Orgelbau und Orgelspiel, das ausserliturgische Lied und die Instrumentalmusik des Mittelalters*. Publicationen älterer praktischer und theoretischer Musikwerke 5. Berlin: L. Liepmannssohn, 1876.
- Schuler, Ernst August. *Die Musik der Osterfeiern, Osterspiele und Passionen des Mittelalters*. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1951.
- Scudo, Paul. *Le chevalier Sarti*. Paris: Hachette, 1857.
- Searle, Mark. *Liturgy Made Simple*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1981.
- Selden, John. *Table-Talk: Being the Discourses of John Selden, Esq. Being his Sense of various Matters of Weight and high Consequence; relating especially to Religion and State*. Edited by Richard Milward. London: E. Smith, 1689.
- Sepet, Marius. “Les Prophètes du Christ: Étude sur les origines du théâtre au Moyen Âge.” *Bibliothèque de l’École des chartes* 28 (1867): 1–27 and 211–64; 29 (1868): 105–39 and 261–93; and 38 (1877): 397–443. Published in book form as *Les Prophètes du Christ: Étude sur les origines du théâtre au Moyen Âge*. Paris: Didier, 1878; reprint Geneva: Slatkin, 1974.

- Sicard of Cremona. *Sicardus Cremonensis Mitraxis de Officiis*. CCCM 228. Edited by Gabor Sarbak and Lorenz Weinrich. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.
- Sievers, Heinrich. *Die lateinischen liturgischen Osterspiele der Stiftskirche St. Blasien zu Braunschweig*. Wolfenbüttel: Kallmayer, 1936.
- Smither, Howard. *A History of the Oratorio*, 4 vols. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977–2000.
- Smits van Waesberghe, Josef. “A Dutch Easter Play.” *Musica Disciplina* 7 (1953): 15–37.
- . “Das Maastrichter Osterspiel. Beitrag zur Literatur der liturgischen Spiele.” *International Musicological Society: Congress Report, Basel [1949]*. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1950, 184–85.
- . “Die niederländische Osterspiel.” *International Musicological Society: Congress Report, Utrecht [1952]*. Amsterdam: Alspach, 1952, 371–76.
- Smoldon, William L. “The Easter Sepulchre Music-Drama.” *Music and Letters* 27 (1946): 1–17.
- . “Liturgical Drama.” *Early Medieval Music up to 1300*, edited by A. Hughes, pp. 175–218. *New Oxford History of Music* 2. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- . “Mediaeval Music-Drama.” *Musical Times* 94 (1953): 557–60.
- . *The Music of the Mediaeval Music Dramas*. Edited by Cynthia Bourgeault. London: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Soane, George. *New Curiosities of Literature and Book of the Months*. 2 vols. London: Churton, 1847.
- Sponsler, Claire. “Cliffnotes: Performance, Pedagogy, and the Medieval Past.” *ROMARD* 52/53 (2014): 27–32.
- The Stage acquitted: being a full Answer to Mr. Collier and the other Enemies of the Drama, with a Vindication of King Charles the Martyr, and the Clergy of the Church of England, from the Abuses of a Scurrilous Book, called The Stage Condemned*. London: J. Barnes, 1699.
- Stemmler, Theo. *Liturgische Feiern und geistliche Spiele*. Tübingen, Niemayer, 1970.
- Steer, Georg. “Carmina Burana in Südtirol. Zur Herkunft des clm 4660.” *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 112 (1983): 1–37.
- Stevens, John. “Medieval Drama.” In *New Grove Dictionary*, 2nd ed., 16:227–67.
- Stoddard, Francis. *References for Students of Miracle Plays and Mysteries*. University of California Library Bulletin 8. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1887.
- Straub, Alexandre and Gustav Keller. *Hortus deliciarum*. Strasbourg: Imprimerie Strasbourgeoise, 1879.
- Stumpff, Robert. *Kultspiele der Germanen als Ursprung des mittelalterlichen Dramas*. Berlin: Junker und Dünnhapt, 1936.
- . *Unsere Kampf um ein deutsches Nationaltheater*. Berlin: Junker und Dünnhapt, 1935.
- Sydney, Philip. *An Apologie for Poetrie*. London: Henry Olney, 1595.

- Symes, Carol. "The Appearance of Early Vernacular Plays: Forms, Functions, and the Future of Medieval Theater." *Speculum* 77 (2002): 778–831.
- . "A Few Odd Visits: Unusual Settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*." In *Music and Medieval Manuscripts: Paleography and Performance: Essays Dedicated to Andrew Hughes*, edited by John Haines and Randall Rosenfeld, pp. 200–322. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- . "The History of Medieval Theatre / Theatre of Medieval History: Dramatic Documents and Performance of the Past." *History Compass* 7 (2009): 1032–48.
- . "The Medieval Archive and the History of Theatre: Assessing the Written and Unwritten Evidence for Premodern Performance." *Theatre Survey* 52 (2011): 29–58.
- Symons, Thomas. *Regularis Concordia: The Monastic Agreement of the Monks and Nuns of the English Nation*. London: Thomas Nelson, 1953.
- Talon, Nicholas. *L'Histoire sainte du Nouveau Testament, divisée en deux tomes et en quatre parties*. Paris: Cramoisy, 1640. Translated by John Paulet Winchester as *The Holy History*. London: J. Brook & J. Baker, 1653.
- Taruskin, Richard. *Music from the Earliest Notations to the Sixteenth Century*. The Oxford History of Western Music 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Tigerstedt, E. N. "Observations on the Reception of Aristotle's Poetics in the Latin West." *Studies in the Renaissance* 15 (1968): 7–24.
- Topsell, Edward, Thomas Moffet, and John Rowland. *The theater of insects, or, Lesser Living Creatures, as Bees, Flies, Caterpillars, Spiders, Worms, etc., a Most Elaborate Work*. The History of Four-footed Beasts and Serpents and Insects 3. London: E. Coates, 1658.
- Turbayne, Colin Murray. *The Myth of Metaphor*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1962.
- Turner, Victor W. *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1982.
- Tydeman, William, ed. *The Medieval European Stage: 500–1500*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Tyrer, John Walton. *Historical Survey of Holy Week. Its Services and Ceremonial*. London: Oxford University Press, 1932.
- Vecchi, Giuseppi. *Uffici drammatici padovani*. Florence: Olschki 1954.
- Villetard, Henri. *Office de Pierre de Corbeil (Office de la circoncision) improprement appelé "Office des Fous"*. Paris: Picard, 1907.
- Vollmann-Profe, Giesela, ed., *Ludus de Antichristo*. 2 vols. Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1981.
- Wagner, Peter. *Introduction to the Gregorian Melodies: A Handbook of Plainsong*. 2nd ed. Translation of Peter Wagner, *Einführung in die gregorianischen Melodien*, vol. 1 by Agnes Orme and E. G. P. Wyatt. London: Plainsong and Medieval Music, 1907. Reprint New York: Da Capo, 1986.

- . "Rheinisches Osterspiel in einer Handschrift des 17. Jahrhunderts." *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum und deutsche Litteratur* 56 (1918–19): 100–108.
- Wallon, Alexandre Wallon. "Notice sur la vie et les travaux de M. Charles Magnin, membre ordinaire de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres." *Éloges académique* 1 (1882): 61–140.
- Wangemann, Otto. *Geschichte des Oratoriums von den ersten Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. Demmen: A. Franz, 1882. Reprint Wiesbaden: M. Sändig, 1973.
- Ward, Adolphus. *A History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne*. 2 vols. London: MacMillan, 1875.
- Whitman, Walt. *Leaves of Grass*. Edited by Oscar Cargill. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Wickham, Glynne. Review of *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages*. *The Review of English Studies*, new series 18 (1967): 300–303.
- Wiepen, Eduard. *Palmsontagsprozession und Palmesel: ein kultur- und kunstgeschichtlich-volkskundlich Abhandlung zum Kölner Palmesel der kunsthistorischen Ausstellung zu Düsseldorf 1902 [Sammlung Schnütgen]*. Bonn: Hanstein, 1903.
- Wilken, Ernst. *Geschichte der geistlichen Spiele in Deutschland*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1872.
- William of Auxerre. *Summa de Officiis Ecclesiasticis*. Edited by Franz Fischer as "Wilhelm von Auxerre, SUMMA DE OFFICIIS ECCLESIASTICIS. Kritisch-digital Erstausgabe." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cologne, 2007. URL: http://guillelmus.uni-koeln.de/tcrit/tcrit_toc.
- Williams, Arnold. Review of *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages* by O. B. Hardison, Jr. *Speculum* 41 (1966): 539–41.
- . Review of *The Origin of the Theater* by Benjamin Hunnigher. *Speculum* 32 (1957): 564.
- Witzel, Georg. *Typus Ecclesiae Prioris: Anzeigung wie die heilige Kyrche Gottes invendig siben und mehr hundert jaren nach unsers Herrn Auffart gestalt gewesen sey*. Mainz: Behem, 1541.
- Wright, Craig. *The Maze and the Warrior: Symbols in Architecture, Theology, and Music*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- . *Music and Ceremonial at Notre Dame of Paris 500–1500*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Wright, Edith. *The Dissemination of the Liturgical Drama in France*. Bryn Mawr, PA: Bryn Mawr College, 1936.
- Wright, James. *Historia Histriónica: An Historical Account of the English Stage Shewing The ancient Use, Improvement, and Perfection, of Dramatick Representations, in this Nation*. London: Croom, 1699.
- Wright, Thomas. *Early Mysteries, and Other Latin Poems of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries: Edited from the Original Manuscripts in the British Museum and the Libraries of Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, and Vienna*. London: Nichols and Son, 1838.
- Würdtwein, Stefan Alexander. *Commentatio historico-liturgica de stationibus eccle-*

- siae Moguntinae: ex antiquitatibus ecclesiasticis eruta et addito ecclesiarum Trevirensis et Coloniensis ritu illustrata.* Mainz: Alef & Haffner, 1782.
- Young, Frances Berkely. "The Drama of the Medieval Church." In *A Memoir of Karl Young*, edited by Wilmart A. Lewis et al., pp. 15–23. New Haven: Privately Published, 1946.
- Young, Karl. "Concerning the Origin of the Miracle Play." *Manly Anniversary Studies in Language and Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923, 254–68.
- . "A Contribution to the History of Liturgical Drama at Rouen." *Modern Philology* 6 (1908): 24–27.
- . *The Drama of the Medieval Church*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.
- . *The Dramatic Associations of the Easter Sepulchre*. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 10. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1920.
- . "Dramatic Ceremonies of the Feast of the Purification." *Speculum* 5 (1930): 97–102.
- . "The Harrowing of Hell in Liturgical Drama." *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters* 16/2 (1909): 889–947.
- . "The Home of the Easter Play." *Speculum* 1 (1926): 71–86.
- . "A Liturgical Play of Joseph and his Brethren." *Modern Language Notes* 26 (1911): 33–37.
- . "A New Text of the *Officium Stellae*." *Modern Language Notes* 27 (1912): 68–71.
- . "A New Version of the *Peregrinus*." *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 34 (1919): 114–29.
- . "Observations on the Origin of the Mediaeval Passion Play." *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 25 (1910): 309–54.
- . "*Officium Pastorum*: A Study in the Dramatic Developments within the Liturgy at Christmas." *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Science and Letters* 17 (1912): 299–396.
- . "On the Origin of the Easter Play." *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 29 (1914): 1–58.
- . "*Ordo Prophetarum*." *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters* 20 (1921): 1–82.
- . *Ordo Rachelis*. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 4. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1919.
- . "Philippe de Mézières' Dramatic Office for the Presentation of the Virgin." *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 26 (1911): 181–234.
- . "The *Poema Biblicum* of Onulphus." *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 30 (1915): 25–41.
- . "La Procession des *Trois Rois* at Besançon." *The Romanic Review* 4 (1913): 76–83.
- . "Some Texts of Liturgical Plays." *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 24 (1909): 294–331.

- . and Gustav Cohen. "The *Officium Stellae* from Bilsen." *Romania* 24 (1916–1917): 357–72.
- Yudkin, Jeremy. *Music in Medieval Europe*. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1989.
- Ziegler, Hieronymus. *Christi vinia: Drama sacrum, ex Mathaei cap XX argumento sumpto*. Basel: J. Operin, 1551.
- . *Cyrus maior, drama tragicum*. Augsburg: P. Ulhart, 1547.
- . *Ophiletis: Drama comicotragicum argumento ex D. matthaei Evangelio sumpto*. Ingolstadt: Weissenhorn, 1549.
- . *Protoplastus: Drama comicotragicum in Memoriam humanae conditionis, & vitae nostrae miserrimae*. Augsburg: Steyner, 1543.
- Zühlke, Hanna. "Angehängt, integriert oder separiert—Zum Buchtyp des Prozessionale im 10. Jahrhundert." Paper presented at *Zur Typologie liturgischer Bücher des westlichen Mittelalters*, Universität Regensburg, July 7–9 July, 2016.

Index of Manuscripts and Printed Liturgical Books

Manuscripts

- Apt, Basilique de Sainte-Anne
MS 17, 134–35
- Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek
MS 4o 62, 134–35
- Avranches, Bibliothèque municipale
MS 214, 132–33
olim MS no. intér. 14, extér. 2524,
132–33
- Bamberg, Staatliche Bibliothek
MS lit. 6, 130–31
MS lit. 119, 140–41
- Barcelona, Bibl. de Catalunya
MS M.911, 144–45
- Bayeux, Bibliothèque du chapitre
MS 121, 138–39
- Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare
MS VI.34, 201, 209n39
MS VI.38, 201, 209n39
MS VI.39, 201, 209n39
- Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin
MS Mus. 40800, 132–33
MS Mus. 40801, 132–33
MS theol. qu. 15, 130–31
- Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale
MS 109, 138–39
- Bologna, Civico Museo Bibliografico
Musicale
MS Q 7, 136–37
- Brussels, Bibliothèque des Bollandists
MS 299, 146–47, 125, 155n73
- Brussels, Bibliothèque royale
MS II.2256, 142–43
- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College
MS 473, 130–31
- Charleville-Mézières, Bibliothèque
municipale
MS 86, 171, 175n23
- Cividale, Museo Archeologico
nazionale
MS CI, 144–45
MS CII, 146–47
MS CXXX, 138–39
- Clermont-Ferrand, Bibliothèque
municipale
MS 67, 136–37
- Cologne, Universitätsbibliothek
MS 5 P 114 (Bäumker 979), 130–31
- Cracow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska
MS Berol. theol. lat. 11, 130–31
- Dublin, Archbishop Marsh's Library
MS Z.4.2.20, 132–33
- Düsseldorf, Universitätsbibliothek
MS C.47, 116, 150n28
- Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek
MS 34, 142–43
MS 300, 46n42, 119, 140–41,
151n42, 155n80
MS 366, 46n42, 124, 126, 146–47,
149n13, 154n68
- Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek
MS 314, 46n42, 125, 144–45,
210n48
MS 1003, 130–31
- Essen, Münsterkirchenarchiv
MS 19, 116, 150n28

- Feldkirch, Bibliothek des
Kapuzinerklosters
MS Liturg. 1 RTR.M, 172, 178n66
- Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und
Universitätsbibliothek
Barth 179, 146–47
- Fulda, Landesbibliothek
MS 8o Aa.138, 104n19
- Geneva, Bibliothèque universitaire
MS lat. 38b, 146–47
- Gerona, Biblioteca Capitolare
Acta Capitularium 1528–1529,
134–35
- Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek
Cod.Lambac.CVI, 201, 191, 209n38
- Graz, Univeritätsbibliothek
MS lat. 211, 130–31
- The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek
MS 71.A.3, 134–35
MS 71.J.70, 125, 144–45, 155n74
MS 76.F.3, 144–45
- Herzogenburg, Stiftsbibliothek
MS 173, 102, 109n79, 153n66
- Hildesheim, Stadtarchiv
MS Mus. 383, 144–45, 210n48
- Huesca, Biblioteca Capitolare
MS 4, 136–37, 149n11
- Istanbul, Topkapi Serayi Müzesi
MS Gayri Islami, Eserler 68, 134–35
- Klagenfurt, Studienbibliothek
MS perg. 32, 144–45
- Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek
CCI 574, 18n13, 45n38, 91, 106n43,
110n80, 119, 140–41, 151n41
CCI 628, 210n46
CCI 629, 26, 45n38, 210n46
CCI 1021, 210n46
CCI 1213, 116, 150n25
- Kremsmünster, Stiftsbibliothek
MS 21, 125, 144–45
MS 24, 125, 144–45
- Lambach, Stiftsbibliothek
Fragment 1, 108n67, 146–47
- Laon, Bibliothèque municipale
MS 215, 113, 130–31
MS 263, 18n13, 124, 125, 126,
130–31, 146–47, 149n13,
154n69
- London, British Library
MS Add. 22124, 142–43
MS Add. 23922, 108n67, 124–25,
146–47, 154n70
MS Add. 30848, 130–31
MS Egerton 2615, 36, 125, 146–47,
153n52, 154n71
- Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional
MS 288, 114, 138–39
MS 289, 114, 138–39
MS Vitr. 20. 4 (C.132), 114, 138–39
- Modena, Biblioteca Capitolare
MS O.I.7, 136–37, 188–191,
209n45
- Montpellier, Faculté de médecine
MS H.159, 49n64
MS H.304, 135, 146–47
- Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek
clm 226, 175n23
clm 3909, 116, 150n26
clm 4660, 120, 142–43, 144–45,
152n51
clm 4660a, 110n80, 120, 140–41,
142–43, 144–45, 152n51,
154n66
clm 6424, 119, 142–43, 151n39
clm 6424a, 119, 142–43, 151n40
clm 14083, 193, 209n45
clm 14845, 130–31
clm 14477, 120, 142–43, 151n46
clm 14834, 142–43
clm 19411, 91, 106n42, 120, 123,
127, 142–43, 152n48
clm 27301, 113, 132–33
clm 28947, 113, 132–33, 210n48

- Münster, Archiv und Bibliothek des
 Bistums Münster
 BAM Pfa MS 113, 132–33, 210n48
 MS A/Dom 9, 144–45
- Münster, Bibliothek des
 Priesterseminars
 MS K4.214, 132–33
- Nürnberg, Germanische
 Nationalmuseum
 MS 22923, 134–35, 153n66,
 210n48
- Oxford, Bodleian Library
 MS Bodl. 775, 130–31
 MS Douce 222, 136–37
 MS Rawlinson Liturg. D. IV,
 132–33
- Oxford, University College
 MS 169, 35, 132–33
- Orléans, Bibliothèque municipale
 MS 201, 42n24, 119, 120–21,
 140–41, 142–42, 151n37,
 153n53, 161, 177n59
- Padua, Biblioteca Capitolare
 MS A.47, 136–37
 MS C.55, 114, 126, 136–37,
 140–41
 MS C.56, 114, 126, 136–37,
 140–41
 MS E.57, 114, 99–100, 109n71,
 114, 126, 136–37, 138–39
- Padua, Biblioteca des seminario
 Vescovile
 MS 697, 136–37
- Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine
 MS 364, 44n30, 104n19
 MS 564, 44n30, 104n19
 MS 1708, 138–39
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale
 MS lat. 779, 134–35
 MS lat. 887, 134–35
- MS lat. 903, 134–35
 MS lat. 904, 30, 47n53, 132–33,
 136–37, 138–39, 149n13,
 153n53
- MS lat. 909, 134–35
 MS lat. 1084, 134–35
 MS lat. 1118, 134–35
 MS lat. 1119, 134–35
 MS lat. 1121, 134–35
 MS lat. 1139, 23, 35, 42nn21–23,
 92, 106n50, 144–45, 149n13
 MS lat. 1152, 120, 151n45, 142–43
 MS lat. 1213, 132–33, 136–37,
 138–39, 149n13, 153n53
- MS lat. 1240, 46n40
 MS lat. 1232, 138–39
 MS lat. 1274, 136–37
 MS lat. 1301, 132–33
 MS lat. 8898, 44n30, 45n35, 104n27
 MS lat. 9449, 134–35, 138–39
 MS lat. 9508, 144–45
 MS lat. 10579, 191, 209n40
 MS lat. 11331, 45n36, 120, 142–43
 MS lat. 11347, 177n53
 MS lat. 12044, 188–191
 MS lat. 13252, 134–35
 MS lat. 16309, 146–47
 MS lat. 16819, 119, 142–43, 151n38
 MS lat. 17330, 125, 154n72, 140–41
 MS n. a. fr. 24541, 48n55
 MS n. a. lat. 1064, 125, 146–47
 MS n. a. lat. 1660, 134–35
 MS n. a. lat. 1871, 134–35
 MS n. a. lat. 1235, 134–35, 138–39
 MS n. a. lat. 1274, 136–37
- Piacenza, Biblioteca Capitolare
 MS 65, 136
- Pistoia, Biblioteca Capitolare
 MS C.121 (70), 136–37
- Prague, Národní knihovna
 MS I.B.12, 119, 140–41, 151n43
 MS VI.E.13, 132–33
 MS VI.G.3b, 132–33

- MS VI.G.5, 132–33
 MS VI.G.10a, 132–33
 MS VI.G.10b, 132–33
 MS VII.G.16, 132–33
 MS XII.A.22, 132–33
 MS XII.E.15a, 132–33
 MS XIII.E.14d, 132–33
 MS XIII.H.3c, 132–33
 MS XVII.E.1, 171–72, 177nn62–63, 178nn64–65
- Regensburg, Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek
 MS CH 1, 172, 178n67
- Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
 MS Palat. 619, 146–47
 MS Vat. lat. 8552, 120, 142–43, 152n47
 MS Vat. lat. 10645, 136–37
- Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale
 MS 222, 138–39
 MS 382, 132–33, 136–37, 138–39, 149n13, 153n53
 MS 384, 132–33, 136–37, 138–39, 149n13, 153n53
- Salzburg, Universitätsbibliothek
 MS II.6, 175n23, 195–200
- St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek
 MS 360, 130–31
 MS 374, 148n8
 MS 376, 148n8
 MS 384, 130–31
 MS 387, 148n8, 209n36
 MS 388, 148n8, 209n36
 MS 391, 148n8, 209n36
 MS 448, 134–35, 210n48
 MS 595, 130–31
 MS 1262, 130–31
 MS 1290, 130–31
 MS 1296, 130–31
- Saint-Quentin, Bibliothèque municipale
 MS 86, 32, 50n67, 140–41
- Sélestat, Bibliothèque municipale
 MS 81, 104n27
- Sens, Bibliothèque municipale
 MS 46, 30, 48n57
- Sion, Archives du chapitre
 MS 47, 138–39
 MS 74, 138–39
- Solesmes, Abbaye-Saint-Pierre
 MS 596, 113, 132–33, 150n30
- Stockholm, Kammerarkivet
 MS Vitterhets-Akad. Frag. Sequ. 37/Dalarna 1575, No. 14, 125, 144–45
- Tours, Bibliothèque municipale
 MS 927, 32, 35–36, 50n66, 120, 122, 140–41, 152n49, 200
- Trier, Bistumsarchiv
 BATr Abt. 95, Nr. 493, 134–35
- Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale
 MS F.IV.18, 136–37
 MS G.V.20, 136–37
- Udine, Biblioteca arcivescovile
 MS 94, 195–200, 211n55
 MS 234, 195, 210n52
- Venice, Biblioteca S. Maria della Consolazione
 MS Lit. 4, 144–45, 146–47
- Venice, Museo Civico Correr, Biblioteca
 cod. Cicogna 1006, 130–31
- Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare
 MS 146, 136–37
 MS 161, 136–37
 MS 162, 136–37
- Vich, Biblioteca Episcopale
 MS 105, 144–45
 MS 106, 136–37
 MS 124, 136–37

- Vienna, Österreichische
Nationalbibliothek
MS lat. 1054, 142–43
MS lat. 13417, 134–35
- Volterra, Biblioteca Guarnacci
MS L.3.39, 136–37, 149n11
- Vorau, Stiftsbibliothek
MS 302 (fragment from), 18n13,
120, 144–45
- Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August
Bibliothek
MS Guelf. 84.2, 134–35
MS Guelf. 309 Novi, 132–33
MS Helmst. 1008, 130–31,
192–93, 209n44
- Wolfenbüttel, Niedersächsisches
Staatsarchiv
MS VII.B.48, 132
MS VII.B.203, 144, 155n75,
210n48
- Zagreb, Metropolitanske knjizhice
MR 165, 138–39
- Zagreb, Nadbiskupijskog arhiva
Collectio Fragmentarum No. 1,
125–26, 146–47, 149n13
- Zurich, Zentralbibliothek
MS C.8.b, 46n39
MS Rheinau 18, 125, 144–45,
155n75, 210n48
- Zwickau, Ratsschulbibliothek
MS I.XV.3, 120, 140–41, 152n50
MS XXXVI.I.24, 120, 140–41,
152n50, 154n66, 210n48

Printed Liturgical Books

- Breviarium Parisiensis. Pars hiemalis* (Paris, 1736), 48n59
- Breviarium Parisiensis. Pars hiemalis* (Paris, 1836), 48n59
- Castellani, Alberto. *Liber sacerdotalis* (Venice, 1523), 130–31
- Castellani, Alberto. *Liber sacerdotalis* (Venice, 1537), 130–31
- Officium hebdomadae sanctae secundum consuetudinem ducalis ecclesiae Sancti
Marci Venetiarum* (Venice, 1736), 130–31
- Obsequiale secundum diocesis Augustensis morem* (Augsburg, 1487), 116, 150n27
- Processionale ad usum Insignis ac Praeclarae Ecclesiae Sarum* (Leeds, 1888), 116,
150n24

Index of People

- Abelard, Peter, 26, 47n42, 56, 119, 155n80
Adam Monachus, 119
Albrecht, Otto, 79n32
Alstatt, Alison, 133–34, 150n30
Amararius of Metz, 117–18, 158
Ambrose, Saint. *See* Ambrosius, Aurelius
Ambrosius, Aurelius, 157–58
Amstutz, Renate, 151n43, 171, 177n63
Anz, Heinrich, 149n14
Arens, Franz, 150n28
Aretin, Johann Christoph von, 152n51
Arlt, Wulf, 48n57, 153n52, 154n71, 174n15
Ashley, Kathleen, 83n96, 165
Aubry, Pierre, 42n24, 51n75

Bailey, Terence, 208n25
Baker, Augustine, 46n40, 86, 103n15, 106n40
Bale, John, 98, 107n53
Barron, James, 62
Bassi, Karen, 82n74
Batoff, Melanie, 74–75, 148n6, 195, 200, 209n34, 209n42, 210n51, 211n61
Bazelaire, Édouard de, 33, 51n72
Beard, Thomas, 170
Beauchamps, Pierre-François Godard de, 20, 39n7, 92, 106n48, 169
Bedingfield, M. Bradford, 74, 83n95, 149n16
Beleth, John, 158–61, 165, 174n15, 175nn19–21

Bellotte, Antoine, 86, 103n3, 130
Bergeron, Katherine, 47n52
Bergman, Rolf, 178nn66–67
Bernard of Clairvaux, Saint, 23, 118, 143, 151n35
Berndt, Günter, 153n51
Bettley, John, 148n9
Bevington, David, 149n19
Bigot, Jean, 47n53, 88
Birck, Sixt, 168
Bischoff, Bernhard, 152n51
Bjork, David, 112, 155n77
Björkvall, Gunilla, 81n65, 148n6
Black, Max, 185, 207n18, 207n22
Bona, Cardinal Giovanni, 162
Borgerhoff, Joseph L., 39n5
Boynton, Susan, 71, 108n65, 121, 155n81, 200, 208n27
Boys, John, 163
Brandt, Joseph A., 78n13
Brisac, Catherine, 44n29
Brockett, Clyde W., 149nn12–13
Brooks, Neil C., 57, 58, 61, 73, 79n31
Bucer, Martin, 163
Bunzel, Joseph H., 59
Bynner, Witter, 79n37

Caldwell, Mary C., 152n49
Campbell, Oscar James, 79n37
Campbell, Thomas, 151n37
Cargill, Oscar, 13, 26, 39n8, 44n31, 56–57, 58, 59, 60, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 77n5
Carlson, Marvin A., 177n52
Caron, Auguste-Pierre, 46n39

- Carr, Amelia J., 123, 152n48, 203, 208n27
- Cassander, Georg, 162
- Castellani, Alberto de, 130
- Cattin, Guilio, 136–37, 139, 140
- Chaguinian, Christophe, 152n49
- Chailley, Jacques, 79n32
- Chambers, Edmond K., 16, 37, 43n24, 52n93, 63, 69, 100, 108n65, 109n76, 127, 175n20
- Champollion, Jean-François, 45n36
- Champollion-Figeac, Jacques Joseph, 26
- Charles the Bald, 120, 143
- Charnage, François-Ignace Dunod de, 86, 140
- Cherubini, Luigi, 28
- Chevalier, Ulysse, 139–40
- Chupungco, Anscar J., 164, 173n2
- Cibber, Colley, 92
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius, 157, 173nn3–4
- Clark, Robert L. A., 82n67
- Clément, Félix, 13, 27–32, 52n81, 52n92, 172, 202
- Clopper, Lawrence, 69, 76, 82n67, 99, 100, 109n77, 166, 170
- Clüver, Claus, 82n67
- Coffman, George R., 57, 79n37
- Cohen, Gustav, 79n30
- Coldeway, John C., 4–5, 76, 167
- Coleman, William E., 154n72
- Collier, Jeremy, 168
- Combe, Pierre, OSB, 47n52
- Congreve, William, 168
- Conomis, Nicos C., 155n72
- Cousse-maker, Charles Edmond de, 2–3, 10, 20, 26, 32, 33–35, 36, 41n18, 47n53, 49n65, 51n75, 51n76, 52n81, 52n92, 53n96, 80n48, 82n89, 172
- Cousse-maker-Robais, Solange de, 51n75
- Creizenach, Wilhelm, 53n99, 109n76
- Crispus, Gaius Sallustius, 120, 123, 127, 143, 151n46
- Crocker, Richard, 165
- Crombach, Hermann, 86, 89, 138, 141
- D’Ancona, Allassandro, 109n76
- Dainat, Holger, 78n14
- Danjou, Félix, 29, 32, 49n64
- Dannenberg, Lutz, 78n14
- Darwin, Charles, 55, 62–63
- Davidson, Clifford, 151n37
- Davis, Lisa Fagin, 108n67
- Davril, Anselm, 81n57
- Dawes, Gregory, 207n18
- De Bartholomaeis, Vincenzo, 136
- De Boor, Helmut, 12, 13, 16, 64–65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 75, 80n47, 82n81, 121, 195, 198, 209n35
- Dehaines, l’Abbé, 51n75
- Deitl, Cora, 177n53
- De la Baume le Blanc, Louis César, duc de la Vallière, 92
- De la Croix, Jean François, 164
- De Mézières, Philippe, 125, 141, 154n72
- Delisle, Léopold, 47n53
- Dennis, John, 168
- De Vries, Hugo, 55
- Didron, Adolphe-Napoléon, 25–26, 29, 33, 43n29, 49n65, 52n92
- Diller, Hans-Jürgen, 65
- Dix, Gregory, 164–65
- Docen, Bernhard Joseph, 152n51
- Dolan, Diane, 155n78
- Donovan, Richard, 5, 70
- D’Ortigue, Joseph Louis, 29, 32
- Douhet, Jules comte de, 32–33, 50n69
- Dox, Donnalee, 48n56, 76–77, 109n78, 167
- Drumbl, Johann, 65–66, 69, 71, 72, 81n57, 82n81, 203
- Du Cange, Charles de Fresne, 33,

- 41n18, 42n20, 42n24, 44n30, 86,
88–89, 103n13, 105n30, 106n41
- Du Méril, Édelstand, 27, 32–33, 34,
40n13, 46nn40–41, 47n43, 133,
134, 143, 144, 172
- Durand, William, 158–61, 165
- Duranti, Jean Étienne, 162, 176n26
- Edwards, Cyril, 80n47
- Eisenberg, Michael, 174–75n18
- Eliot, George, 184
- Elliott, John R., Jr., 38–39n5
- Ellis, Katherine, 47n52
- Emerson, John, 47n52, 127, 207–8n23
- Enders, Jody, 183, 205n1
- Engelhardt, Christian Moritz, 108n69
- Erasmus, Desiderius, 162.
- Evans, Mary Ann. *See* George Eliot
- Eveillon, Jacques, 86–87, 89, 104n17
- Evers, Ute, 81n65, 131, 134–35,
146, 148nn3–4, 148n9, 153n66,
206n12, 209n35
- Evitt, Regula Meyer, 149n13
- Fassler, Margot, 48n57, 71, 154n71,
155n76, 155n81, 174nn15–16
- Fauriel, Claude-Charles, 38n2
- Feillée, François de la, 49n63
- Fichte, Jörg A., 65
- Fischer, Franz, 174n13
- Fischer, Maximilian, 45n38
- Flanigan, C. Clifford, 1–2, 10, 11–12,
13, 61, 62, 66–69, 70, 71, 73, 74,
75, 80n56, 81n57, 82n67, 82n81,
107n63, 111, 153n56, 165,
177n59, 181–82, 184, 186, 189,
194, 203, 205n8, 208n24, 208n30
- Fosbroke, Thomas Dudley, 90–91,
106n41
- Frank, Grace, 57
- Franklin, R. W., 28
- Frisi, Antonio Francesco, 86
- Fuller, Sarah, 154n67
- Gastoué, Amédée, 48n57
- Gautier, Léon, 36
- Génébrard, Gilbert, 162
- Gerbert, Martin, 46n39, 86
- Gerhoh of Reichersberg, 98–99, 101,
121
- Gibson, James M., 149n11
- Gilpin, George (the Elder), 52n88, 95,
107n59
- Googe, Barnebe, 93, 95, 107n53
- Gosson, Stephen, 107n63, 168
- Green, Rosalie, 108n69
- Gregory IX (Pope), 100–101
- Griffiths, Fiona, 108n69
- Haller, Robert S., 155n72
- Halliwell, Stephen, 177n52
- Hamilton, Sarah, 150n29
- Hanuš, Ignac Jan, 151n43, 177n63,
178nn64–65
- Hardison, O. B. Jr., 12, 13, 16, 62–64,
65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75,
81n66, 115, 150n34, 188–89,
193, 195, 198, 203, 208n29,
210n52
- Harris, Max, 48n57, 100, 154n69,
154n71, 155n76, 174nn15–16,
175n18
- Hase, Karl, 53n97
- Hawkins, Thomas, 92–93, 169
- Heiserman, Arthur, 64
- Hennig, Ursula, 81n57, 151n43
- Herrad of Landesberg, 99–100, 101,
108n69
- Hilarius, 26, 32, 45n36, 56, 60, 72,
100n80, 120, 143, 214
- Hild, Elaine Stratton, 206n12
- Hiley, David, 208n23, 208nn25–26
- Hilka, Alfons, 153n51
- Hoeynck, F. A., 150n26
- Hoffman von Fallersleben, Heinrich,
45n37, 152n51
- Holliday, Joan A., 149n17

- Honorius Augustodiensis, 159
 Honders, A. C., 176n28
 Hone, William, 52n88
 Hrosvitha of Gandersheim, 4, 22, 43n27
 Hughes, Andrew, 17n12, 186, 208n26
 Hugo, Victor, 26
 Huglo, Michel, 151n37, 208n25
 Hunningher, Benjamin, 13, 59–61,
 69, 70, 71, 73–74
 Hussman, Heinrich, 154n69
- Imbert, M., 49n63
 Innocent III (Pope), 100
 Isidore of Seville, 116–17, 158
 Iversen, Gunilla, 48n57, 71, 81n65,
 148n6
- Jacobsson, Ritva (Ritva Jonnson),
 81n65, 136, 148n11
 Janota, Johannes, 81n65, 131,
 134–35, 146, 148nn3–4, 153n66,
 206n12, 209n35
 John of Avranches, 88, 158
 Johnson, Mark, 206n18
 Joigny, Jacques de (Pamelius), 162
 Jones, D. Mervyn, 59
 Jones, David, 170
 Jonnson, Ritva. *See* Jacobsson, Ritva
 Josephus, Titus Flavius, 120, 123,
 127, 143
 Jouve, l'Abbé, 48n55, 52n81
 Jubinal, Achille, 38n1
 Jungmann, Joseph Andreas, 176n43
- Keller, Gustav, 108n69
 King, Norbert, 149n14, 154nn69–70,
 155n73
 Kirchmayer, Thomas (Naogeorgus),
 93–98, 107n53
 Klein, David, 52n92
 Klugseder, Robert, 135
 Kobialka, Michal, 71, 73, 75–76,
 82n80, 83n95, 114–15
- Kövecses, Zoltán, 207n18
 Kretzmann, Paul Edward, 171
 Kühlmann, Wilhelm, 78n15
 Kurvers, Robert G. A., 149n12
 Kurz, Franz, 26, 45n38
- Lagueux, Robert, 154n69, 155n81
 Lakoff, George, 206n18
 Lange, Carl, 37, 63
 Lebeuf, l'Abbé Jean, 25, 42n21, 42n24,
 49n63, 91–92
 Le Brun des Marettes, Jean-Baptiste,
 25, 33, 41n18, 41n20, 44n30,
 45–46n39, 86, 87, 88, 89–90,
 105n28, 105n39
 Lehtonen, Thomas M. S., 153n51
 Leighton, Alexander, 97–98, 177n55
 Léniaud, Jean-Michel, 44n29
 Le Prévôt, Jean, 25, 41n18, 41n20,
 44n30, 46n39, 88, 104n28,
 105n39
 Le Sieur de Moleon.
See Le Brun des Marettes,
 Jean-Baptiste
 Lesueur, François, 28
 Lesure, François, 38n5
 Lingard, Thomas, 90, 106n40
 Linke, Hans Jürgen, 152n50
 Lipphardt, Walther, 67, 69, 70, 79n32,
 81nn64–65, 104n17, 131, 135,
 141, 144, 147, 151n43, 152n51,
 153n66, 172, 175n20, 178n66,
 211n59
 Lippsmeyer, Elizabeth, 149n17
 Locher, Jacob, 167, 177n53
 Lodge, Thomas, 107n63, 177n55
 Loewen, Peter, 151n43
 Luzarche, Victor, 32, 50n66, 120, 141
- Mabillon, Jean, 162
 Máchal, Jan, 151n43, 177n63,
 178nn64–65
 Macy, Gary, 174n11

- Magnin, Charles, 3, 13, 15, 19–26,
29, 30, 33, 34, 38n1, 38n5, 39n8,
40nn12–15, 41n18, 41n20, 42n22,
43n25, 43n27, 44n30, 46n39,
52n81, 52n92, 77, 82n89, 85, 86,
92, 101, 102, 106n39, 172, 175n19,
179–81, 183, 194, 200–202, 203
- Manly, John M., 13, 20, 55–56, 59,
62, 63
- Marnix van St. Adelgonde, Philippe
van, 52n88, 95–97, 98, 107n59
- Marshall, Mary, 77n12
- Martène, Edmond, 25, 41n20, 44n30,
45n35, 46n39, 46n40, 86, 87–88,
103n5, 104n19, 136, 137, 138,
140–41, 149n13
- Martimort, Aimé-Georges, 164,
173n2, 176n34
- Mazza, Enrico, 118
- McDonald, William A., 59
- Mehler, Ulrich, 152n50
- Melanchthon, Philipp, 162
- Meredith, Peter, 4, 69–70, 150n19
- Meyer, Kathi, 79n32
- Meyer, Wilhelm, 146, 152n51
- Michel, Francisque, 20, 40n13, 45n37
- Milchsack, Gustav, 37, 63
- Mone, Franz Josef, 27, 32–33, 45n39,
46nn41–42, 172
- Monmerqué, Louis-Jean Nicolas, 20,
26, 40n13, 42n24, 45n35, 45n37
- Monsabert, P. de., 130–31
- Morandi, Nausica, 108n67, 109n71,
139, 141, 143, 144, 147, 149n14,
151n45, 154nn69–70, 155n73
- Morrison, Stanley, 176n28
- Moulinet, D., 47n52
- Much, Rudolf, 57
- Muir, Lynette R., 70
- Naogeorgus, Thomas. *See* Kirchmayer,
Thomas
- Nicéron, Jean-Pierre, 104n18
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, 184
- Nivers, Guillaume-Gabriel, 49n63
- Norton, Michael L., 71, 80n51, 115,
122, 148n5, 148n10, 152n49,
155n81, 200, 208n27, 209n32,
210n51
- O'Connor, Sarah Hardison, 81n66
- Ogden, Dunbar, 183, 209n41
- Operin, Johannes, 168
- Ortony, Andrew, 207n18
- Otto of Freising, 120, 123, 127, 143
- Oudoux, l'Abbé, 49n63
- Pacchiorotti, M., 49n64
- Palazzo, Éric, 5–6
- Pamelius. *See* Joigny, Jacques de
Parfaict, Claude and François, 20,
39n7, 92, 169
- Paris, Paulin, 20
- Parkinson, John, 170
- Pascal, R., 78n21
- Paululus, Robert, 158, 174n11
- Petersen, Nils Holger, 2, 10, 11, 13,
39n8, 74, 83n95, 83n99, 112,
115, 165, 173n1, 182, 183, 184,
185, 189, 192, 207n19, 208n31
- Pez, Bernhard, 45n38, 91, 92,
106nn42–43
- Pfeiffer, Hermann, 45n38
- Planchart, Alejandro Enrique, 137,
149n11
- Poisson, l'Abbé Léonard, 49n63
- Poll, Joseph, 79n32, 178n67
- Pröll, Robert, 37
- Proudfoot, Wayne, 207n19
- Prynne, William, 107n63, 177n55
- Pullain, Valérand, 176nn28–29
- Rainold, John, 107n63, 177n55
- Ramsey, J. T., 153n65
- Rankin, Susan K., 4, 71, 108n67,
114, 123, 126, 133, 135, 148n6,
148n9, 153n53, 155n78, 209n34

- Raynouard, François-Just-Marie, 42n21
 Reidt, Heinrich, 53n98
 Reynolds, Roger, 211n67
 Ridpath, George, 168–69
 Robboneu van Louen, Isaac. *See*
 Marnix van St. Adelgonde,
 Philippe van
 Rock, Daniel, 36–37
 Roeder, Anke, 65
 Rokseth, Yvonne, 79n32
 Roth-Burnette, Jennifer, 118,
 151nn35–36
 Rowden, Clair, 47n49
 Rozik, Eli, 70–71, 72, 183, 211n66
 Rupert of Deutz, 118–19, 158
 Ryle, Gilbert, 178n68, 183–84,
 206n18
- Sacks, Sheldon, 207n18
 Sainte-Beuve, Charles Augustin, 20,
 38n3
 Sallust. *See* Crispus, Gaius Sallustius
 Sandbach, F. E., 58, 73
 Schechner, Richard, 71
 Schlager, Karlheinz, 48n57
 Schmeller, Johann Andreas, 152n51
 Schmelzeisen, Volker, 175n19
 Schmid, Toni, 79n32
 Schoch, Jürg, 80n47
 Schröder, Edward, 175n19
 Schubiger, Anselm, 53n96
 Schuler, Ernst August, 79n32,
 151n43, 177n63
 Schumann, Otto, 153n51
 Scudo, Paul, 33
 Searle, Mark, 166
 Selden, John, 163
 Sepet, Marius, 35–36, 52n92, 154n72
 Sheingorn, Pamela, 83n96, 165
 Sicard of Cremona, 158, 159, 160,
 161, 165
 Smither, Howard, 47n49
 Smits van Waesberghe, Josef, 79n32
- Smoldon, William L., 3–4, 6–7, 67,
 79n32, 81n63
 Soane, George, 36, 52n88
 Sponsler, Claire, 82n67
 Stemmler, Theo, 65, 80n56
 Steer, Georg, 152n51
 Stevens, John, 127
 Stoddard, Francis, 37, 42n24, 52n92
 Straub, Alexandre, 108n69
 Stumpfl, Robert, 13, 57–58, 59, 60,
 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 78nn13–15
 Sydney, Sir Philip, 107n63, 177n55
 Symes, Carol, 42n22, 50n65, 71–74,
 81n57, 82n89, 83n93
- Talon, Nicolas, 170
 Taruskin, Richard, 208n23
 Tigerstedt, E. N., 177n52
 Topsell, Edward, 170
 Turbayne, Colin Murray, 178n68,
 184–85, 206n18
 Turner, Victor W., 71, 165
 Tydeman, William, 69–70, 150n19,
 206n11
 Tyrer, John Walton, 208n26
- Vecchi, Giuseppi, 79n32, 137
 Villetard, Henri, 48n57
 Vollmann-Profe, Giesela, 152n48
- Wagner, Peter, 79n32
 Wallon, Henri Alexandre, 20, 40n14
 Wangemann, Otto, 53n96
 Ward, Adolphus, 37
 Ward, James, 206n17, 207n19
 Waugh, Robin, 151n43
 Wiepen, Eduard, 149n17
 Wilken, Ernst, 53n100
 William of Auxerre, 158, 159, 173n5,
 174n16
 Williams, Arnold, 59, 62, 73
 Winchester, John Paulet, 170
 Witzel, Georg, 162, 175n25

Wright, Craig, 174n18, 175n22,
208n27

Wright, Edith, 155n78

Wright, James, 107n63

Wright, Thomas, 26, 42n24, 45n37

Würdtwein, Stefan Alexander, 86

Young, Frances Berkely, 79nn34–35

Young, Karl, 5, 15, 16, 37, 42n20,
46n42, 61, 62, 63, 65, 67, 69, 70,
73, 78n30, 79nn36–37, 81n63,
110n80, 111, 127, 137, 143, 144,
145, 147, 149n11, 149n13–14,
153n53, 155n80, 180–81

Yudkin, Jeremy, 207n23

Zeigler, Hieronymus, 168

Zühlke, Hanna, 18n14

Index of Places

- Angers, 86–87, 89–90
Angoulême, 27
Arles, 134
Augsburg, 18n13, 98–99, 108n68,
116, 121, 167, 172, 175n23,
210n51
- Bailleul, 34
Bamberg, 18n13
Barking Abbey, 113, 133, 153n53
Beauvais, 18n13, 32, 36, 40n13, 56, 70,
72, 110n80, 125, 126, 146, 153n52
Bergues, 34
Berlin, 57
Besançon, 86, 87, 89, 138–39, 140
Bilsen, 18n13, 125, 146
Braunschweig, 125, 144, 210n48
Bursfeld, 104n19
- Cividale, 125, 138, 144, 146–47
Cologne, 89
Compiègne, 119, 142
Corbie, 20, 125, 144
Coutances, 113, 133, 153n53
- Dijon, 27
Douai, 34
Dublin
St. John the Evangelist, 133, 153n53
Dunkerque, 34
- Egmont, 126, 144
Einsiedeln, 27, 46n42, 119, 124, 126,
140, 142, 146, 149n13
Engelberg, 27, 46n42, 125, 144,
210n48
Essen, 116, 150n28
- Fleury, Saint-Benoît, 91, 140, 142
Freiburg, 89
Freising, 18n13, 119, 120, 123, 142
- Gandersheim, 20, 113, 133
Gernrode, 113, 133
Gurk, 18n13, 135, 143n66, 210n48
Győr, 138
- Hagia Sophia, 20, 24
Hazebrouk, 34
Heidelberg, 57, 146
Hersfeld, 135, 210n48
Hildesheim, 99, 108n68, 120, 142
- Klosterneuburg, 18n13, 26, 45n38,
91, 106n43, 110n80, 116, 119,
140, 150n25, 151n41, 210n46
Köln. *See* Cologne
Kremsmünster, 125, 144
- Laon, 18n13, 44, 88, 104n25, 113,
124, 125, 126, 131, 146, 149n13,
154n69
Le Mans, 27
Liebfrauen. *See* Münster, Liebfrauen.
Lille, 27, 34
Limoges 86, 88, 125, 134, 138
Saint-Martial, 14, 20, 23, 24, 35,
46n40, 88, 92, 106n50, 134,
144, 146, 149n13
Maastricht, 125, 126, 135, 144
Malmédy, 120, 123, 142
Marienberg am Schonenberg, 113, 131
Marienberg bei Helmstedt, 113, 133
Medingen bei Lüneburg, 125, 144,
210n48

- Metz, 18n13
Minden, 113, 131, 192–93, 209n44
Moggio, 183, 210n52
Mont-Saint-Michel, 113, 133, 153n53
Monte Cassino, 44n30, 104n19
Montpellier, 125
Münster, 125, 144
 Liebfrauen, 113, 133
Münsterschwarzach, 108n67, 146
- Narbonne, 44n30, 88, 104n25
Nîmes, 27
Nottuln bei Münster, 113, 133,
 210n48
- Origny-Sainte-Benoîte, 32, 140
Obermünster. *See* Regensburg,
 Obermünster
Ossiach, 125, 144
- Padua, 49n64, 99–100, 109n71, 114,
 126, 136, 138, 140
Palermo, 126
 cathedral, 138, 153n53
 capella palatina, 138
- Paris, 21, 25, 34
 Bibliothèque royale (impériale), 13,
 19, 20, 47n53
 Collège Stanislas, 29
 Hôpital de la Trinité, 20, 92
 La Madeleine, 28
 Notre Dame, 27, 49n64, 160–61
 Saint-Denis, 44n30, 104n19
 Sainte-Genviève, 28
 Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois, 27
 Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas, 28
 Sainte-Marguerite, 27–28
 Saint-Maur des Fossées, 20, 92, 189,
 190, 198
 Saint-Philippe-du-Roule, 28
 Sorbonne, 13, 19, 25–26, 28, 29,
 38n1, 40n13, 82n89, 85
 Tuileries chapel, 28
- Poitiers, 44n30, 88, 103n5, 104n27
 Sainte-Croix, 113, 131, 161,
 208n30
Prague, 119, 135, 140, 151n43, 171,
 177nn62–63, 178nn64–65
 St. George, 113, 133
Prüfening, 18n13
- Raab. *See* Győr
Regensburg, 142, 172, 178n67
 St. Emmeram, 142, 192–93
 Obermünster, 113, 133
Reichersberg am Inn, 99, 108n68
Remiremont, 33
Rheinau, 125, 144, 155n75, 210n48
Rome, 96, 97, 98
 Sant'Agnese fuori le mura, 94
 Santa Maria Maggiore, 20, 24
Rouen, 20, 125, 146
 cathedral, 18n13, 24, 33, 35, 41n18,
 41n20, 44n30, 47n53, 86,
 88–89, 105n39, 106n41, 113,
 114, 121, 126, 133, 136, 138,
 149n13, 153n53
- Saint-Maur des Fossées. *See* Paris,
 Saint-Maur des Fossées
Salisbury, 116, 150n24
St. Blasien, 46n39, 113, 131
St. Emmeram. *See* Regensburg, St.
 Emmeram
St. Florian, 26
St. Gall, 46n41, 113, 131, 148n8,
 150n19, 190, 209n36
Sarum. *See* Salisbury
Schonenberg, *See* Marienberg am
 Schonenberg
Sens
 cathedral, 30, 45n35, 48n57
 Saint-Maurice, 48n59
Silos, St. Domingo, 113, 131
Soissons, 44n30, 45n35, 48n55, 88,
 115, 208nn30–31

- Solesmes, 29, 47n52, 62
 Stockholm, 125, 126, 144
 Strasbourg, 20, 24, 44n30, 45n35, 88,
 104n27, 108n67, 108n69, 124,
 125, 146, 163
 Székesfehérvár, 113, 131
- Tegernsee, 14, 91, 93, 106n42, 120,
 142
 Toul, Saint-Aper, 44n30, 104n19
 Tours, 32, 36, 50n66, 120, 122, 140,
 152n49, 200
 Saint-Martin, 44n30, 45n35, 86, 88,
 104n27, 114, 138, 149n13
- Venice, 21, 22
 San Marco, 113, 131, 148n9
 Verdun, Saint-Vitus, 44n30, 88,
 103n5, 104n27
 Versailles, 28
 Vich, 126, 136, 144
 Vienne, 44n30, 45n35, 88, 104n27
 Villers, 120, 142
 Vornau, 18n13, 120, 144
- Wilton, 113, 133, 150n30
 Worms, 125, 146
 Wrocław, 18n13
 Würzburg, 18n13, 206n12
- Zagreb, 125, 146, 149n13
 Zwickau, 120, 140, 152n50, 154n66,
 210n48

Index of Chants, Rites, Feasts, and Other Subjects

- Ad coenam agni* (RH 22337), 193
Adoratio Crucis. See Good Friday,
Adoratio Crucis
 Advent, 9, 29, 30, 87, 107n53, 121,
 141, 158, 187, 208n28, 214, 217
Angelus domini descendit (CAO
 6093), 161
Annales archéologique, 25, 29, 43n29,
 49
 Antiphon, 9, 71, 91, 102, 113, 121,
 131, 150n19, 158, 187, 194, 195,
 199, 213, 215, 217, 218, 219
Antiquitates Judaicae (Josephus), 120,
 123, 127, 143
Anxietus est in me (CAO 1442), 121
 Ascension, 32, 62n88, 103–4n17,
 107n53, 116, 150n30, 201,
 208n28, 217
 Ash Wednesday, 29, 31, 107n53,
 210n46
 Expulsion of the Penitents, 88, 116
Asperges, 213
 Augsburg Confession, 162

Bellum Catilinae (Sallust), 120, 123,
 127, 143, 151n46
 canticle, 158, 213–14, 215, 219
Carmina Burana, 26, 45n37, 46n41,
 70, 72, 80n56, 110n80, 120, 141,
 143, 145, 152n51, 154n66
catechresis, 207n22
Christ ist erstanden (German hymn),
 195, 197, 199, 211n59
 Christmas, 9, 21–22, 27, 29, 30, 32,
 36, 43n25, 44n30, 70, 81n65,
 87–88, 89, 98, 99, 100–101,
 107n53, 111, 113–14, 117, 118,
 121, 134–39, 148n11, 153n51,
 158, 174n18, 187, 208n28, 217
Officium/Ordo Pastorum, 8, 18n13,
 22, 24, 30, 35, 42n20, 47n43,
 86, 88, 89, 98, 113–14,
 120–21, 125, 126, 134–37,
 142–43, 146–47, 149n11, 187,
 216
Officium/Ordo Prophetarum, 18n13,
 23, 35, 73, 86, 88, 114, 124,
 125–26, 131, 138–39, 146–47,
 149n13, 154n69, 216
Christus resurgens (CAO 1796), 131,
 194, 210n50
 Church of England, 163–65
Congratulamini mihi omnes (CAO
 6322), 161
 Corpus Christi, 76, 94, 95, 107n53
Currebant duo simul (CAO 2081),
 196, 199

Danielis ludus, 32, 36, 56, 60, 70, 72,
 74, 110n80, 120, 125, 126, 143,
 147, 153n52, 154n71, 214
Debelis cessent elementa legis (Latin
 hymn), 30–31, 48n59
Depositio Crucis/Hostiae. See Good
 Friday, *Depositio Crucis/Hostiae*
 Divine Office, 8, 9, 28, 75, 79n36,
 125, 158, 165, 176n26, 187, 190,
 207n23, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217,
 219
 compline, 9, 27, 214

- lauds, 9, 86, 113, 121, 130–31, 214, 215, 217,
 matins, 9, 56, 59, 64, 71, 86, 87–88, 89–90, 100, 102, 112–14, 123, 126, 129–37, 139, 149n12, 154n66, 155n77, 160, 161, 171, 172, 187, 189, 190–92, 198, 201, 214, 215, 216, 218, 219
 prime, 9, 117, 214, 217
 sext, 9, 117, 214, 217
 terce, 9, 117, 214, 217
 vespers, 9, 28, 30, 48n57, 113, 118, 130–31, 139, 150n19, 171, 187, 214, 215, 216, 217, 219
 drama, 76–77, 166–70
- Easter Monday, 89, 114, 139, 161
Officium/Ordo Peregrinorum, 18n13, 42n20, 42n24, 47n43, 67, 70, 81n65, 86, 89, 103n13, 114, 120, 125, 126, 138–39, 142–43, 146–47, 149n12, 152n51, 216
- Easter Sunday, 3–5, 9, 15, 21–22, 27, 30, 32, 36, 37, 41n18, 43n25, 44n30, 46n39, 47n51, 48n55, 56, 59, 63, 64, 70, 71, 75, 81n65, 86, 88, 89, 90, 94, 95, 96, 99, 100, 102, 104n19, 107n53, 112–113, 114, 115, 123, 124, 127, 129–35, 150n19, 154n66, 158, 159, 160–61, 165, 171–72, 187–200, 201, 208n28, 210n46, 214, 217
Elevatio Crucis/Hostiae, 79n36, 81n65, 95, 96, 104n19, 113, 115, 131, 133, 150n19, 188–89, 192, 193, 210n46, 214
Visitatio Sepulchri, 1–2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18n13, 24, 26–27, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 41n18, 42n20, 44n30, 45n35, 45n38, 46n39, 46n40, 46n42, 47n43, 52n88, 56, 60, 63, 64–68, 71, 73–76, 80n51, 81n65, 83n95, 85–91, 93, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100–102, 103n15, 104n19, 105n29, 106n41, 109n79, 112–13, 114–15, 119, 120, 124, 125–26, 127, 129–35, 144–47, 148nn3–10, 150n19, 153n53, 153n66, 154n69, 155n77, 155n80, 160–61, 173, 175nn23–24, 181–83, 186–200, 201, 202, 208nn30–31, 209nn32–35, 209n41, 210n46, 210n48, 218, 219
 mass vs. matins placement, 190–93
 sacramental interpretation of, 192–94, 199–200
 trope vs. procession, 112–13
 type 1, 190–94, 218
 type 2, 194–200, 210n51, 219
- Easter Vigil, 64, 118, 131, 150n19, 188–89, 192–93
Elevatio Crucis/Hostiae. See Easter Sunday, *Elevatio Crucis/Hostiae*
- Ember Days, 87, 141, 158, 214
epanalepsis, 198, 211n58
- Epiphany, 21–22, 27, 29, 30, 32, 55, 88, 89, 98–100, 107n53, 119, 121, 123, 124–25, 139, 143, 147, 158–59
Officium/Ordo Stellae, 8, 16, 18n13, 22, 24, 30, 33, 41n18, 42n20, 47n43, 86, 88, 89, 98, 108n67, 114, 119, 120–21, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 131, 138–47, 149n14, 151nn45–46, 154nn69–70, 155n73, 216
- Exagoge* of Ezekiel, 21
- Feast of Fools, 48n57, 92, 100, 154n71, 158–59, 160
- Fleury “Playbook,” 14, 16, 18n13, 23, 25, 26, 32, 42n24, 45n35, 45n37, 47n43, 50n69, 70, 91–92,

- 93, 119, 120–22, 123, 140–43,
153n53, 161, 177n59, 200
- Fourth Lateran Council (1215),
75–76
- Gesta Friderici Imperatoris* (Otto of
Freising), 120, 123, 127, 143
- Glorious revolution (England,
1688–1689), 168
- Good Friday, 52n88, 94, 95, 96,
107n53, 115, 121, 188, 192, 193,
201, 210n46, 213, 214, 218
- Adoratio Crucis*, 52n88, 150n19,
188, 192–93, 210n46, 213,
214, 218
- Depositio Crucis/Hostiae*, 65,
79n36, 81n65, 94, 95, 96, 115,
150n19, 188–89, 192–93,
210n46, 214
- Holy Innocents Day, 23, 50n69,
107n53, 108n65, 120, 121, 159,
187
- Holy Thursday, 107n53, 114, 115,
116, 117, 188, 192, 201, 210n46
- Hortus Deliciarum* (Harrad of
Landesberg), 99–100, 108n69,
109n70
- hymn, 30–31, 48n59, 193, 213, 214,
215, 217, 219
- Improperia*, 193, 213, 215, 218
- In resurrectione tua* (CAO 3280), 194,
210n50
- Jeu d'Adam*, 36, 50n66, 120, 141,
152n49
- July revolution (France, 1830), 19,
27, 28
- Lent, 9, 31, 63–64, 95, 96, 107n53,
107n59, 119, 187, 188, 201,
208n28, 214, 217
- liturgia*. *See* liturgy
- liturgical books
- agenda, 9, 46n40, 64, 112, 124,
129, 131, 135, 137, 139, 145,
147, 190, 191, 193, 209n39,
209n44, 209–10n45, 213
- antiphoner, 7, 9, 112, 129, 131,
133, 135, 147, 153n66, 171,
189, 190, 195, 197, 209n36,
210n48, 211n55, 213
- benedictionale. *See* agenda
- breviary, 7, 9, 30, 48n59, 64, 112,
129, 131, 133, 135, 137, 147,
153n66, 171, 213
- classification of, 8–9, 18n14
- customary, 129, 209n38
- evangelary, 125, 127, 145, 147, 215
- gradual, 7, 9, 30, 47n53, 64, 112,
124, 129, 131, 133, 135, 137,
139, 147, 191, 192, 209n39,
209n44, 210n48, 210n52, 215,
216
- hymnal, 9, 48n59, 131, 145, 147, 215
- missal, 9, 129, 145, 191, 216
- obsequiale. *See* agenda
- ordinal, 7, 9, 41n20, 45n35, 64,
99–100, 102, 112, 116, 129,
131, 133, 135, 137, 139, 141,
150n25, 150n28, 195, 196–97,
209n40, 210n48, 211n56, 216
- processional, 9, 18n14, 112, 115,
116, 129, 131, 133, 137, 139,
141, 145, 147, 150n24, 172,
217
- ritual. *See* agenda
- sequentiary, 9, 124, 129, 218
- troper, 9, 46n40, 64, 112, 124, 129,
131, 135, 137, 139, 145, 147,
188, 190, 191, 193, 209n39,
209n44, 209n45, 218
- liturgy, 157–66, 170–73, 186–87
- Ludus de Antichristo*, 14, 91, 93, 120,
123, 127, 143, 152n48

- Ludus Paschalis*, 8, 18n13, 27, 32, 45n35, 45n38, 46n42, 65, 67, 70, 80n56, 81n65, 91, 95, 106n43, 110n80, 119, 120, 122, 123, 140–41, 151n41, 152n49, 152nn50–51, 153n53, 153n66, 161, 171–72, 177n63, 178n64, 200
- Mass, 4, 5, 8, 9, 28, 30, 47n51, 56, 62, 64, 71, 75, 79n36, 81n65, 88, 89, 94, 96, 112–14, 116, 117–18, 123, 125, 126, 129, 134–37, 139, 141, 154n72, 155n77, 157–58, 162–66, 172, 173n5, 176nn25–26, 180, 187, 188, 190–94, 199, 201, 207n23, 210n46, 213, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219
- ordinary of, 9, 56, 215, 216
- proper of, 9, 193, 215, 217
- metaphor, 10, 13, 16, 19, 24, 29, 33–35, 38, 47n51, 55, 169–70, 172, 178n68, 179–86, 200–202, 206n17, 206n18, 207n19, 207n22
- music-drama, 4, 6–7
- mystère*. *See officium vs. mystère*
- neume, 213, 216
- Nos respectu gratiae* (RH 12241), 105n36
- Novae geniturae* (RH 12329), 105n36
- office vs. mystère* (*Feier vs. Spiel*), 3, 27, 32–33, 34–36, 47n43, 64–65
- officium vs. ordo*, 7–8, 18n13
- Officium/Ordo Infantem*, 88
- Officium/Ordo Pastorum*. *See* Christmas, *Officium/Ordo Pastorum*
- Officium/Ordo Peregrinorum*. *See* Easter Monday, *Officium/Ordo Peregrinorum*
- Officium/Ordo Prophetarum*. *See* Christmas, *Officium/Ordo Prophetarum*
- ordo*. *See officium vs. ordo*
- Ordo de Ysaac et Rebecca*, 18n13, 119–20, 145
- Ordo Joseph*, 18n13, 124, 131, 147, 154n69
- Ordo Rachelis*, 18n13, 23, 70, 100, 119, 121, 142–43, 147, 200, 217
- Palm Sunday, 9, 15, 94, 95, 96, 107n53, 115, 116, 150n19, 188, 189, 192–93, 201, 210n46
- Pange lingua* (RH 14481), 213
- Pentecost, 9, 30, 52n88, 107n53, 116–17, 150n30, 158, 201, 208n28, 217
- pila*, game of, 159, 160, 174n18
- Play of Antichrist. *See Ludus de Antichristo*
- Presentation of Mary in the Temple, 125, 140–41, 154n72
- Processionarum Asinorum*, 35
- Proper of the Saints, 158, 187, 217
- Proper of the Time, 158, 187, 217
- Purification of Mary, 9, 107n53, 116, 140–41, 193
- Quem quaeritis* (Christmas), 81n65, 114, 148n11, 216
- Quem quaeritis* (Easter), 5, 46n40, 56, 59, 60, 63–67, 71, 73, 74, 75, 81n65, 83n89, 86, 88, 89, 112, 114, 148n5–6, 155n77, 161, 192, 193, 201, 207n19, 209n34, 216, 218, 219
- Regularis Concordia*, 2, 37, 44n30, 46n40, 56, 60, 71, 73, 75, 83n95, 86, 87, 90–91, 103n15, 106n40, 114–15, 150n19, 183, 208n30, 208n31
- religious plays, 1, 6, 7–8, 12, 14–15, 27, 32, 55, 56, 71, 95, 111, 119–24, 140–45, 171, 200, 201, 203, 203, 204, 209n41, 210n48

representation, 3, 7, 24, 56, 75–77,
 114–15, 118–19, 194, 195
 representational rites, 6, 7, 14–15, 24,
 25, 83n95, 88–89, 91, 100–101,
 111, 112–19, 120, 121, 122,
 123, 125, 126, 127, 129–41,
 173, 181–88, 194, 200, 206n12,
 209n41, 210n48
 responsory, 9, 48n57, 71, 86, 87, 90,
 102, 118, 139, 150n19, 154n66,
 158, 160, 161, 187, 213, 215, 217,
 218, 219
 Rogation (Rogationtide), 107n53,
 158, 217, 218

Schmackostern, 159–60
Sedit angelus (CAO 4858), 194,
 210n50
 sort-crossing, 173, 178n68, 184,
 206n18
Sponsus, 14, 23, 25, 26, 32, 45n37,
 49n65, 50n65, 72, 82n89, 92,
 107n50, 124, 126, 146–47
 Stiepern. *See* Schmackostern
Surrexit enim sicut (CAO 5081), 131,
 195, 197, 199

Trinitas, deitas, unitas (trope), 30–31,
 48n57

trope, 5, 46n40, 48n57, 56, 59, 60,
 64, 112, 114, 129, 134, 148n6,
 148n11, 155n17, 190, 218

Utraquist, 171–72, 219

Venite et videte (CAO 5352), 89, 131
Visitatio Sepulchri. *See* Easter Sunday,
Visitatio Sepulchri

Typeset in Garamond Premier Pro
Composed by Martine Maguire-Weltecke

Medieval Institute Publications
College of Arts and Sciences
Western Michigan University
1903 W. Michigan Avenue
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5432
<http://www.wmich.edu/medieval/mip>



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY