

LITURGICAL DRAMA AND THE REIMAGINING OF MEDIEVAL THEATER

Michael L. Norton

INTRODUCTION: AN IMPROBABLE FICTION

By the opening decades of the nineteenth century, the notion that a category could be framed to encompass both a collection of medieval liturgical rites that appeared to be drama and a scattering of more overtly dramatic texts that were presumed to be liturgical had yet to occur to anyone.¹ Once framed, however, this idea of “liturgical drama,” as incongruous as its collation might happen to be, became so firmly embedded in the scholarly understanding that later attempts to dislodge it would be met with incredulity.

“There is no such thing,” Drumbl concluded, “as ‘liturgical drama.’” 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.²

Indeed, with those two sentences, Carol Symes shrugs off nearly three-quarters of a century of critical inquiry into the nature of what we have long called “liturgical drama.” On the one hand, she is correct. The study of medieval drama would be meager indeed without the preamble that a consideration of liturgical drama provides. But keeping alive the notion of liturgical drama surely requires some defense, as sustained attacks on the notion have been ongoing for some time. As early as 1930, Oscar Cargill challenged both

¹ As Andrew Hughes observed over two decades ago, to study what we now call liturgical drama demands that disciplinary boundaries be crossed if not ignored altogether (Andrew Hughes, “Liturgical Drama: falling between the disciplines,” *The Theatre of Medieval Europe: New Research in Early Drama*, ed. Eckehard Simon [Cambridge, 1991], 42–62). 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 uninvited, 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 thank Donnalee Dox, who took great care with earlier drafts of this study and who offered a great many insights and suggestions, along with Amelia Carr, James Ward, and the denizens of the PERFORM listserv. I pray that you will forgive me for having paid insufficient heed to your advice and warnings. 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.

² Carol Symes, “The Appearance of Early Vernacular Plays: Forms, Functions, and the Future of Medieval Theater,” *Speculum* 77 (2002), p. 793. The quotation is taken from Johann Drumbl, *Quem Quaeritis: Teatro Sacro dell'Alto Medioevo* (Rome, 1981), p. 365.

the liturgical origin of medieval drama and the very notion of liturgical drama by proposing medieval minstrels as the originators of drama in the Middle Ages.³ Similar challenges were offered in 1936 by Robert Stumpfl⁴ and in 1955 by Benjamin Hunningher,⁵ who saw the origin of medieval drama in Germanic folk ritual rather than in the recesses of the Latin liturgy. While these early attacks were largely unsuccessful in the face of the steadfastness with which the notion liturgical drama was held,⁶ they set the stage for the more nuanced, and the more direct, challenges that would follow.

In 1965, O. B. Hardison, Jr. took issue with the teleological foundations that supported the earlier attempts by Edmond K. Chambers⁷ and Karl Young⁸ to trace the transformation of drama from liturgical to secular.⁹ Two years later, Helmut de Boor offered a replacement for the developmental categories finalized by Young for the *Visitatio Sepulchri* some thirty-four years earlier,¹⁰ and two decades after that De Boor's counter-scheme was challenged by Michael Norton.¹¹ A little over a half century after Cargill's attempt, Johann Drumbl questioned the notion of liturgical drama yet again, although he was unable to put it to

³ Oscar Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy* (New York, 1930).

⁴ Robert Stumpfl, *Kultspiele der Germanen als Ursprung des mittelalterlichen Dramas* (Berlin, 1936).

⁵ Benjamin Hunningher, *The Origin of the Theater* (The Hague, 1955).

⁶ On the reaction to Cargill and Hunningher especially, see Grace Frank, "Review of Oscar Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy* (1930)," *Modern Language Notes* (1931): pp. 62–64 and Arnold Williams, "Review of Benjamin Hunningher, *The Origin of the Theater* (1955)," *Speculum* 32 (1957): p. 564.

⁷ Edmond K. Chambers, *The Medieval Stage*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1903).

⁸ Karl Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1933).

⁹ O. B. Hardison, Jr., *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages* (Baltimore, 1965).

¹⁰ Helmut de Boor, *Die Textgeschichte der lateinischen Osterfeiern* (Berlin, 1967). De Boor proposed three poetic types in place of the three developmental stages of Young and his predecessors.

¹¹ Michael L. Norton, "Of 'Stages' and 'Types' in *Visitatio Sepulchri*," *Comparative Drama* 21(1987): pp. 34–61 and 127–44 reprinted in *Drama in the Middle Ages: Comparative and Critical Essays: Second Series*, ed. Clifford Davidson and John Stroupe (New York, 1991), pp. 61–105. This essay traces the history of the three-stage classification for the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and proposes in its place a two-part framework based on the textual and musical content that defines them. Norton's two types correspond to the first two types of De Boor's study, with De Boor's third type incorporated within Norton's two.

rest.¹² The most cogent and sustained attacks on the notion of liturgical drama, though, were those of C. Clifford Flanigan, who, more than any scholar before him, focused on the liturgical contexts within which the so-called liturgical dramas lived. 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.¹³ In subsequent essays and presentations, Flanigan carried his argument further, 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.¹⁴

Flanigan’s forceful arguments were highly influential, particularly among students of liturgy and chant. M. Bradford Bedingfield, for one, internalized Flanigan’s contributions in his study of what he called the “dramatic liturgy of medieval England,”¹⁵ while Nils Holger

¹² Drumbl, *Quem Quaeritis* (1981). Symes’ critique of Drumbl’s work is given in Symes, “The Appearance,” pp. 793–94. See also the review by Ursula Hennig in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 113 (1984): pp. 60–67 and the critiques by Anselm Davril, OSB, “Johann Drumbl and the Origins of the *Quem Quaeritis*: A Review Article,” *Comparative Drama* 20 (1986): pp. 65–74 and C. Clifford Flanigan, “Medieval Latin music-drama,” *The Theatre of Medieval Europe: New Research in Early Drama* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 21–41 (esp. pp. 27–30).

¹³ C. Clifford Flanigan, “The Roman Rite and the Origins of Liturgical Drama,” *University of Toronto Quarterly* 43 (1974): pp. 263–84.

¹⁴ See, for example, C. Clifford Flanigan, “The Fleury Playbook and the Traditions of Medieval Latin Drama,” *Comparative Drama* 18 (1984–85): p. 350.

¹⁵ M. Bradford Bedingfield, *The Dramatic Liturgy of Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2002), pp. 156–170 treats the *Visitatio Sepulchri* as a ritual act and discusses its context in terms of the rites that surrounded it. He treats the issues in somewhat more depth in “Ritual and Drama in Anglo-Saxon England: The Dangers of the Diachronic Perspective,” *The Liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 291–317.

Petersen continues to carry Flanigan's insights into new directions.¹⁶ Building out from the foundation laid by Flanigan, scholars from literature and theater have cast further doubt on the notion of liturgical drama, albeit indirectly. Michal Kobialka, for one, stirred the shifting theological sands upon which the *Quem quaeritis* dialogue settled in his study of the representational practices of the medieval liturgy.¹⁷ Lawrence Clopper examined the medieval usage and understanding of the word "ludus," showing that its manifold meanings only sometimes pointed to what we might today think of as plays.¹⁸ Donalee Dox, conversely, focused on the notion of "theatrum" as it was reflected in Christian writing from late Antiquity through the Middle Ages, demonstrating that this word was specifically reserved for discussions of the theatrical traditions of antiquity.¹⁹ The very notion of liturgical drama was thus rendered only marginally useful when applied to those representations called liturgical drama, and we have reached the rather paradoxical state where for many students of medieval liturgical drama the label "liturgical drama" has become largely unusable, meaningless at best and oxymoronic at worst.

¹⁶ Petersen has been quite prolific on a number of different subjects. The following are representative of his output regarding liturgical drama: Nils Holger Petersen, "The Representational Liturgy of the Regularis Concordia," *The White Mantle of Churches. Architecture, Liturgy, and Art around the Millennium* (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 107–17; "Liturgical Drama: New Approaches," *Bilan et perspectives des études médiévales (1993–1998): Euroconférence (Barcelone, 8–12 juin 1999)*, Textes et études du moyen âge 22 (Turnhout, 2004), pp. 625–44; "The Question of the Origin of Medieval Drama in Medieval Liturgy," *The Origins of Theater in Ancient Greece and Beyond: From Ritual to Drama* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 239–360; "Biblical Reception, Representational Ritual, and the Question of 'Liturgical Drama'," *Sapientia et Eloquentia: Meaning and Function in Liturgical Poetry, Music, Drama, and Biblical Commentary in the Middle Ages*, Disputatio 11 (Turnhout, 2009), pp. 163–201.

¹⁷ Michal Kobialka, *This is My Body: Representational Practices in the Early Middle Ages* (Ann Arbor, 1999).

¹⁸ Lawrence M. Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game: English Festive Culture in the Medieval and Early Modern Period* (Chicago, 2001).

¹⁹ Donalee Dox, *The Idea of Theater in Latin Christian Thought* (Ann Arbor, 2004).

Yet the notion “liturgical drama” persists, even among those who would resist its call.²⁰ Its hold is so strong, in fact, that recent attempts to topple the theory of medieval drama’s ritual beginnings have conceded the existence of liturgical drama nonetheless.²¹ Indeed, the accumulated arguments of a half-century and more, while finding an enthusiastic if limited audience, have proven unconvincing to many while being ignored by some.²²

²⁰ Susan Rankin, “Liturgical Drama,” *The Early Middle Ages to 1300, New Oxford History of Music 2* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 310–56, for example, while using the label “play” out of convenience, is fully aware of the difficulties:

[T]he two aspects of ‘play’ and ‘ceremony’ have to some extent been separately evoked, and even set in opposition to each other. Here, rather than confuse the issue by choosing the term ‘ceremony’ on some occasions and ‘play’ on others, I refer throughout to ‘play’; this does not constitute a judgement of the nature of liturgical drama, but is merely intended as a neutral term. (p. 311)

Nils Holger Petersen, on the other hand, hedges in his use of the expression “liturgical drama,” either placing it in quotes or qualifying his usage in some other way. The opening sentence from “Liturgical Drama: New Approaches” is illustrative:

For most of this century the scholarship of the so-called liturgical drama has been occupied with two fundamental questions: first, the question of the origin of what seemed to emerge as dramatic practices within (and gradually also outside of) the religious observances of the Medieval church, secondly — dependent on the answer(s) to the first — why dramatic texts at all would occur among the ceremonies in liturgical manuscript from the 10th century onwards. (p. 625)

²¹ For Eli Rozik, *The Roots of Theatre — Rethinking Ritual and other Theories of Origin* (Iowa City, 2002), for example, liturgical drama was an adaptation within the liturgy of dramatic impulses that had developed outside of the church. A similar view, albeit from a Marxist perspective, is offered by Leonard Goldstein, *The Origin of Medieval Drama* (Madison NJ, 2004).

²² See, for example, Lawrence Clopper’s “Review of William Tydeman, et al., *The Medieval European Stage 500–1500*,” *Speculum* 79 (2004): pp. 848–51. Commenting on Tydeman’s introduction, Clopper observes that:

[t]he 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), here is no acknowledgment, as far as I can determine, of his systematic demonstration of the inadequacies of Chamber’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 taken into account (p. 848).

Challenges to the notion liturgical drama, though, also persist, and these challenges when assembled produce a barrier to embracing the notion that is difficult to breach. 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? More pragmatically, if we are to write about liturgical drama, by what noun might we refer to its individual instances? The word “play” seems clearly inappropriate for liturgical rites such as the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, while the word “rite” feels equally well off-the-mark for the St. Nicholas plays of the so-called Fleury Playbook. Indeed, there are multiple sorts of entities embraced by the rubric “liturgical drama,” some clearly liturgical and others seemingly dramatic, but were there any that were both? Specifically, can we justify applying the label “liturgical drama” to the prescriptions for — or the performances of — those medieval liturgical rites since cast as drama and those religious plays since assumed to be liturgical in the absence of any encompassing and contemporaneous 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?

In this essay, I will argue that the notion of liturgical drama, as we have come to know it, is a fantasy, a fantasy spun by scholars in the middle third of the nineteenth century to serve as a metaphor that could serve either as an explanatory framework for the development of drama or as a paradigm that could justify a return to what some considered to be the more expressive liturgical practices of the Middle Ages. Indeed, the notion “liturgical drama” was new to the scholars of the mid-nineteenth century, and it prompted a reimagining of theater history that placed the path travelled by medieval theater parallel to that followed by the theater of the ancients. The narrative seemed so correct, the plot so compelling, that the metaphor “liturgical drama” would come to be reified as category, a category whose unsteady foundation would come to support all manner of later attempts to understand the origin and nature of medieval drama at large. Following an inverse chronology, I will show not only that this notion of liturgical drama, as obvious as it came to be, was a nineteenth-century fabrication, but that any such notion would have been unimaginable in the years and in the centuries that preceded its manufacture. I will show further that the label “liturgical drama” itself is problematic, that the terms making up the label as well as their collation have no clear meaning, and that the label ultimately has no clear referent. I will conclude by suggesting that the polarity seen by most scholars between liturgy and drama in the Middle Ages is illusory, generating a false dichotomy whose merger has served more to obscure than to clarify our understanding of the individual entities to which it has been applied.

I. A PRODIGIOUS BIRTH: THE EMERGENCE OF “LITURGICAL DRAMA”

While the expression “liturgical drama” may be of relatively recent pedigree, the story of its birth is just as compelling as that to which it alludes. Born as metaphor, the idea of “liturgical drama” saw its conception not in the aftermath of Carolingian liturgical reforms, but in the years following the restoration of the French monarchy in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Despite the success of its introduction, however, the metaphor could not hold. Even so, it laid the foundation for the category that followed, and in this role it has dominated the discussion of early medieval drama since the end of the Second Empire’s first decade. The story of this passage, from metaphorical youth to categorical maturity, is one of both great industry and serendipity, and it took place at the juncture where studies in historical musicology, iconography, liturgiology, literature, and theater began their campaigns to recapture (or perhaps rebrand) the monuments of their medieval past.

“Liturgical Drama” as Metaphor

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 1834–35.²³ Magnin was the curator of printed books at the Royal Library in Paris and served for that year as the acting

²³ Magnin’s course began with the start of the first semester on 1 December 1834 with lecture times scheduled for 9:30 in the morning on Mondays and Fridays (*Journal Générale de l’Instruction Publique* 4 [1834], p. 36). In his review of Magnin’s *Cours*, however, Achille Jubinal complains of an earlier time, noting the “. . . 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” (. . . 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). Achille Jubinal, “Cours de M. Charles Magnin sur les Origines du Théâtre en Europe,” *Le Mond Dramatique* 1 (1835): pp. 313–15 and 334–36. The quotation is drawn from p. 313.

professor for the chair of foreign literature in the *Faculté des Lettres*.²⁴ 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

²⁴ 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 sous la domination des conquérants germains*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1836), the middle part of a three-part general history of southern France that he had intended to write, but was unable complete. Fauriel's work focused largely on Provençal poetry. His lectures from 1831–32 were published posthumously as *Histoire de la littérature Provençal*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1846). Volume 1 and parts of volume 2 were translated into English by G. J. Adler as *History of Provençal Poetry* (New York, 1860). Charles Magnin was highly regarded by his contemporaries in France. Well-known as a theater critic and historian of the theater, he was the subject of two essays by Charles Auguste Sainte-Beuve, the first in 1843: "Ecrivains critiques et historiques et historiens littéraire de la France — Charles Magnin," *Revue des Deux Mondes* 4 (1843): pp. 245–61 and the second following Magnin's death: "Un Érudit Écrivain: M. Charles Magnin," *Revue des Deux Mondes* 45 (1863): pp. 299–320. The eulogy given by Paulin Paris at Magnin's funeral was published as "Discours de M. Maulin Paris, Vice-Président de cette Academie, Prononcé aux Funérailles de M. Magnin, Le Samedi 11 Octobre 1862," *Bulletin de Bibliophile et du Bibliothécaire* 5 (1862): pp. 1286–90. An extended biography of Magnin was provided some years after his death by Henri 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): pp. 61–140. On Magnin's role in the attempted recovery in 1831–32 of materials believed stolen from the Paris *Conservatoire* by its former librarian, François Fetis, see François Lesure, "L'affaire Fétis," *Revue belge de Musicologie/Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Muziekwetenschap* 38 (1974): pp. 214–21. On Magnin's influence as critic, particularly with reference to the performances of Shakespeare in Paris in 1827–28, see J. L. Borgerhoff, *Le Théâtre anglais à Paris sous la Restauration* (Paris, 1912) and John. R. Elliot, Jr., "The Shakespeare that Berlioz Saw," *Music and Letters* 57 (1976): pp. 292–308. Magnin was particularly taken with the performances of Harriet Smithson, who would inspire Berlioz's *Symphonie Fantastique*, and who would become the composer's wife as well (Elliot, "Shakespeare," 302).

predecessors had maintained,²⁵ but developed from earlier forms of drama born within, and borne by, the ritual of the medieval Church. The development of modern drama had thus followed the same path as had the drama of the ancients, moving from ecclesiastical to

²⁵ Magnin noted the significance of the break in his review of Louis-Jean Nicolas Monmerqué and Francisque Michel, *Théâtre français au moyen âge* (Paris, 1839) in the *Journal des Savants* (1846): pp. 5–6:

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.

[It would have been quite astonishing twenty years ago if we had seen a volume entitled: French Theater in the Middle Ages, during the 11th, 12th, 13th, and 14th centuries. It was so 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 St. Maur around 1398, and at Paris, in a solon of the Hospital of the Trinity in 1402.]

Charles-Edmond-Henri de Cousse-maker, echoed this assessment five years later in his article "Drame Liturgique," *Annales Archeologique* 11 (1851): p. 198:

Il y'a à peine vingt-cinq ans, on croyait encore, avec Beauchamps et les frères Parfait, que 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.

[It has been only twenty-five years since one believed, with Beauchamps and the brothers Parfait, 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 national archeology, like many others that remained too long in oblivion, finally attracted the attention of scholars.]

Cousse-maker refers here to Pierre-François Godard de Beauchamps, *Recherches sur les theatres de France depuis l'année onze cens soixante-un, jusques à present*, 3 vols (Paris, 1745–40) and Claude and François Parfait, *Histoire de theatre François depuis son origine jusqu'à present*, 15 vols. (Paris, 1734–49; repr. Geneva, 1967). On Cousse-maker's article and the chapter from which it was drawn, see n. 75 below.

aristocratic to popular.²⁶ This was not a developmental, or teleological progression, however. Rather it was 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:

... 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.²⁷

[... the religious, marvelous, theocratic 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 St. Martial, of Gandersheim, and of St. Alban.]

The second family included:

... la théâtre seigneurial et royal, qui brilla aux palais des ducs de Provence, de Normandie, de Bretagne et d'Aquitaine, aux donjons des comptes 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.²⁸

[... 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

²⁶ 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 (Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, p. 7):

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.

A more recent assessment of Magnin's work, influenced to some extent by an earlier presentation of the current study, was offered by Nils Holger Petersen, "The Concept of Liturgical Drama: Charles-Edmond de Coussemaker and Charles Magnin," *Études Grégoriennes* 36 (2009): pp. 305–14.

²⁷ Charles Magnin, "Des Origines du Théâtre en Europe," *Revue des Deux Mondes* 3 (1834), p. 585.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

and England, in the court of the emperor, in the official receptions of the kings of Sicily and Aragon.]

The third family then embraced:

... le théâtre populaire et forain, qu'on vit constamment à de certains jours, s'agiter et s'ébattre, à grand renfort de bruit et de gaieté, dans les places de Florence, sur les quais et les canaux de Venise, dans les carrefours de Londres et de Paris.²⁹

[... the popular and traveling theater, for which one lived constantly on certain days to stir and frolic with much noise and gaiety in the streets of Florence, on the quays and canals of Venice, in the crossroads of London and Paris.]

²⁹ Ibid.

What we know of Magnin's course comes from notes to his lectures published between 1834 and 1836³⁰ and from a series of articles that appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*

³⁰ B. Z., "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): pp. 45–46; 4/16 (25 Dec. 1834): p. 75; 4/19 (4 Jan. 1835): pp. 90–91; 4/21 (11 Jan. 1835): p. 99; 4/23 (18 Jan. 1835): pp. 106–7; 4/26 (29 Jan. 1835): pp. 119–20; 4/29 (8 Feb. 1835): pp. 134–35; 4/31 (15 Feb. 1835): p. 145; 4/33 (22 Feb. 1835): pp. 153–54; 4/35 (1 Mar. 1835): p. 162; 4/39 (15 Mar. 1835): pp. 178–79; 4/42 (26 Mar. 1835): pp. 190–91; 4/43 (29 Mar. 1835): pp. 194–95; 4/46 (9 Apr. 1835): pp. 208–9; 4/48 (16 Apr. 1835): pp. 222–23; 4/52 (30 Apr. 1835): pp. 245–47; 4/54 (7 May 1835): pp. 256–57; 4/57 (17 May 1835): pp. 275–76; 4/66 (18 Jun. 1835): pp. 328–29; "Second semestre" 4/70 (2 Jul. 1835): pp. 351–52; 4/73 (12 Jul. 1835): pp. 370–72; 4/77 (26 Jul. 1835): pp. 395–96; 4/81 (9 Aug. 1835): pp. 418–19; 4/87 (30 Aug. 1835): 455–56; 4/88 (3 Sep. 1835): pp. 461–62; 4/91 (13 Sep. 1835): pp. 478–80; 4/97 (4 Oct. 1835): pp. 514–16; 4/101 (18 Oct. 1835): p. 539; 4/102 (22 Oct. 1834): pp. 546–47; 5/1 (1 Nov. 1835): pp. 4–5; 5/4 (12 Nov. 1835): pp. 28–30; 5/6 (19 Nov. 1835): pp. 43–45; 5/10 (29 Nov. 1835): pp. 67–69; 5/13 (13 Dec. 1835): pp. 99–101; 5/19 (3 Jan. 1836): pp. 150–51; 5/22 (14 Jan. 1836): pp. 172–73; 5/26 (28 Jan. 1836): pp. 202–4; 5/37 (6 Mar. 1836): pp. 292–96 (hereafter "Magnin Cours"). A manuscript copy of the "Cours" 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 1834–1835. (Copie textuelle de Compte rendu inséré dans les T. IV et V des Journal général de l'Instruction publique). Beauvais. Janvier 1850." While the catalog 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. Copied by several hands, this manuscript contains a literal copy of the notes to the "Cours" as printed in the *Journal Général de l'Instruction Publique* along with other items, including several book reviews by Magnin. The text of the "Cours" is written exclusively on the recto side of the page, with numerous additions and corrections on the facing versos. Included among these are quotes from other Magnin essays published before 1850 (see n. 31 below) 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: Louis-Jean Monmerqué and Francisque Michel, *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1839) and Édouard Du Méril, *Les Origines Latines du Théâtre Moderne* (Paris, 1849). 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.

and the *Journal des Savants* between 1834 and 1861.³¹ His opening lecture, published in full in the December 1834 issue of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*,³² offers the earliest,

³¹ Charles Magnin, “Des Origines du Théâtre en Europe,” *Revue des Deux Mondes* 3 (1834): pp. 578–97; “La Comédie au IV^e siècle,” *Revue des Deux Mondes* 4 (1835): pp. 633–73; “Études sur les Origines du Théâtre Antique, pour servir d'Introduction à l'Histoire des Origines du Théâtre Moderne,” *Revue des Deux Mondes* 13–14 (1838), 13: pp. 681–88, 14: pp. 40–70; “Review of Monmerqué and Michel, Théâtre français au Moyen Âge (Paris, 1839)” *Journal des Savants* (1846–47), 1846: pp. 5–16, 76–93, 449–65, 544–58 and 626–37; 1847: pp. 36–53 and 151–62; and “Review of Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques du moyen âge* (Rennes, 1860),” *Journal des Savants* (1860–61), 1860: pp. 309–19 and 521–40; 1861: pp. 481–503.

³² Magnin, “Des Origins” (1834).

seemingly unambiguous use of the expression “drame liturgique.”³³ Magnin speaks of the grand spectacle of contemporary opera as successor to the pious representations of medieval confraternities, which “ . . . 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 cathedrales” (. . . had themselves succeeded others more solemn and more serious,

³³ While Magnin had used the phrase “théâtre liturgique” as early as 1827, his use of the expression appears to have been directed more toward religious drama generally rather than toward what we know as liturgical drama specifically. See Charles Magnin, “Résumé de l'Histoire Littéraire du Portugal, suivi de Résumé de l'Histoire Littéraire du Brésil, par M. Ferdinand Denis,” *Le Globe* V/37 (28 June 1827): 194–196. This was revised and reprinted in Charles Magnin, “Du Théâtre en Portugal,” *Causeries et Méditations Historiques et Littéraires*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1843), 2, pp. 404–16, where the phrase “théâtre liturgique” was changed to “drame liturgique.”

. . . les premiers drames ont été, en Portugal, comme presque partout, consacrés d'abord et mêlés aux cérémonies religieuses. Les autos étaient, comme nos mystères et nos diableries, représentées dans les églises ou dans les lieux attendants, et succédaient au service divin, dont ils étaient la suite et le complément. Cette sorte de mélange et de confraternité bizarre dura en Europe jusqu'un peu après la Réforme. Ce fut alors seulement que s'arrêta ce paganisme renaissant et que s'établit, pour l'amusement du peuple, l'usage des pièces d'invention ou tirées de l'histoire profane. . .

Gil Vicente, auteur d'un grand nombre d'autos et de comédies, fleurit sous Emmanuel et Jean III, au moment où s'opérait cette scission du théâtre liturgique et du théâtre mondain. (p. 194)

[. . . the first dramas were, in Portugal, as everywhere, devoted primarily to and intermixed with religious ceremonies. The autos were, as our mysteries and devilries, represented in churches or on their grounds and succeeded the divine service that they followed and complemented. This sort of mixture and bizarre confraternity endured in Europe until a little after the Reformation. It was only then that this resurgent paganism was halted and that pieces, either newly composed or drawn from secular history, were established for the amusement of the people.

Gil Vicente, the author of a large number of autos and comedies, flourished under [King] Manuel [I] and [King] João [III] at the moment when secular drama separated from liturgical theater.]

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).³⁴

While it is tempting to interpret Magnin's words according to our current understanding of the expression, it is unclear to what Magnin actually refers with the words "drame liturgique." He abandons its use in his subsequent lectures in favor of the more inclusive "drame hiératique," "drame sacerdotale" or "drame ecclésiastique" and we are left to infer his meaning from the content of his course as a whole.³⁵ From this perspective, Magnin's understanding of "drame liturgique" and its cognates appears quite expansive. He offers 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 notes that:

... 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 institua 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

³⁴ Magnin, "Des Origins" (1834), p. 582. This paragraph is cited also in the introduction to Magnin's book as well. See n. 46 below.

³⁵ The expression "drame liturgique" appears but twice in the notes to Magnin's lectures, and in neither case is its reference clear. However, this did not deter Magnin from taking credit for its invention a quarter-century later. In his review of Charles-Edmond-Henri de Coussemaker's, *Drames liturgiques du Moyen Âge* (Rennes, 1860) in the *Journal des Savants* (1860): p. 312, Magnin states quite immodestly: "C'est fort judicieusement, suivant moi, que M. de Coussemaker a donné son livre le titre de Drames liturgiques du moyen âge. Il ne pouvait en choisir aucun qui précisât mieux le caractère et la destination des morceaux qui le composent." (It is wise that, following me, Mr. Coussemaker has given his book the title of *Drames liturgique du moyen âge*. He could hardly have chosen a title better able to describe the book's character and content.)

représenter l'ascension du Christ ; toutes cérémonies vraiment mimiques, qui on fait, comme nous le verrons, l'admiration de fidèles au moyen-âge.³⁶

[. . . 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, the *Praesepe* or the manger for Christmas, the star or the three kings for Epiphany, 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; 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.]

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 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 *dialogues des liturgies apostoliques* where the priest, deacon, and people took the floor in succession, the dialogue-like songs sung at common meals, and dances that were allowed in liturgical processions and around the tombs of martyrs, as well as a host of other mimetic practices that he would detail in later lectures. With the sixth to twelfth centuries came the full flowering of the *génie sacerdotal*, as demonstrated by the use of masks in nunneries, by short funeral dramas where nuns shared roles, by the plays of Hrosvitha of Gandersheim, by the representations of the great feast days, and by the dance macabre. The twelfth through the sixteenth centuries saw the escape of the drama

³⁶ Magnin, "Des Origines" (1834): pp. 589–90. Magnin's reference to what we now know as the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter is likely drawn from the setting of the office from Rouen given in the second edition of Jean LePrévôt, *Joannis Abricensis Episcopi diende Rotamagensis, Archiepiscopi Liber de Officiis Ecclesiasticis, Notis D. Johannis Prevotii* (Rouen, 1679), pp. 211–15, edited and enlarged by Jean-Baptiste Le Brun des Marettes (reprinted by Migne, PL 147 (1853), pp. 139–42). Le Brun des Marettes' transcription of the *Office du Sepulcre* is the only setting of those conceivably known by Magnin that includes the phrase "ad similitudinem mulierum." This together with the *Officium Stellae* were also the first transcriptions of what we now call liturgical dramas to include musical notation. It would be nearly two centuries before Coussemaker would offer the second. See the discussion of Coussemaker's contribution below. For the other settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* known at the time of Magnin's lectures, see n. 50 below.

from the cloister to the town, where it moved from the control of the Church to the confraternities, and from Latin to the vernacular.³⁷

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 Pastorem* 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:

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 au de l'Etoile. — L'office des pasteurs. — Liturgies exécutées par des laïcs. — Fêtes royales — Lune de Charlemagne. — Foires. — Jongleurs. — Pièces laïques. — Chants nationaux. — Fêtes nationales à Venise.³⁸

[Eighth and ninth centuries — Materialization of objects for worship — Dances in the church — Defenses of the councils. — Antiphoners. — The claims of Agobard. — Valdamnus — Christmas carols. — Use of wax for liturgical representations. — Diptychs. - Office of the three Kings following the Star. — Office of the Shepherds. —

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 591–92.

³⁸ “Magnin Cours” 4/52, p. 245 (NYPL, Magnin Papers, fol. 143^r). For both offices, Magnin cited manuscripts from the cathedral at Rouen as given by Le Brun des Marettes in the second edition of *Jean LePrévôt, Joannis Abricensis Episcopi*, pp. 206–10 (see n. 36 above) from 1679 and from Edmond Martène, *Tractatus de antiqua ecclesiae disciplinae in divinis celebrandis officiis* (Lyons, 1706), pp. 87 and 111–12 (republished in his *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus*, 4 vols., 2nd ed. (Antwerp, 1736–38), 3, cols. 96 and 122–123 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 Charles de Fresne du Cange, *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* (Frankfurt, 1710). These include the following articles: “Pastorum Officium” (IV, col. 209), “Peregrinorum Officium” (IV, cols. 269–70), “Officium Sepulchrum” (IV, cols. 901–2), and “Stellae Festum” (IV, cols. 1058–59). On the manuscripts consulted by Le Brun des Marettes, Martène, and Du Cange, see Karl Young, “A Contribution to the History of Liturgical Drama at Rouen,” *Modern Philology* 6 (1908): pp. 24–27. On Martène's sources in particular, see Aimé-Georges Martimort, *La documentation liturgique de dom Edmond Martène. Étude codicologique* (Vatican City, 1979), p. 243. See also n. 50 below.

Liturgy performed by laity. — Royal feasts. — Charlemagne's moon. — Fairs. — Jongleurs. — Secular works. — National songs. — National festivals at Venice]

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

Onzième siècle. — Liturgie mêlée de la 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 en l'honneur de Sainte Marie. — Mystère des vièrges folles et des

vièrges sages, tiré de manuscrit de S. Martial. — Bas reliefs et sculptures de Cathédrales.³⁹

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

³⁹ “Magnin Cours” 4/77, p. 395 (NYPL, Magnin Papers, fol. 213^r). This play, or series of plays, was first noted by l’Abbé Jean Lebeuf in 1741 in his *Dissertation sur l’Histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Paris*, 3 vols (Paris, 1739–43), 2, p. 65 and first published in 1817 by François-Just-Marie Raynouard, *Choix des Poésies originales des troubadours*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1816–21), 2, pp. 139–43. 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 those who had gone before, an argument that has been accepted by most subsequent critics. He discerned a fourth play in the manuscript as well (Lamentation of Rachel). His most thorough defense for this thesis is given in his review of Louis-Jean Nicolas Monmerqué and Francisque Michel, *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* (1839), *Journal des Savants* (1846): pp. 76–93. Discussing the time he spent with the manuscript in 1835, he describes his epiphany (p. 77):

Je crus y apercevoir, non pas seulement, somme mes savants prédécesseurs, un drame ou un mystère unique, mais bien trois mystères séparés et distincts, a savoir: 1^e deux mystères complets, l’un tout en latin et l’autre en latin mêlé de langue romane; 2^e 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.

[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 which had not been previously reported.]

Disagreeing with Magnin’s division, Marius Sepet, “Les prophètes du Christ. Étude sur les origines du théâtre au moyen âge,” *Bibliothèque de l’École des chartes* 28 (1867): pp. 1–27 and 211–64, 29 (1868): pp. 105–39 and 261–93, and 38 (1877): pp. 397–443 (republished in book form under the same title [Paris, 1878]), argued that this was indeed a single play, an argument that has been taken up more recently by Carol Symes, “The Appearance,” pp. 793–801. Symes attributed the division of the text into multiple plays to Coussemaker.

In his second lecture dealing with the so-called Fleury Playbook,⁴⁰ given as the sixth lecture of the second semester, Magnin offered a similarly disparate group of topics:

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. —

⁴⁰ Orléans, Bibliothèque du Ville, MS 201, pp. 176–243 (hereafter Orléans 201). The earliest use of the label “Fleury Playbook” that I could find appeared in Edmond K. Chambers’ 1903 study, *The Medieval Stage*, 2, pp. 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.” Francis Stoddard, *References for Students of Miracle Plays and Mysteries*, University of California Library Bulletin 8 (Berkeley, 1887), p. 22. The collection of plays contained within the manuscript was first noted in 1729 by l’Abbé Jean Lebeuf, “Remarques envoyée d’Auxerre, sur les spectacles que les ecclésiastiques ou les religieux donnaient anciennement au public, hors le temps de l’office,” *Mercur de France* (1729): pp. 2981–93. This essay included a textual transcription of the *Tres Clerici*. In a second essay published six years later, “Lettre d’un solitaire à M. D. L. R., au sujet des nouveaux livres sur les anciennes représentations théâtrales,” *Mercur de France* (1735): pp. 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 Abbé Lebeuf are treated in Pierre Aubry, *La Musicologie Médiévale: Histoire et Méthodes. Cours profesée à l’Institut Catholiques de Paris* (1898–99) (Paris, 1900), pp. 31–43. The 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.

Charles de Fresne du Cange and Pierre Carpentier, *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis . . . in Compendium Redactum* (Halle, 1772–84), 4, p. 5. The ten plays contained within the manuscript were first edited by Louis-Jean Nicolas Monmerqué in his *Mysteria et miracula ad scenam ordinata, in coenobiis olim a monachis repraesenta, ex codice membranaceo XII mi saecule, in Aurelianensi bibliotheca servato desumpta* (Paris, 1834). According to Thomas Wright, only 30 copies of Monmerqué’s edition were printed, and the texts were edited again from Monmerqué’s uncorrected proofs in Wright’s, *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, 1838), pp. 1–53. See also his introduction to the manuscript on pp. vi–vii and the notes to his edition on pp. 124–26. The notice from Du Cange given above is given also by Wright, p. 125.

Manuscrit de S. Benôit-sur-Loire. — Mystère de la Conversion de St. Paul. — Mystère de la Rèsurrection de Lazare. Quatre Miracles de S. Nicolas.⁴¹

[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 St. Aignan. — The colloquy between Gabriel and Mary. — Monastic liturgy. — Manuscript of St. Benôit-sur-Loire. — Mystery of the Conversion of St. Paul. — Mystery of the Resurrection of Lazarus. — Four Miracles of St. Nicholas.]

All in all, Magnin was not so much interested in religious or liturgical theater as he was on the development of, and the continuation of, what he called the “g nie 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:

Je ne crois ni au r veil ni au sommeil des facult s humains; je crois   la continuit ,   leurs transformations, surtout   leur perfectibilit  et   leurs progr s. J’esp re  tablir par des preuves irr fragables, c’est - -dire par des monumens et par des textes, que la facult  dramatique, aussi naturelle   l’homme que la facult  lyrique, par exemple, n’a jamais cess  d’exister et de se produire. Non, messieurs, pendant tout se long intervalle de d composition et de recomposition sociale, qu’il me faut bien appeler, comme tout le monde, le moyen- ge, jusqu’  ce qu’on le connaisse assez bien pour lui pouvoir donner un nom moins vague, pendant tout ce long intervalle, le g nie dramatique n’a pas manqu  tout   fait   l’humanit : la seule, la grande difficult  pour le critique est de savoir le discerner et le reconna tre sous les nouvelles

⁴¹ “Magnin Cours” 4/91, p. 478 (NYPL, Magnin Papers, fol. 233^r). Magnin limits 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.

apparences qu'il revêt, et sous la couche épaisse de barbarie qui le recouvre et le déguise.⁴²

[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 under the new skins and under the thick layer of barbarism that covers and disguises it.]

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 in dance, in sculpture, or in funeral orations. Indeed, the list of churches whose naves served as stage for the *drame theocratique* cited above went far beyond that needed to accommodate the true dramas to which he had alluded in his opening lecture. While the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, *Officium Stellae*, and *Officium Pastorem* may have been known in the cathedrals of Strasbourg and Rouen and in the monastery of St. Martial, they were certainly not a part of the liturgical fabrics of Hagia Sophia in Byzantium

⁴² Magnin, "Des Origines," pp. 580–81. More recently, Carol Symes, "The Appearance," pp. 784–85 has argued the same point:

On the one hand, the indeterminate appearance of a representative set of medieval plays strongly suggests that there are many more such texts still to be recovered; on the other, their very indeterminacy exemplifies the degree to which theatrical documents should be viewed as integral to their manuscripts and to the conditions that produced them. . . . To date, no one has attempted to evaluate the particularity of the surviving evidence for medieval drama prior to the fourteenth century or asked what circumstances governed the transcription of plays into manuscript books. And among scholars currently at work in the field, only Stern has given voice to the opinion that there may be many more plays hidden away in those books . . .

She was apparently thinking here of vernacular plays only, as the repertory of the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, for one, has exploded from the twenty-eight texts known to Gustav Milchsack, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern* (Wolfenbüttel, 1880) to over eight hundred published in Walther Lipphardt, *Lateinischen Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*, 9 vols. (Berlin, 1976–90) a century later.

or the church of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome. For Magnin, and his immediate successors, the expression “drame liturgique” was a metaphor, the drama of the liturgy, so to speak:

The impact of Magnin’s course was both immediate and far-reaching. Adolphe-Napoléon Didron, founder and publisher of the *Annales Archéologique*, was so moved by Magnin’s lectures that he left Paris the following year on a six-month voyage through *le Midi* of 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 observed:

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.⁴³

[This history I heard with such passion, that I have not forgotten its essential contours or its main facts. Freshly nourished by this science of others, so excellent and substantial, I made a six-month journey in 1836 to several provinces of France, and particularly in the *Midi*. Attracted especially to religious monuments and to the carved and painted representations in such monuments, the facts that Mr. 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 Mr. Magnin had spoken so long on the benches of the Faculty actually performed by the characters of sculpture and stained glass.]

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

⁴³ Adolphe-Napoléon Didron, “Introduction to Félix Clément, ‘Liturgie, musique et drame du Moyen Âge,’” *Annales Archéologique* 7 (1847): p. 304. Didron was one of the early champions of Gothic art and iconography in mid-nineteenth century France. In addition to his publication of the *Annales Archéologique*, Didron also published several books on medieval art and iconography, including *Manuel d’iconographie chrétienne grecque et latine* (Paris, 1845), *Iconographie des chapiteaux du palais ducal de Venise* (Paris, 1857), and *Manuel des objets de bronze et d’orfèvrerie* (Paris, 1859). Didron followed Magnin’s example in publishing only one volume of what was to be his grand study Christian iconography: *Histoire de Dieu*, vol. 1 of *Iconographie chrétienne* (Paris, 1843). See Catherine Brisac and Jean-Michel Lénlaud, “Adolphe-Napoléon Didron ou les media au service de l’art chrétien,” *Revue de l’Art* 77 (1987): pp. 33–42.

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 veritable revelation. Des vues profondes, des considerations éléves, de apercus ingénieux, des analyses multipliées, des rapprochements pleins de sagacité, ont fait de ces leçons une histoire des plus substantielles et des plus attrayantes.⁴⁴

[In a memorable course professed 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 elevated considerations, the ingenious realizations, the multiple analyses, the syntheses so full of wisdom, made these lessons all the more substantial and attractive.]

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 Gringoir, author of mysteries, in the first chapter of Hugo's *Notre Dame de Paris* (Paris, 1831).⁴⁵

Magnin's reimagining of the history of drama was revolutionary, and its impact may well have been even more profound, and the name Magnin better known to our own time, 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.⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷ Didron,

⁴⁴ Coussemaker, *Drame liturgique*, p. v.

⁴⁵ Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, p. 6.

⁴⁶ Charles Magnin, *Les Origines du Théâtre moderne, ou Histoire du Genie dramatique depuis l'origine jusqu'au XVIe Siècle* (Paris, 1838). 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: *Théâtre de Hrosvitha: Religieuse Allemande du Xe Siècle* (Paris, 1845) and a study on the history of marionettes: *Histoire des Marionnettes en Europe depuis l'Antiquité jusqu'à nos Jours* (Paris, 1862). In addition, a collection of Magnin's essays culled from various periodicals was published as *Causeries et Méditations Historiques et Littéraires*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1843).

⁴⁷ Magnin, *Les Origines*, pp. i–ii.

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: "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." (In 1838, M. Magnin entered the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, where he gained, we fear, the disease of the place, the inactivity, the somnolence.)⁴⁸

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 embraced by the category of liturgical drama. He knew of the manuscripts reported by Lebeuf a century earlier: the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139 and the so-called Fleury Playbook of Orléans 201,⁴⁹ and he knew many of the dramatic rites published in the liturgical collections of Le Brun des Marettes (LePrévôt) and Martène a half-century before that.⁵⁰ All that would soon change, however, and Magnin's reimagining of theater history would provide a framework for understanding the proliferation of newly discovered texts that appeared so clearly correct that none would question its propriety for nearly a century.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Didron, "Introduction to Clément" (1847), p. 303. Didron's criticism of Magnin is ironic given that he was able to complete only a single volume of his own study of medieval iconography as well. See n. 43 above.

⁴⁹ See n. 39 and 40 above.

⁵⁰ It is unclear which settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* Magnin may have known beyond the Rouen setting transmitted by Le Brun des Marettes. 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. 38 above), 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 Toul, St. Denis, Monte Cassino, Narbonne, Poitiers, Soissons, St. Martin in Tours, Laon, Vienne, and Strasbourg. Edmond Martène, *De antiquis monachorum ritibus* (1690), pp. 446–47 (*Regularis Concordia*), 447 (Toul), 450–51 (St. Denis), and 451 (Monte Cassino) and *Tractatus de antiqua ecclesiae disciplinae* (1706), pp. 478–79 (Laon), 479–80 (Narbonne), 481–82 (St. Martin, Tours), 496 (Soissons), 501 (Tours), 503 (Vienne), and 505 (Strasbourg). These were republished in *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus* (1736–38), 3, cols. 483–507 and 4, cols. 419–25 as well as in the posthumous editions of 1763, 1783, and 1788. For Martène's sources, see Martimort, *La documentation liturgique*, pp. 127–29, 157–58, 224–27, 496, 519–20, 523, and 544–47.

⁵¹ Cf. Cargill, 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.

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 of medieval drama. Louis-Jean Nicolas Monmerqué published the texts of what we now know as the Fleury Playbook in 1834,⁵² and Jacques Joseph Champollions-Figeac offered the three plays of Abelard's student, Hilarius, four years later.⁵³ 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 what he called the "rude dramas" of the Fleury Playbook, but the plays of Hilarius, the Passion of the Carmina Burana, and the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139 as well.⁵⁴ Two previously unknown settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* also found their way into print about the same time. In 1830, Franz Kurz, canon and librarian at the Austrian priory of St. Florian, included a textual edition of a *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Klosterneuburg as an appendix to his study of

⁵² Louis-Jean Nicolas Monmerqué, *Mysteria et miracula ad scenam ordinata*.

⁵³ Jacques Joseph Champollions-Figeac, *Hilarii Versus et Ludi* (Paris, 1838). Jacques Joseph Champollions-Figeac was elder brother of Jean-François Champollion, who had deciphered the Rosetta Stone. For a recent account of the younger Champollions, see Daniel Merson, *The Linguist and the Emperor: Napoleon and Champollion's Quest to Decipher the Rosetta Stone* (New York, 2005). The plays and poetry of Hilarius are contained in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS lat. 11331, fols. 9^r-16^v.

⁵⁴ Thomas Wright, *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, 1838). His title notwithstanding, Wright drew his editions of Latin medieval drama from other publications and not from the manuscripts themselves. His edition of what is now known as the "Fleury Playbook," was based on proofs from Monmerqué's edition from 1834. The Passion Play of the *Carmina Burana* was taken from Heinrich Hoffman von Fallersleben, *Fundgruben für Geschichte deutscher Sprache und Litteratur*, II. Theil (Breslau, 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: Louis-Jean Nicolas Monmerqué and Francisque Michel, *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1839). See Wright, *Early Mysteries*, pp. vi-xiv.

Emperor Albrecht V,⁵⁵ and another *Visitatio Sepulchri* from an unknown, and presumably lost, manuscript from the cathedral at Sens, was published in 1833.⁵⁶

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 publication of Franz Josef Mone's two volume *Schauspiele des Mittelalters*.⁵⁷ Mone, who served as archivist in Karlsruhe, was the first scholar to actively 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.

⁵⁵ Franz Kurz, *Oesterreich unter Herzog Albrecht V*, 2 vols. (Linz, 1830), 2, pp. 425–27. Kurz, who was the librarian at the Augustinian priory of St. Florian, likely never saw the manuscript from which this text (without its music) was excerpted. He had intended to print the text of the *Ludus Paschalis* from Klosterneuburg noted by Bernhard Pez a century earlier (*Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, 6 vols. (Augsburg, 1721–29), 2, col. 183). He sought help from Maximilian Fischer, his counterpart at the Augustinian priory at Klosterneuburg in locating the *Ludus*, but Fisher was unable to locate the manuscript and referred Kurz instead to the *Visitatio Sepulchri* contained in Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, CCl 629, fols. 103^v–5^v. Kurz published the text of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from this manuscript as *Beilage Nro. 1* in his study, *Österreich unter Herzog Albrecht IV* (Linz, 1830), pp. 425–27. On the “rediscovery” of the Osterspiel in the early twentieth century, see Hermann Pfeiffer, “Klosterneuburger Osterfeier und Osterspiel,” *Jahrbuch des Stiftes Klosterneuburg*, 1, pp. 1–56, esp. 1–8. Pfeiffer also provided a facsimile of the *Osterspiel* as an appendix to the *Jahrbuch*. Kurz's contribution is particularly significant in that it offered the first liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* to be described in print as a dramatic, rather than a liturgical, event.

⁵⁶ *Mélanges de la Société des Bibliophiles* (1833), p. 165.

⁵⁷ Franz Josef Mone, *Schauspiele des Mittelalters* (Karlsruhe, 1846). 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 (LePrévôt) and the few published in the 1830s, a result likely of Magnin's earlier lack of interest in this office. While Mone ignored the French sources found in those earlier collections, he did include two texts previously published in the liturgical collections of Martin Gerbert: a setting of a *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Zurich (now Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, MS C.8.b. fols. 55^{r-v}), published by Gerbert in *Vetus Liturgia Alemannica*, 3 vols. (St. Blasien, 1776), 3, p. 864, and another from St. Blasien (manuscript lost) in his *Monumenta Veteris liturgiae Alemannicae*, 2 vols. (St. Blasien, 1777–79), 2, p. 237. One further setting of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Paris, although without manuscript citation, was published contemporaneously with Mone's edition by Auguste-Pierre Caron, *Notice Historique sur les Rites de l'Église de Paris* (Paris, 1846), p. 22.

Three years later, Édelstand du Méril included Mone's corpus along with all known Latin religious plays in his *Les Origines Latines du Théâtre Moderne*.⁵⁸ Even though both Mone and Du Méril included multiple examples of what we would later 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,⁵⁹ 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 unknown. 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 those settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* where

⁵⁸ Du Méril, *Les Origines* (1849). Du Méril 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 (St. Martial troper, DuMéril, *Origines latin du Théâtre Moderne*, p. 97) as well as the *Visitatio Sepulchri* contained within the later-tenth century *Regularis Concordia* (DuMéril, pp. 116–17), the former seen by 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 Méril attached no such significance to these texts, however, relegating both to footnotes. The *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the *Regularis Concordia* was well-known to students of the liturgy, however, having been published twice before the turn of the eighteenth century by Augustine Baker, *Apostolatus Benedictinorum in Anglia*, ed. Clement Reyner (Douai, 1626), “Appendix,” p. 89 and Edmond Martène in *De antiquis monachorum ritibus* (1690), pp. 446–47.

⁵⁹ Du Méril’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 uses 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 notes (p. 117):

La Passion allemande de Donaueschingen, ap. Mone, *Schauspiele des Mittelalters*, t. II, p. 183–350, 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.

[The German Passion of Donaueschingen, after Mone, *Schauspiele des Mittelalters*, 2, p. 183–350, 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 ms. from the fourteenth century in the library of St. Gall.]

the liturgical context was not given.⁶⁰ Du Ménil, similarly, used the term “Office” to refer to the liturgical ceremonies of *Visitatio Sepulchri* and its siblings from Christmas and Epiphany and “Mystère” to refer to those for which evidence for liturgical performance was lacking.⁶¹

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. Between 1847 and 1851, Clément published a serialized study of liturgical drama in Didron's *Annales Archéologiques*. Originally entitled “Liturgie, musique, et drame au Moyen Âge,” the title was changed midway through 1848 to “Drame liturgique.”⁶² According to Didron's introduction, the article's intent was to cover the subject of liturgical drama for the entire church year, including the offices 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 1848 Revolution 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.

⁶⁰ The *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 366 (olim 179), pp. 55–56 and that from Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 314 (olim 4/25), fols. 75^v–78^v, for example, are labeled “Osterfeiern,” while the longer, and more elaborate setting of the Easter play from Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 300, pp. 93–94 is labeled “Osterspiel.” This latter setting, included by Young among the texts of his third stage (1, pp. 389–90), follows a series of sermons and other works of Peter Abalard and thus offers no liturgical connection, a peculiarity that Young saw as “totally irrelevant” (Ibid.).

⁶¹ Du Ménil, *Origines latin du Théâtre Moderne*, consistently labeled settings of the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri*, for example, as “Office du Sépulcre” or “Office de la Résurrection” (pp. 89, 91, 94, 96, 98, 100, and 101), the *Officium Pastorem* as “Office des Pasteurs” (p. 147), and the *Officium Stellae* as “Office des Mages” or “Office de l'Étoile” (pp. 151 and 153). The plays of the Fleury Playbook, on the other hand, are labeled either “Mystère,” e.g., “Mystère de la Résurrection” (p. 108), “Mystère de l'Apparition à Emmaüs” (p. 120), and “Mystère de l'Adoration des Mages” (p. 162), or given no designation at all, e.g., “Massacre de saints Innocents” (p. 173).

⁶² Félix Clément, “Liturgie, Musique et Drame du Moyen Âge,” *Annales Archéologique* 7 (Dec. 1847): pp. 303–20: “L'Avent et Noël”; 8 (Jan. 1848): pp. 36–48: “Circconcision — Épiphanie”; (Feb. 1848): pp. 77–87: “Mercredi des Cendres — Carême”; continued as “Le drame liturgique” (Sep.–Dec. 1848): pp. 304–11: “Dimanche des Rameaux”; 9 (Jan.–Feb. 1849): pp. 27–40: “La Semaine Sainte”; (May–Jun. 1849): pp. 162–74: “Le Jour de Pâques”; 10 (May–Jun. 1850): pp. 154–60: “Semaine de Pâques”; 11 (Jan.–Feb. 1851): pp. 6–15: “L'Ascension — La Pentecôte.”

His title notwithstanding, Clément was really not interested in liturgical drama as we might characterize it. Like Magnin before him, Clément saw the notion of “drame liturgique” as metaphor.⁶³ His use of the metaphor, though, was more as polemic than description. 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.⁶⁴ His concern here 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 expressed largely in a

⁶³ The opening sentence of his essay on Easter week, for example, signaled both the thrust of his essays at large and his metaphorical understanding of the expression “drame liturgique,” when he noted that “Les sequences occupaient dans le drame liturgique une place importante.” (“The sequences occupy an important place in the liturgical drama”). *Ibid.*, 9, p. 154.

⁶⁴ 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. On the neo-Gallican reforms of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see David Hiley, “Neo-Gallican Chant,” *New Grove Dictionary of Music*, 2nd ed., 17, pp. 755–56 and John Emmerson et al., “Plainchant, 10: Developments from 1500 to 1800, ii: Neo-Gallican Reforms,” *New Grove Dictionary of Music*, 2nd ed., 19, pp. 852–53. On the ultramontanes in nineteenth-century France, see D. Moulinet, “Un réseau ultramontain en France au milieu de 19e siècle,” *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique*, 112 (1997): 70–125. The larger liturgical movement is treated by R. W. Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches: The History of a New Catholicism in Württemberg, England, and France* (New York, 1987). Briefer accounts are provided by John A. Emmerson et al., “Plainchant, 11: Restoration and Reform in the 19th century,” *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed., 29 vols., ed. Stanley Boorman, et al. (London, 2001), 19, pp. 853–58 (pp. 853–55 deals specifically with the reform movement in France), and Katherine Ellis, *Interpreting the Musical Past* (Oxford, 2005), esp. pp. 21, 71–72, and 194–202. Katherine Bergeron, *Decadent Enchantments* (Berkeley, 1998), provides an engaging history of the efforts to restore the chant of the Middle Ages by the monks of Solesmes. See also the history provided by Dom Pierre Combe, OSB (monk of Solesmes), *Histoire de la Restauration du Chant Grégorien d’après les Documents Inédits: Solesmes et l’Édition Vatican* (Solesmes, 1969), translated by Theodore Marier and William Skinner as *The Restoration of Gregorian Chant: Solesmes and the Vatican Edition* (Washington D.C., 1983).

single, unnamed gradual from the thirteenth century.⁶⁵ While this *graduale* included the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter Sunday, the *Officium Pastorem* of Christmas, and the *Officium Stellae* of Epiphany, their treatment by Clément was almost incidental. With missionary zeal, he focused his discussion 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 sequences, tropes, proses and hymns.⁶⁶

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,

⁶⁵ This manuscript was later identified by Coussemaker (*Drames liturgiques*, p. 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 L. Delisle *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, 1868-81), 1, pp. 322–29 (“Bibliothèque des Bigot. 1706”) and L. Delisle, *Bibliothèque Bigotiana manuscripta. Catalogue des manuscrits rassemblés au XVIIe siècle par les Bigot* (Rouen, 1877).

⁶⁶ Clément included two musical examples within his study, a harmonized setting (3 voices plus organ accompaniment) for the sequence *Qui regis sceptrā*, for the third Sunday in Advent (vol. 7, between pp. 312 and 313) and a monophonic setting of the troped Kyrie: *Kyrie fons bonitatis* (vol. 8, between pp. 36 and 37). He offered no musical examples of what appeared to be the object of his study. The facsimile of the opening for the sequence *Ave gloriosa virginum*, drawn from a Soissons manuscript now in Paris (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS nouv. acq. fr. 24541), which appears within Clément’s discussion of Easter Sunday (vol. 10, between pp. 154 and 155), is associated with the article by l’Abbé Jouve, “Histoire de l’harmonie au moyen âge,” *Annales Archéologiques* 10 (1850): pp. 186–99, which includes the conclusion of the facsimile.

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*,⁶⁷ he remarked:

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.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ This text was variously employed in medieval liturgical manuscripts, most often as a trope to the Sanctus or Agnus Dei. See the discussions by Karlheinz Schlager, "Trinitas, unitas, deitas — a trope for the Sanctus of the Mass," *Journal of the Plainsong and Mediaeval Music Society* 6 (1983): pp. 8–14 and Gunilla Iversen, "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*," *Liturgische Tropen. Referate zweier Colloquien des Corpus Troporum in München [1983] und Canterbury [1984]*, *Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung* 36, ed. Gabriel Silagi (Munich, 1985), pp. 45–66, esp. pp. 60–66. The text was edited in AH 47, pp. 348–49 (#345) and in Gunilla Iversen, *Tropes du Sanctus. Corpus Troporum 7, Tropes de l'ordinaire de la messe* (Stockholm, 1990), pp. 196–99 (no. 161*). The text cited by Clément is drawn from Sens, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 46, fols. 3^{r-v}, where it is included in first Vespers for the Office of the Circumcision, as *versiculus* after the Prosa that follows the Responsory *Descendit de coelis*. The text and music from this manuscript was given in Henri Villetard, *Office de Pierre de Corbeil (Office de la Circoncision) Improprement appelé "Office des Fous"* (Paris, 1907), pp. 90–91 [text] and 136 [music]. The melody was treated also by, among others, Amédée Gastoué, *Les anciens chants liturgiques des Églises d'Apt et du Comtat* (Grenoble, 1903), pp. 9 and 18 and Wulf Arlt, *Ein Festoffizium des Mittelalters aus Beauvais in seiner liturgischen Bedeutung*, 2 vols. (Cologne, 1970), 2, pp. 124–25. On the new Office of the Circumcision in thirteenth-century France and its relation to the so-called Feast of Fools, see the discussions by Margot Fassler, "The Feast of Fools and *Danielis Ludus*: Popular Tradition in a Medieval Cathedral Play," *Plainsong in the Age of Polyphony* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 65–99 and Max Harris, *Sacred Folly: A New History of the Feast of Fools* (Ithaca, 2011), pp. 98–112.

⁶⁸ Clément, "Drame liturgique," 8, p. 41.

[Such grandeur! such lavish enumeration! such sonority! The thought of the Middle Ages appears very whole in this poetry with its originality and its boldness. The musical expression rises or is moderated, 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." It is there only one example among thousands of the marvelous fruitfulness of the poets of the thirteenth century.]

His view of the contemporary hymn, *Debilis cessant elementa legis*,⁶⁹ on the other hand, was less generous:

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 . . .⁷⁰

[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 small number of professors of rhetoric . . .]

He then asks rhetorically:

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

⁶⁹ The hymn text, *Debilis cessant elementa legis*, was written by l'Abbé Sebastian Besnault (d. 1724), who served as priest at the church of St. Maurice in Sens. The hymn was included in the Paris Breviary of 1736 (*Breviarium Parisiensis. Pars Hiemalis* [Paris, 1736], pp. 272–73) and was still in use a century later (*Breviarium Parisiensis. Pars Hiemalis* [Paris, 1836], pp. 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* (St. Louis, 1941), #117 as well as in the more recent *Lutheran Service Book* (St. Louis, 2006), #898. See also John Julian, *A Dictionary of Hymnology: Setting Forth the Origin and History of Christian Hymns of All Ages and Nations* (New York, 1892), p. 285.

⁷⁰ Clément, "Drame liturgique," 8, pp. 41–42.

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?⁷¹

[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 hymn], or in this weak quatrain, half poetic, half philosophical, whose words, displaced by the requirements of meter, are as stubs of reptiles running one after the other. What did these intruders bring to Christian liturgy, these saphic, adonic verses, with their feet of molasses, anapests and bacchic?]

The modern hymn for Clément was simply barbaric: “Pourquoi ne pas nous ramener tout de suite à adorer Jupiter et Saturne?” (Why do we not immediately bring back Jupiter and Saturn for us to adore?).⁷²

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:

... 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.⁷³

⁷¹ Ibid., 8, p. 42.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid., 8, p. 85. Among the new treatises on chant composition that accompanied the neo-Gallican liturgical reforms (see n. 64 above) were Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers, *Dissertation sur le chant grégorien* (Paris, 1683), idem., *Méthode certaine pour apprendre le plein-chant de l’église* (Paris 1699), l’Abbé Jean Lebeuf, *Traité historique et pratique sur le chant ecclésiastique* (Paris, 1741), l’Abbé Léonard Poisson, *Nouvelle method, ou Traité théorique et pratique du plain-chant* (Paris, 1745), F. de la Feillée, *Méthode nouvelle pour apprendre parfaitement les règles du plain-chant et de la psalmodie* (Poitiers, 1748), l’Abbé Oudoux, *Méthode nouvelle pour apprendre facilement le plain-chant* (Paris, 1772), and Imbert, *Nouvelle Méthode, ou Principes raisonnés du plein-chant* (Paris, 1780). See also Philippe Lescat, *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, 1991).

[... how could men have done all these things they have done with the chant? Not only have they mutilated and rendered it almost unrecognizable, but again, while adding nothing new, they invented absolute systems based on imaginary or fortuitous connections. In a word, unable to understand the old chant, they have invented a new one, and any harm they caused has prevented composers from writing anything in plainsong. 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.]

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 *Revue de musique religieuse*, provided a musical edition of the Beauvais *Danielis Ludus*, then in private hands.⁷⁴ In 1852, Coussemaker included a facsimile, transcription and analysis of the so-called plays of Paris 1139 in his book, *Histoire de l'Harmonie du Moyen Âge*.⁷⁵ The text and music of the *Ludus Paschalis* of Tours was

⁷⁴ Félix Danjou, "Le théâtre religieux et populaire au XIII^e siècle: Mystère de Daniel," *Revue de musique religieuse* 4 (1848): pp. 65–78, 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: British Library, MS Egerton 2615. See the *Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the Years 1882–1887* (London, 1889), no. Eg. 2615.

⁷⁵ Coussemaker, *Histoire de l'Harmonie du Moyen Âge*. The chapter on *drame liturgique* was published separately in Didron's *Annales Archéologique* the year prior (see n. 25 above). The chapter was devoted largely to the plays of Paris 1139 as outlined earlier by Magnin (see n. 39 above). Coussemaker included a facsimile of the folios that included these items in their original context as well, 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 du Moyen Âge* (Rennes, 1860). In her essay, "The Appearance of Early Vernacular Plays," pp. 794–95, Symes took Coussemaker to task for having removed the play from its manuscript context by merging portions of two folios onto the single-page facsimile. Since he had provided the full facsimile in context in his earlier study, however, it is unlikely that Coussemaker intended the acontextual reading that Symes discerns. His intent, rather, was more instructional than interpretive, "... de donner une idée de la notation originale, nous avons reproduit un facsimile de chacun des manuscrits" (... to give an idea of the original notation by reproducing a facsimile from each manuscript). Coussemaker, *Drames Liturgiques*, p. xvii.

published by Victor Luzarche in 1856,⁷⁶ and in 1858, Coussemaker provided a textual transcription of the macronic *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the convent of Origny-St.-Benôit.⁷⁷

The first encyclopedia article on *drame liturgique* appeared in 1854 in Joseph d'Ortigue's *Dictionnaire Liturgique*, which was drawn primarily from the chapter on the plays of Paris 1139 included in Coussemaker's *Histoire de l'Harmonie*.⁷⁸ That same year, Jules de Douhet included a series of articles on the plays of the Fleury Playbook, the plays of Hilarius, and on the representational offices of Christmas, Epiphany, and Easter in his *Dictionnaire de Mystères*, avoiding the expression "drame liturgique" in favor of the more general, and somewhat more accurate "représentations figurées dans les rites ecclésiastiques" (figural representations in the ecclesiastical rites) or "rites figurée" (figural rites).⁷⁹ In 1860, Félix Clément extended his earlier discussion on the *drame liturgique* in his *Histoire generale de la Musique Religieuse*.⁸⁰ In the chapter on *Drame liturgique* (easily the longest in the book), he not only retread the ground he had covered over a decade earlier, but he added new

⁷⁶ Victor Luzarche, *Office de Pâques ou de la Résurrection* (Tours, 1856). Tours, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 927, fols. 1^r-8^v (twelfth-century miscellany, L00 824). The text of the *Jeu d'Adam* (*Ordo representacionis Ade*) from this manuscript was published by Luzarche two years earlier, *Adam: Drame Anglo-Normand du XIIe Siècle* (Tours, 1854).

⁷⁷ Charles-Edmond-Henri de Coussemaker, *Office du Sépulcre selon l'Usage de l'Abbaye d'Origny-Sainte-Benoite* (Paris, 1858). St. Quentin, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 86, pp. 609-25 (thirteenth-century miscellany, L00 825).

⁷⁸ Joseph Louis d'Ortigue, "Drame liturgique," *Dictionnaire Liturgique, Historique et Théorique du Plain-Chant et de Musique Religieuse, au Moyen Age et dans les Temps Modernes*, vol. 29 of *Nouvelle Encyclopédie Théologique, ou deuxième Série de Dictionnaires sur Toutes les Parties de la Science Religieuse*, ed. J.-P Migne (Paris, 1854), cols. 506-13.

⁷⁹ Jules de Douhet, *Dictionnaire de mystères, ou collection générale des mystères, moralités, rites figurés et cérémonies singulières* (Paris, 1854) — Reprint (Turnhout, 1989). Included in this work are articles on the Fleury Playbook: *Apparition de Notre-Seigneur Jesus-Christ (L')*, cols. 150-53; *Benoît-sur-Loire (Manuscrit de Saint)*, cols. 199-201; *Filles Dotées (Les)*, cols. 373-75; *Fils de Getron (Le)*, cols. 375-78; *Hérode ou l'Adoration des Mages*, cols. 402-6; *Innocents (Le Massacre des)*, cols. 459-61; *Juif Volé (Le)*, cols. 479-82; *Lazare Ressucité (Saint)*, cols. 486-89; *Miracles de Saint-Nicolas*, col. 517; *Paul (Conversion de Saint)*, cols. 825-26; *Résurrection (La)*, cols. 855-57 (first of the *Représentations Dramatiques* following the *Rites Figurés*), and the *Trois Clercs (Les)*, cols. 970-72. In addition are articles dealing with the plays of Hilarius: *Daniel d'Hilaire*, cols. 279-84; *Hilaire, Disciple d'Abailard*, cols. 406-7; *Lazare (La Résurrection de)*, cols. 489-92; and *Nicolas (La Statue de Saint)*; cols. 533-40 (also includes a discussion on *Le Jeu de Saint Nicolas* of Jean Bodel) as well as articles on the *Rites figurés*: *Nativité de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ*, cols. 519-22; *Résurrection (La)*, cols. 847-55; and *Trois Rois (Les)*, cols. 973-75.

⁸⁰ Félix Clément, *Histoire Generale de la Musique Religieuse* (Paris, 1860). The chapter on *Drame liturgique* runs from pages 89 to 318.

sections on the Marian feasts and on the Office of Thomas Becket. 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 Méril's "offices" and De Douhet's "rites figurée") 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 connections (Mone's "Osterspiele" and Du Méril's and De Douhet's "mystères"). Yet the expression "drame liturgique" was directed not toward this particular division, but 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 several books on the subject, and he would have given them the title "Liturgie dramatique, ou Drame liturgique au moyen âge" ("Dramatic liturgy or Liturgical Drama in the Middle Ages").⁸¹ Other writers, both near to and far from the study of medieval theater, took to this reading as well. In 1839, Eduouard de Bazelaire in an essay on the last of the mysteries commented on "... ces kiriolès de Rimiremont, 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" (... the Kyrieles [i.e., the processional litanies] of Remirement, the procession of Reynard (the Fox), the internment of the Mardi Gras, the travesties in animals of all kinds, the thousand follies that we can see in the glossary of DuCange), noting that:

Ce dévergondage de l'esprit dura assez long-temps; mais, vers le XIVe 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.⁸²

[This shamelessness of mind lasted long enough, but about the fourteenth century, the improvement of customs and the treatment of these ideas drove out sacrilegious jokes, and primitive symbols themselves gave way to a more spiritual way of

⁸¹ "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.'" Didron, Introduction to Clément, *Annales Archéologiques* 7, p. 305.

⁸² Edouard de Bazelaire, "Le Dernier des Mystères," *L'Austrasie, Revue du Nord-Est de la France* 5 (1839): pp. 20–21.

thinking. These liturgical dramas, expelled from the church, ascended the stage, and the ancient theater was once the mystery out of Eleusis.]

If De Bazelaire's understanding of "drame liturgique" echoed that of Magnin, Paul Scudo stretched the metaphor further in his 1857 biographical novel on the life and works of composer Giuseppe Sarti (1729–1802). In describing a performance of Sarti's sacred works, for example, Scudo noted several symphonic interludes that had the effect of "... suspendre agréablement l'action du drame liturgique" (... suspending agreeably the action of the liturgical drama).⁸³ In discussing of the music of Palestrina, Scudo stretched the metaphor yet further, noting that "... la valeur absolue de l'oeuvre de Palestrina ... a touché à toutes les parties du drame liturgique" (... the absolute value of the works of Palestrina ... has effected all parts of the liturgical drama).⁸⁴

"Liturgical Drama" as Category

As well entrenched as this metaphorical reading of "liturgical drama" appeared to be, though, its hold was weak, and following the 1860 publication of Charles-Edmond-Henri de Coussemaker's *Drames Liturgiques du Moyen Âge* it was largely abandoned. Nearly two centuries after Le Brun des Marettes had offered musical editions for the *Officium Stellae* and *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the cathedral of Rouen, Coussemaker 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. For Coussemaker, "drame liturgique" was not a metaphorical abstraction. It was a categorical descriptor. Expanding the distinction made by Du Ménil a decade earlier, Coussemaker saw two types of religious drama during the Middle Ages: liturgical dramas and mysteries, and these, while based on the same subject matter, were completely different: "Le drames liturgiques sont ceux qui se liaient d'une manière intime aux cérémonies du culte; ils étaient la mise en action es offices des temps et des saints ... Les mystères étaient représentés sur un théâtre proprement dit et par des acteurs laïques" (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 theatre itself and by lay actors).⁸⁵ The *drames liturgiques*, moreover, could themselves be subdivided:

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

⁸³ Paul Scudo, *Le Chevalier Sarti* (Paris, 1857), pp. 161–62

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 368.

⁸⁵ Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, p. vii.

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 sont 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.⁸⁶

[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 worship. They were dramatic at their creation. They have as their subject the sacred text, but their development made them into special compositions whose length made it impossible to preserve their place in the offices.]

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 on precision in the use of terms.⁸⁷ 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, and in so doing, he formalized a genre that remains with us today. 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 belongs 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

⁸⁶ Ibid., pp. ix-x.

⁸⁷ After studying music in his youth, Coussemaker went on to study law in Paris. He continued his study of music and his research into its history while serving as an advocate in Douai and later as judge for Bergues (1843), Hazebrouk (1845), Dunkerque (1852), and Lille (1858). Coussemaker's biography was given shortly after his death by l'Abbé Dehaines in an article, "Notice sur la Vie et les Travaux de M. E. de Coussemaker," which served as a preface to Coussemaker's *Troubles Religieux du XVIe Siècle dans la Frandre Maritime* (1560-1570), 4 vols (Bruges, 1876), 1, pp. i-xxv. Appended to the article are a bibliography of Coussemaker's writings in music, history, and archeology (pp. xxxvi-xliv) and a collection of notices on the death of Coussemaker (pp. xlv-lii). A summary is provided by Aubry, *La Musicologie Médiévale*, pp. 64-68.

boundaries that Coussemaker had suggested.⁸⁸ 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 drames liturgique* did not hold. Even Coussemaker himself could not maintain the distinction, intermixing the expressions in his discussions of individual texts.⁸⁹ 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 Pastorem* and *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Rouen and elsewhere along with the *Officium Prophetarum* of St. Martial.⁹⁰ While he conflated the usage of “mystère” and “drame liturgique,” Sepet saw the divisions among the *drames 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

⁸⁸ The effect was not immediate. One year after Coussemaker’s edition, l’Abbé Jouve, “Du Théâtre et de ses diverse conditions, durant le Moyen Age,” *Revue de l’Art Chretien Recueil Mensuel d’Archeologie Religieuse* 5 (1861): pp. 353–69, for example, continued to use the expression in the more expansive sense favored by Magnin and Clément, even though he was well aware of Coussemaker’s new edition.

⁸⁹ In his discussion of the manuscripts and of the liturgical dramas contained within them (*Drames liturgiques*, pp. 311–47), Coussemaker used the labels “drame,” “drame liturgique,” “liturgie dramatique,” “pièces dramatique,” and even “mystère” interchangeably. For example, in his discussion of the *Prophètes du Christ* of Paris 1139, he noted that (p. 318) “Ce mystère avait son orgine dans la liturgie catholique. C’est donc un véritable drame liturgique.” (This mystery had its origin in the catholic liturgy. It is therefore a true liturgical drama.) In his discussion of the Resurrection of Lazurus from the Fleury Playbook, he observed that (p. 331) “Il y a encore d’autres drames sur le même sujet, mais ils n’appartiennent pas à la liturgie dramatique. La pièce de Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire a ce dernier caractère. Comme les autres de même Manuscrit, elle était représentée dans l’église du monastère.” (There are other dramas on the same subject, but they do not belong to the dramatic liturgy. The work from Saint-Benoit-sur Loire has this latter character. As the other plays in this same manuscript, it was represented in the church of the monastery.)

⁹⁰ Marius Sepet, “Les Prophètes du Christ: Étude sur les origines du théâtre au moyen âge,” *Bibliothèque de l’École des Chartres* 28 (1867): pp. 1–27 and 211–64, 29 (1868): pp. 105–39 and 261–93, and 38 (1877): pp. 397–443. This series was published in book form as *Les Prophètes du Christ: Étude sur les origines du théâtre au moyen âge* (Paris, 1878).

whose position was variable, if known at all.⁹¹ Léon Gautier, in his 1872 article on the origins of modern theater,⁹² 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.⁹³

The notion “liturgical drama” was thus a product of French literary and musicological 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, George Soan, in his discussion of customs formerly observed in the British Isles for the celebration of Easter,

⁹¹ Comparing what he felt to be the fixed liturgical position of the *Officium Prophetarum* of Paris 1139 with the the moveable placement of the *Processionarum Asinorum* of Rouen, for example, Sepet noted:

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'émaniciper et à rompre les liens qui le retiennent au sein de cette liturgie où il a pris naissance.

[The more or less obligatory character of the dramas that had a place in the liturgy is a nuance, often difficult to grasp, that serves to distinguish the liturgical mystery of this kind of transition to that of the first, which I felt obliged to impose called semi-liturgical mystery, thus indicating a kind of a mixture, a compromise, if you will, where worship and the drama itself are confused, although the latter tend visibly to emancipate themselves and to break the ties that hold it to the liturgy where it originated.]

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 associated. *Ibid.* 29 (1868): pp. 223–24 and 264–65.

⁹² Léon Gautier, “Origines du Théâtre Moderne,” *Le Monde* 13/195 (16–17 Aug. 1872): pp. 1–2; 13/204 (28 Aug. 1872): p. 1; 13/206 (30 Aug. 1872): pp. 1–2; and 13/210 (4 Sep. 1872): pp. 1–2.

⁹³ Gautier expanded on this discussion of tropes in his *Histoire de la Poésie Liturgique au Moyen Age — Les Tropes* (Paris, 1886).

still spoke in terms reminiscent of late-sixteenth century Protestant reformers (see below), 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.⁹⁴

Two years later, 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:

[t]here 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.⁹⁵

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:

⁹⁴ George Soan, *New Curiosities of Literature: and Book of the Months*, 2 vols. (London, 1847), 1, p. 191. Soan's approach to the rite of the sepulchre is little different from that of his predecessors. William Hone, for example, in his *Ancient Mysteries Described* (London, 1823), pp. 220–22 drew from Philips van Marnix's *Beehive of the Romish Church* (London, 1579), p. 201 (see n. 143 below) 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.

⁹⁵ Daniel Rock, *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, 1849–53), 2, p. 427.

Easter Sunday had one rite which exclusively belonged to itself, and consisted in showing how the two Maries and Salome made their sunrise Visit to the Sepulchre of our Lord.⁹⁶

By the latter part of the nineteenth century, the notion was taken up by English-speaking literary scholars as well, and by the turn of the century the expression had become as commonplace in English as it was in French. In 1887, 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.⁹⁷ The expression was then picked up by later English-speaking scholars, most notably by Edmond K. Chambers⁹⁸ and Karl Young.⁹⁹

The notion 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 Anselm Schubiger, monk at the Benedictine monastery of Einsiedeln, found use for the expression or its equivalent (“liturgische Drama” or “liturgische Spiele”).¹⁰⁰ For the rest, the expressions used were either more general: “Schauspiele” or “geistliche Schauspiele” (Karl Hase),¹⁰¹ “liturgische-dramatischen

⁹⁶ Ibid, III/2, 102. Rock provides a translation of the text on p. 102 and gives the Latin on pp. 103–4.

⁹⁷ Stoddard, *References for Students of Miracle Plays and Mysteries* (1887), pp. 21–24. The following year, Stoddard took up the professorship at New York University. Stoddard’s biography is available in the *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, 11 vols. and supplement (New York, 1893–1910), 10, p. 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 David Klein, “A Contribution to a Bibliography of the Medieval Drama,” *Modern Language Notes* 20 (1905): pp. 202–5.

⁹⁸ Chambers, *The Medieval Stage* (1903).

⁹⁹ Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church* (1933).

¹⁰⁰ Anselm Schubiger, *Musikalische Spicilegien über das liturgischen Drama, Orgelbau und Orgelspiel, das ausserliturgische Lied und Instrumentalmusik des Mittelalters*, Publicationen Älteren Praktischer und Theoretische Musikwerke 5 (Berlin, 1876).

¹⁰¹ Karl Hase, *Die geistliche Schauspiel: Geschichtliche Uebersicht* (Leipzig, 1858), English translation by A. W. Jackson as *Miracle Plays and Sacred Dramas: A Historical Survey* (London, 1880). These lectures were delivered during the winter of 1857–58 at the University of Jena and at Weimar (Hase/Jackson, *Miracle Plays and Sacred Dramas*, p. v).

Kirchendrama” (Heinrich Reidt)¹⁰² or more particular: “liturgische-dramatische Auferstehungsfeier” (Wilhelm Creizenach)¹⁰³ and “Weinachtspiele” or “Osternachtfeiern” (Ernst Wilken).¹⁰⁴ Beginning with the study of Gustav Milchsack in 1880¹⁰⁵ and continuing with those of Carl Lange in 1881 and 1887,¹⁰⁶ most subsequent German-speaking scholars avoided the broader categories altogether, choosing to focus instead on individual forms, the *Osterfeiern* and *Osterspiele* in particular.

¹⁰² Heinrich Reidt, *Das geistliche Schauspiele des Mittelalters in Deutschland* (Frankfurt am Main, 1868), pp. 12–45 (esp. pp. 12–24).

¹⁰³ Wilhelm Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, 5 vols. (Halle, 1893), 1, pp. 47–107. Creizenach also used the expression “geistlichen Drama.”

¹⁰⁴ Ernst Wilken, *Geschichte der geistlichen Spiele in Deutschland* (Göttingen, 1872).

¹⁰⁵ Gustav Milchsack, *Die lateinischen Osterspiele, Die Oster- und Passionsspiele: Literarhistorische Untersuchungen ueber den Ursprung und die Entwicklung derselbe bis zum Siebebzehnten Jahrhundert vornehmlich in Deutschland 1* (Wolfenbüttel, 1880) — only one volume printed.

¹⁰⁶ Carl Lange, *Programmabhandlung über die lateinischen Osterfeiern* (Halberstadt, 1881) and *Die lateinische Osterfeiern* (Munich, 1887).

II. PAST AS PROLOGUE: BEFORE “LITURGICAL DRAMA”

The notion that a continuum from ritual to drama could serve as a gauge by which to assess the dramaticity of a particular sung Latin text was a notion that was unknown, and very likely unfathomable, in the several centuries that preceded the revelations of Magnin. Yet, the liturgical rites and religious plays that would later form the corpus of the category “liturgical drama” had not gone unnoticed during that long span that preceded the category’s nativity.

Late Sixteenth 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),¹⁰⁷ Jacques Eveillon (1641),¹⁰⁸ Antoine Bellotte (1662),¹⁰⁹ Jean-Baptiste le Brun des Marettes (1679),¹¹⁰ Edmond Martène (1690-1738),¹¹¹ Martin Gerbert (1776),¹¹² and Stefan Würdtwein (1784).¹¹³ In addition, the Rouen *Officium Pastorem* and Tours *Officium Prophetarum* had been offered by Martène, and the Rouen *Officium Stellae* had been given by both Le Brun and Martène. And yet, in the two centuries that separated the publication of Baker’s *Apostolatus Benedictinorum* in 1626 and Magnin’s lectures of 1834–35, no one saw fit to consider these rites as instances of drama. All were presented either within the context of the rites that surrounded them or among other rites that were similarly configured. Eveillon, for example, included his transcription of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the cathedral at Angers in a chapter entitled

¹⁰⁷ Baker, *Apostolatus Benedictinorum in Anglia* (1626), Appendix, p. 89. See also n. 58 above.

¹⁰⁸ Jacques Eveillon, *De Processionalibus Ecclesiasticis Liber. In quo earum institutio, significatio, ordo et ritus, ex sacris Scripturis, Conciliis, et variorum Auctorum scriptis, explicantur* (Paris, 1641), pp. 177–79.

¹⁰⁹ Antoine Bellotte, *Ritus Ecclesiae Laudensis redivivi: Illustrissimi Lauduns, episcopi ac venerabilis matricis ecclesiae capituli consensione*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1662), 1, p. 215 and 2, p. 819.

¹¹⁰ LePrévôt, *Joannis Abricensis Episcopi* (1679, ed. Le Brun des Marettes), pp. 206–15. See also n. 38 above.

¹¹¹ See n. 50 and 58 above.

¹¹² Gerbert, *Vetus Liturgia Alemannica* (1776), p. 864; *Monumenta veteris liturgiae allemannicae*, 2 vols. (1777–79), 2, p. 237. See also n. 57 above.

¹¹³ Stefan Alexander Würdtwein, *Commentatio historico-liturgica de Stationibus Ecclesiae Moguntinae: ex antiquitatibus ecclesiasticis eruta et addito ecclesiarum Trevirensis et Coloniensis ritu illustrata* (Mainz, 1782), pp. 179–81 and 187–88.

“De Processione matutine ante Laudes, in die Paschae” (On the morning processions before Lauds on Easter Sunday), prefacing it as follows: “In Ecclesia Andegauensi celebratur hoc mysterium finito tertio Responsorio Matutini” (At the cathedral of Anger, the following mystery is celebrated at the end of the third responsory of Matins).¹¹⁴ A half century later, Martène introduced his transcription of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the *Regularis Concordia* with the following heading: “Post tertium Responsorum singularem ritum praescribit in Concordia Dunstanus.” (After the third responsory [of Matins] a singular rite is prescribed in the [Regularis] Concordia of [St.] Dunstan).¹¹⁵ Martène presented the future liturgical dramas included in his *Tractatus de antiqua ecclesiae disciplinae* of 1706 according to their liturgical placement, providing such headings as “Processio ad praesepe” (Procession to the manger), “Officium trium Regum” (Office of the Three Kings), “Processio ejusdem SS. Sacramenti” (Procession of the Holy Sacrament), “Processio ad Domini Sepulchrum” (Procession to the Sepulcher of the Lord), and “Processio post Tertiam” (Procession after Terce).¹¹⁶ 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, and Strasbourg.¹¹⁷ In the additions provided by Le Brun des Marettes to the 1679 edition of the *Liber de Officiis Ecclesiasticis* of Jean d’Avranches, the musical editions of the *Officium Stellae* and *Visitatio Sepulchri* (*Officium Sepulchri*) were placed within a series of processions and other rites drawn from Paris 904 and other manuscripts then in the Bigot collection.¹¹⁸ While these rites were set off from those that surrounded them, they were set off by their use of musical notation rather than by any dramatic qualities that may or may not have been perceived. The settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* offered by Baker, Bellotte, and Würdtwein, moreover, presented their settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* as they were set forth in the manuscripts from which each was drawn, with no particular notice that anything unusual or untoward was going on.

¹¹⁴ Eveillon, *De Processionalibus Ecclesiasticis Liber* (1641), p. 177. 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 “... hoc mysterium plenitudinis gratiae Christi” (the mystery of the fullness of Christ’s grace, p. 56), to the “... mysterium Ascensionis” (mystery of the Ascension, p. 33) and the “... mysterium passionis” (mystery of the Passion, p. 144).

¹¹⁵ Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiae monachorum* (1690), p. 446.

¹¹⁶ Martène, *Tractatus de antiqua ecclesiae disciplinae* (1706), pp. 87, 111–12, 478–79, 479–80, and 481–82. See n. 38 and 50 above. An *Officium Prophetarum*, noted by Young, in “Ordo Prophetarum,” *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters* 20, 1919, pp. 48–49, is given by Martène without title as a part of the New Year celebration at Tours. *Ibid.*, 106–7.

¹¹⁷ Martène, *Tractatus de antiqua ecclesiae disciplinae* (1706), pp. 496–508. See n. 50 above.

¹¹⁸ On the Bigot collection, see n. 65 above.

Later 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 his book, *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.¹¹⁹

In 1817, Thomas Fosbroke 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 stealingly 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 (*dulcisone*), “ 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

¹¹⁹ Thomas Lingard, *The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (London 1806). The quotation is taken from the second edition of 1810, pp. 420–21. Lingard’s knowledge of this ceremony was drawn from the transcription of the *Regularis Concordia* provided by Augustine Baker, *Apostolatus Benedictinorum in Anglia, Appendix*, p. 89. See also n. 58 above.

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.”¹²⁰

In a later chapter, he outlined the *Visitatio Sepulchri* as celebrated at the cathedral of Rouen as given by Du Cange.¹²¹ Again, this was presented as given with not even a hint that the author saw this as a species of drama.

Even more telling was the eyewitness account offered in 1718 by Le Brun des Marettes (writing here under the pseudonym *Le Sieur de Moleon*) of the liturgical celebration of the *Office du Sepulcre* that he had observed at the cathedral of Angers more than two decades earlier:

Le troisième & dernier Répons de Matines étant fini, les deux Maires-Chapelains du Choeur qui font 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 gaints 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 hîc, surrexit sicut praedixerat; vitite, & 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*.¹²²

¹²⁰ Thomas Dudley Fosbroke, *British Monachism: or, Manners and Customs of the Monks and Nuns of England*, 2nd ed. (London, 1817), pp. 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.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 94. This was drawn from Du Cange’s article on “Sepulchri Officium.” See n. 38 above.

¹²² Jean-Baptiste Le Brun des Marettes, *Voyages liturgiques de France; ou, Recherches faites en diverse villes du royaume, contenant plusieurs particularitez touchant les rits et les usages des églies, avec des découvertes sur l’antiquité ecclésiastique & payenne* (Paris, 1718), p. 98. He notes that this *Office du Sepulcre* 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 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. 38 above). Le Brun’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). According to Magnin, the publication was delayed due to Le Brun’s imprisonment at the Bastille (1707–11) over his role in the Jansenist controversy. See Charles Magnin, “Review of Coussemaker Drames Liturgiques” (1860): pp. 531–32.

[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 deacons in dalmatics wearing simple amice with embroidered caps on their heads and with gloves or mittens on their hands, preceded the others to the altar. The priests chant the question, *Quem quaeritis?* The deacons representing the Marys respond, *Jesum Nazarenum crucifixum*. The priests, *Non est hic, surrexit sicut praedixerat; venite et videte locum ubi positus erat Dominus*. The deacons enter, and the priests continue the chant, *Ite, nuntiate discipulis ejus quia surrexit*. Leaving the altar, the deacons 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*.]

Other texts now included among the liturgical dramas, conversely, were regarded as plays, with no reference to any intended liturgical use. In 1729 and again in 1735, l'Abbé Jean Lebeuf referred to his transcriptions from the so-called Fleury Playbook as "spectacles" or as "représentations théâtrales."¹²³ In the brief discussion of the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139 given in his *Dissertation sur l'Histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Paris* of 1741, Lebeuf used the expression "tragedie en rimes latines."¹²⁴ Similarly, Bernhard Pez, in the second volume of his *Thesaurus Anecdotorum novissimus* published in 1721, used the label "Ludus Paschalis" to describe both the Tegernsee *Ludus de Antichristo* and the *Ludus Paschalis* of Klosterneuburg.¹²⁵

To 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 *Ludus de Antichristo* or those of the Fleury Playbook were regarded as dramatic events, if not actually theater. This distinction between two very different sorts of things was recognized even during the period in which the so-called liturgical dramas flourished. In a sixteenth-century ordinal from the Augustinian priory of Herzogenburg, the rubric at the end of Easter Matins directs:

¹²³ Lebeuf, "Remarques envoyée d'Auxerre, sur les spectacles que les ecclésiastiques ou les religieux donnaient anciennement au public, hors le temps de l'office" (1729) and "Lettre d'un solitaire à M. D. L. R., au sujet des nouveaux livres sur les anciennes représentations théâtrales" (1735). See n. 40 above.

¹²⁴ l'Abbé Jean Lebeuf, *Dissertation sur l'Histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Paris*, 3 vols (Paris, 1739–43), 2, p. 65.

¹²⁵ Pez, *Thesaurus Anecdotorum novissimus*, 2, col. 185. The Tegernsee play is preserved in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 19411, fols. 2^v–7^r. The Klosterneuburg play is preserved in Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, CCl. 574, fols. 142^v–44^v. On the rediscovery of the Klosterneuburg manuscript, see n. 55 above.

Et sub isto resonsiorio (Dum transisset) fit visitatio sepulchri, et duo iuvenes antecedant cum luminibus. Finito responsorio, cum non habetur ludus, tunc canitur antiphona: Maria Magdalena . . .¹²⁶

[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* . . .]

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 christened as liturgical dramas, moreover, and such appearances are rare, it appears in conjunction with texts for which no well-defined connection with the liturgy exists.¹²⁷

Twelfth to Sixteenth Century

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 Pastorem*, 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. In Chambers’ lively prose: “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

¹²⁶ Herzogenburg, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 173, fol. 150^v (Lipphardt, *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*, 3, pp. 971–74 [No. 589]). The *Visitatio Sepulchri* associated with the priory of Herzogenburg begins with the words: “*Maria Magdalena*.” For other settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* at Herzogenburg, see Lipphardt, *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*, 3, pp. 967–70 (Nos. 587–88). Given the array of possible meanings for the word “*ludus*,” I leave it untranslated here. See the discussion on the word “*Drama*” below, pp. 74–78.

¹²⁷ The use of the term “*ludus*” is found only occasionally and only in works that have no clear liturgical connection. Young lists the following instances of the term in the texts that he treated: *Incipit Danielis Ludus* (Beauvais ‘Play of Daniel’ — see n. 74 above), “*Ludus super Iconia Sancti Nicolai*” (Hilarius version — see n. 53 above), and “*Incipit ludus, immo exemplum, Dominicæ Resurrectionis*” (from the *Carmina Burana*, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 4660a, fols. v^r–vi^v). Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2, p. 408. In addition, the Klosterneuburg Easter Play (see n. 55 and 125 above), 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 catalogs at Klosterneuburg, see Theodor Gottlieb, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Österreichs: Niederösterreich*, 2 vols. (Vienna, 1915), 1, pp. 83–120.

other quasi-theatrical spectacle made an excuse for a feast.”¹²⁸ However tempting it might be to claim otherwise, Gerhoh’s complaint was not directed toward liturgical rites that we might now consider as liturgical drama. Indeed, he offers no indication that the representations to which he objects were performed as a part of any liturgical observance. Rather as Clopper notes, the representations to which Gerhoh objects were performed outside of the liturgy, and likely in the refectory rather than in the church itself.¹²⁹ Such rites from Christmas and Epiphany, moreover, are altogether rare in the liturgical books of German-speaking Europe. Only two manuscripts, an eleventh-century liturgical fragment from Lambach and a thirteenth-century antiphoner/processional from the cathedral at Strasbourg, contain any such rites,¹³⁰ and no such rites appear in the liturgical books of Augsburg itself. Of the churches with which Gerhoh had been associated, moreover, including the cathedrals at Hildesheim and Augsburg and the Augustinian priory at

¹²⁸ Chambers, *The Medieval Stage*, 2, 98. The relevant passage is taken from *Gerhoch Praepositi Reichersgergensis Commentarium in Psalmos*, PL 194, cols. 890–91.

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 interfactorem seu ludis aliis aut spectaculis quasi theatralibus exhibendis comportaretur symbolum ad faciendum convivium in refectorio, alis pene omnibus temporibus vacuo.

¹²⁹ Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, p. 46.

¹³⁰ Lambach, Stiftsbibliothek, Fragment I and British Library, MS Additional 23922, fols. 8^v–11^r. Both contain the *Officium Stellae* for Epiphany, although their liturgical associations are vague (see the discussion of “Strange Bedfellows: Representational Rites and Religious Plays” below, pp. 56–60). Another version of this rite from southern Germany, now lost, is cited by Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2, pp. 448–49. An incomplete *Ordo Stellae* is preserved with its music although without liturgical context in Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 366, p. 53. This is followed directly by an *Officium Prophetarum* (p. 54) and *Visitatio Sepulchri* (pp. 55–56). Two eleventh-century texts with music from the cathedral at Freising, one *Ordo Stellae* and the other an *Ordo Rachelis* are copied on spare pages in sermon collections, the first (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 6264a, fol. 1^r) containing sermons of John the Deacon and the second (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 6264, fol. 27^v) containing sermons on the Epistles of St. Paul. Despite the *Te Deum* that ends the *Ordo Rachelis*, the copying of these musical texts in sermon collections rather than liturgical books seems to belie any liturgical intent. See Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2, pp. 91–99 and 117 for a full description and textual transcription of these texts (although without their music). On the Lambach fragment, see Lisa Fagin Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphoner: Music and Liturgy in Twelfth-Century Lambach* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 119–21.

Reichersberg am Inn, all observed the *Visitatio Sepulchri* as a part of their liturgical celebration for Easter.¹³¹

Harrad of Landesberg (ca. 1130–95), abbess of the Augustinian canonesses at the convent of Hohenburg in Alsace, complained in her *Hortus Deliciarum*¹³² of a similar constellation of activities that took place during Epiphany and its octave:

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 deputatis, 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 irrilegionis dissolutionis exercetur iuvenilis lascivia. Mutatur habitus clericalis, incohatur ordo militaris, nulla in sacerdotis vel milite differentia, domus Dei permixtione laicorum et clericorum confunditur, commessationes, ebrietates, scurrilatates, ioci inimici ludi placesibiles armorum strepitus, ganearum concursus omnium vanitatum indiciplanatus

¹³¹ See Lipphardt, *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*, 2, pp. 276–81 (Nos. 217–22 [Hildesheim]); 3, pp. 745–88 (Nos. 505–29 [Augsburg]); and 4, pp. 1255–59 (No. 602 [Reichersberg am Inn]).

¹³² The *Hortus Deliciarum* (Garden of Delights) was an illuminated encyclopedia of Christian knowledge compiled by Harrad 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 Christian Moritz Engelhardt, *Harrad von Landsperg, Aebtissin Zu Hohenburg, oder St. Odilien, im Elsass in zwölften Jahrhundert und ihr Werk: Hortus Deliciarum. Ein Beytrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften, Literatur, Kunst, Kleidung, Waffen und Sitten des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1818). The text of much of the manuscript was published by A. Straub and G. Keller, *Hortus deliciarum* (Strasbourg, 1879). More recently, a reconstruction of the manuscript along with a scholarly treatment of the surviving sources was provided by Rosalie Green, ed., *Hortus Deliciarum of Harrad of Hohenbourg, a Reconstruction*, 2 vols. (London, 1979). See also Fiona Griffiths, *The Garden of Delights: Reform and Renaissance for Women in the Twelfth Century* (Philadelphia, 2006), for a compelling treatment of Harrad, the *Hortus Deliciarum*, and the intellectual and spiritual milieu within which the manuscript was created.

excursus. Huc accedit quod aliquo discordie genere semper turbatur hoc regnum et si alio modo pacifice incohatur vix sine dissidentium gravi tumultu terminatur.¹³³

[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.]¹³⁴

Again, there is little in Harrad'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). Indeed, she seems clearly to be complaining about something else altogether.¹³⁵ She distinguishes between the customary rituals, the acts of reverence of past religious services, and the irreligious extravagances that have 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:

... in liturgical representation the clergy do not costume themselves in worldly garb but wear liturgical garments. Although it is true that liturgical texts may say that participants "signify" the angel or the *obstetrices* of the *Pastores*, they frequently indicate that the participants are wearing albs or amices. They are not costumed to

¹³³ The excerpt is taken from a brief treatise on the religious life found near the end of the *Hortus Deliciarum*. The treatise was contained in fols. 314^v–15^v. The passage above was on fol. 315^v. Green, *Hortus Deliciarum*, 2, pp. 491–92. See also Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2, pp. 413–14.

¹³⁴ Translation by Karl Pearson, "The German Passion-Play: A Study in the Evolution of Western Christianity," *The Chances of Death and Other Studies in Evolution*, 2 vols. (London, 1897), 2, pp. 285–86.

¹³⁵ Chambers, for one, saw her complaint as directed toward the Feast of Fools rather than toward any so-called plays within the liturgy. Chambers, *The Medieval Stage*, 1, pp. 318–19.

represent a figure; rather, they are said to represent a figure in the liturgical responses. Harrad's objection, by contrast, is to customs that misrepresent a clerical person.¹³⁶

In 1234, Pope Gregory IX, following the earlier injunctions by Innocent III, prohibited the performance of "ludi theatrales, ludibria, larvae et spectacula" within the church and/or by clerics, except, as the accompanying gloss notes:

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.¹³⁷

[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.]

This gloss makes two important distinctions: first, that there is a qualitative difference between the religious spectacles that were being prohibited and the liturgical representations 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.¹³⁸

While the complaints of Gerhoh, Harrad and Popes Innocent and Gregory may have confirmed for later critics the unwelcome intrusion of drama into the liturgy of the twelfth- and thirteenth-century Church, there is no compelling evidence that these medieval writers entertained such a notion themselves.¹³⁹ By invoking the rich associations of theater's corrupting influence bequeathed by the fathers of the Church and later ecclesiastical

¹³⁶ Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, p. 48.

¹³⁷ Cited by Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2, pp. 416–17.

¹³⁸ The distinction between approved and disapproved representations was first noted by Allassandro D'Ancona, *Origini del Teatro italiano*, 2 vols. (Turin, 1891), 1, pp. 53–54 and later picked up by Wilhelm Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, 2 vols. (Halle, 1893), 1, p. 94 and Chambers, *Medieval Stage*, 2, pp. 99–100. See Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2, p. 417.

¹³⁹ See especially Clopper's critique of earlier views on these texts, Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, pp. 43–49.

writers,¹⁴⁰ Gerhoh, Harrad, and the two Popes were able to convey the full extent of their dismay that the depraved practices they described could take place within the sacred spaces of a church at all. 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.

If the medieval critics were uncomfortable with what they saw as theatrical intrusions into the ritual of the Church, Protestant critics from the sixteenth century were nearly apoplectic with what they saw as the contamination of the Roman liturgy by the trappings of theater. While much has been made of the complaints of Protestant critics on the theatrical nature of the sepulcher rites of Holy Week,¹⁴¹ these complaints, like those of their medieval predecessors, were not directed toward those rites now seen as liturgical drama specifically. Rather these criticisms aimed more broadly at the nature and practice of the Roman liturgy at large. Thomas Kirchmayer (1511–63), in his satiric exposition on the practices of the Roman Catholic Church, roundly criticized the liturgical and popular devotional practices of the liturgical year from Advent through Holy Week and the post-Paschal feasts, including the feasts of the saints.¹⁴² While the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter

¹⁴⁰ 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 in Latin Christian Thought*. See n. 19 above.

¹⁴¹ See, for example, Karl Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, pp. 525–38.

¹⁴² 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 (including its procession), Maundy Thursday, Good Friday (including the Adoration of the Cross and the Deposition of the Cross), Holy Saturday, Easter Sunday (including the Elevation of the Cross, the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, and the procession to Mass), 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, All Souls Day, along with the rites for Funerals and other occasional rites. Thomas Kirchmayer (as Thomas Naogeorgus), *Regnum Papisticum* (Basel, 1553), pp. 129–74 (pagination from the revised edition of 1559), translated by Barnebe Googe as *The Popish Kingdome, or reigne of Antichrist, written in Latine verse by Thomas Naogeorgus, and englyshed by Barnabe Googe* (London, 1570), fols. 44^r–60^r. Kirchmayer 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 Jesse H. Harris, *John Bale, a Study in the Minor Literature of the Reformation* (Urbana, 1940), p. 75.

was included among the rites and practices of which Kirchmayer disapproved, it was merely one among many such rites that in the eyes of Kirchmayer fell beyond the bounds of proper worship. A few years later, Philippe van Marnix (1540–98), in a Calvinist take on Catholic institutions and practice, offered much the same criticism, and again, his critique was broadly directed toward Roman liturgical practice in general and not toward what we now know as liturgical drama in particular.¹⁴³

¹⁴³ Philippe van Marnix van St. Adelgonde (as Isaac Robboneu van Louen), *Biënkorf der H. Roomsche Kercke: Welck is een clare ende grondelicke wtlegginghe des Sendbriefs M. Geniani Heruit, nu corts wtbegeen int Fransoys end int Duytsch: Ghescreven aen de afgedwaelde van het afgedwaelde van het Christen gheloove* (Emden, 1569). The section on Lent, the rites of Holy Week, and those of the post-Paschal feasts is given in fols. 219^v–226^v. This work was 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 Genian Heruet, a Romish Catholike his booke, which is divided into sixe partes, as in the Argument doeth appeare* (London, 1579). The relevant section is found in fols. 197^v–204^v.

III. STRANGE BEDFELLOWS: REPRESENTATIONAL RITES, RELIGIOUS PLAYS, AND OTHER THINGS

The repertory that has collected under the banner “liturgical drama” is both large and diverse, and any meaningful consideration of its contents requires that we have at least some idea of its composition. The rites, plays, and possibly other things now considered to be liturgical dramas, however, 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 (or not quite liturgical) items whose casting as drama is as variable as their liturgiality (if not inversely proportional), and this has lent to the notion of “liturgical drama” a legitimacy that it does not warrant.¹⁴⁴ It is probably more instructive therefore to consider these texts according to the contexts of their presentation within the manuscripts and books that preserve them. This results in three broad, and to some extent overlapping, clusters of texts: the first containing those texts whose liturgical placement is secure, the second containing those texts for which evidence of liturgical intent is lacking, and a third group containing those texts for which evidence of liturgical intent is equivocal.

Representational Rites

The largest group comprises those liturgical rites that appear most clearly dramatic to modern scholars. Following Nils Holger Petersen, I will call these “representational rites” (see Table 1).¹⁴⁵ 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 850 manuscript and printed liturgical books (see Table 1, “*Visitatio Sepulchri*”). These books stem from nearly every corner of the western Church and date from the early-tenth

¹⁴⁴ C. Clifford Flanigan noted the difficulties in this arrangement over a quarter century ago. In his essay “The Fleury Playbook, p. 349, he observed:

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.

¹⁴⁵ See, for example, Nils Holger Petersen, “Biblical Reception, Representational Ritual, and the Question of ‘Liturgical Drama’.” See n. 16 above.

to the late-seventeenth century.¹⁴⁶ The rite is found in varying liturgical placements and in liturgical books of varying types. In nearly all cases, its liturgical placement is well defined, and its location within the liturgical book is consistent with its intended use. When found prior to the Mass, it is typically found within a proper, gradual, or processional.¹⁴⁷ When placed at the end of Matins, the rite is often found within breviaries or ordinals or more rarely in antiphoners. Later medieval settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* that include music are more often than not found in books variously called *Benedictionales*, *Rituales*, or *Obsequiales*, books that contain blessings, sacraments and other rites of various sorts (profession, funerals, communication, reconciliation, marriages, 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* itself was embedded.

Other rites since cast as drama are both limited in number and geographically constrained. Most closely allied with the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter are the rites of Christmas morning representing the shepherds' visit to the manger. Parallel versions of the *Quem quaeritis* trope for the third Mass of Christmas are found in two dozen or so trope

¹⁴⁶ The most comprehensive treatment of the manuscript and printed sources of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* is that of Walther Lipphardt, *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele* (1976–90). See n. 42 above.

¹⁴⁷ 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 the liturgical scene further north (David Bjork, "On the Dissemination of *Quem quaeritis* and the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and the Chronology of their Early Sources," *Comparative Drama* 14 (1980): pp. 46–69). The distinction was more likely one of categorization than it was of liturgical function. Indeed, in most cases the trope and processional versions of the dialogue occurred at the same point in chronological time. The *Quem quaeritis* trope was sung just prior to the Introit to the Easter Mass. When located in the procession to Mass, the dialogue was typically placed at the end of the procession, thus directly before the Introit as well. On the trope versions of *Quem quaeritis*, see Gunilla Iversen, Gunilla Björkvall, and Ritva Jonsson, eds., *Corpus Troporum* III: Tropes du propre de la messe 2. Cycles de Pâques (Stockholm, 1982), esp. pp.15–16 and 217–23. Both the trope and the processional versions of the dialogue are transcribed in the first volume of Walther Lipphardt's *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele* with commentary in volumes 6–9. Gunilla Iversen's essay, "Aspects of the Transmission of the *Quem Quaeritis*," *Text* 3 (1987): pp. 155–82 remains the most cogent discussion of the original form and function of this dialogue. The best treatment of the musical settings for the early *Quem quaeritis* is that of Susan K. Rankin, "Musical and Ritual Aspects of *Quem queritis*," *Liturgische Tropen: Referat zweier Colloquien des Corpus Troporum in München [1983] und Canterbury [1984]* (Munich, 1985), pp. 181–92.

manuscripts from southern France and northern Italy,¹⁴⁸ while settings of the more elaborate *Officium Pastorem* of Christmas Matins are concentrated in a group of ordinals, breviaries, and antiphoners from northern France (see Table 1, “*Officium Pastorem*”). Other rites are more rare yet, and most of these are concentrated in liturgical manuscripts from areas influenced by Norman liturgical practices. The *Officium Peregrinorum* of Easter Monday, for example, is found in a few liturgical manuscripts from Rouen and Norman Sicily along with a single manuscript from Padua (see Table 1, “*Officium Peregrinorum*”), while a handful of settings for the *Officium Prophetarum* are found in manuscripts from Rouen and Tours (see Table 1, “*Officium Prophetarum*”).¹⁴⁹ Liturgical settings of the *Officium Stellae*, on the other hand, while more plentiful, survive in liturgical manuscripts of

¹⁴⁸ The *Officium Pastorem* is treated in James M. Gibson, “The Place of the ‘Quem Queritis in Presepe’ Trope in Medieval Liturgical Drama” (Unpublished Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1976) and later in “*Quem queritis in presepe: Christmas Drama or Christmas Liturgy?*,” *Comparative Drama* 15 (1981/82): pp. 343–65. The older treatment by Kar, “*Officium Pastorem: A Study in the Dramatic Developments within the Liturgy at Christmas*,” *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Science and Letters* 17 (1912): pp. 299–396 was to some extent superseded by the discussion in the second volume of his study *Drama of the Medieval Church*, but remains valuable.

¹⁴⁹ In the use of Rouen, these were performed only occasionally. On the *Officium Prophetarum*, see Young, “*Ordo Prophetarum*” (see n. 116) and idem, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2, pp. 125–71. A Tours *Officium* survives only as a description from a manuscript given by Martene, *Tractatus* (1706), pp. 106–7. Other settings of this office have survived in liturgical manuscripts that do not specify the liturgical use for these settings. These include manuscripts from St. Martial (if, indeed this is a separate play — Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS lat. 1139, fols. 55^v–58^r), Laon (Laon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 263, fols. 147^v–49^r), Einsiedeln (Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 366, pp. 53–54 — this version is incomplete), and Zagreb (Zagreb, Archbishop’s Archive, *Collectio Fragmentorum* No. 1 — see Clyde W. Brouckett, “A Previously Unknown *Ordo Prophetarum* in a Manuscript Fragment in Zagreb,” *Comparative Drama* 27 (1993): pp. 114–27). See the discussion of “Possible Representational Rites” below.

various kinds spread throughout Europe, including both Rouen and Norman Sicily (see Table 1, “Officium Stellae”).¹⁵⁰

Connecting these rites from the Easter and Christmas seasons is their placement within liturgical books that makes 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. Considering these as representational rites, moreover, allows us to see these rites more broadly along 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, beginning with the procession of Palm Sunday (where both people and clerics process carrying palms and, in some of German-speaking Europe, pulling a *Palmesel*),¹⁵¹ continuing with the *Mandatum* of Holy Thursday (which commemorates Christ’s washing of the feet of his apostles [John 13: 1–15]), the reading of the Passion of Good Friday (where the altar cloth is torn when Christ’s clothes are divided), the *Adoratio Crucis* and *Depositio Crucis* (and/or *Hostiae*) of Good Friday, and culminating with the *Elevatio Crucis* (and/or *Hostiae*) of Easter morning. Indeed, it is this series of ceremonies that the *Visitatio Sepulchri* concludes, and it is within this context that the *Visitatio Sepulchri* is best understood. Biblical allusions can infuse the liturgy in other instances as well. A fourteenth-century ordinal from Klosterneuburg, for

¹⁵⁰ The Latin settings of the *Officium Stellae*, whether liturgical or not, are treated in Norbert King, *Mittelalterliche Dreikönigsspiele: Ein Grundlagenarbeit zu den lateinischen, deutschen und französischen Dreikönigsspielen und -spielszenen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg, 1979), pp. 1–50. See also the older discussions in Young, “A New Text of the Officium Stellae,” *Modern Language Notes* 27 (1912): pp. 68–71; idem, *Ordo Rachelis*, University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature 4 (Madison, 1919); and idem, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2, pp. 29–101. In an unpublished paper first delivered at the Royal Music Association Annual Conference (March 1998) entitled “Ottonian Epiphanies: Liturgical Drama as Political Allegory,” Susan K. Rankin makes a convincing argument that the *Officium Stellae* was likely not conceived as a liturgical rite at all, but rather in the context of Ottonian struggles in the tenth century. I would like to thank Dr. Rankin for allowing me access to a later version of this paper.

¹⁵¹ See Joan A Holliday, “Palmesel,” *Medieval Germany: An Encyclopedia*, ed. John M. Jeep (New York, 2001), pp. 631–33; Elizabeth Lippsmeyer, “Devotion and Decorum: Intention and Quality in Medieval German Sculpture” *Gesta* 34 (1995): pp. 20–27 and idem, “The Liber Ordinarius by Konrad von Mure and Palm Sunday Observance in Thirteenth-Century Zurich,” *Manuscripta* 32 (1988): pp. 139–45. See also Eduard Wiepen, *Palmsonntagsprozession und Palmesel: ein kultur- und kunstgeschichtlich-volkskundlich Abhandlung zum Kölner Palmesel der kunsthistorischen Ausstellung zu Düsseldorf 1902 [Sammlung Schnuutgen]* (Bonn, 1903).

example, notes that the procession to the font that precedes the baptismal rite of Holy Saturday should circle the font “. . . sicut Iosye muros Iericho” (. . . as Joshua the walls of Jericho).¹⁵² Other ceremonies, including those associated with the feasts of the Ascension and Pentecost and the Marian feasts can also be seen as representational in one way or another.¹⁵³

Religious Plays(?)

At the other end of the spectrum are those texts that offer little or no evidence of a liturgical association (see Table 2). While many of these treat the same themes as the liturgical rites outlined above, most are outliers and include those texts that are most demonstrably dramatic (whatever that may mean — see the discussion of “Drama” below, pp. 76–80). These texts are typically copied into, or bound with, texts that have little or no association with the liturgy. Many, in fact, were copied — or inserted — into collections of sermons or other exegetical texts. 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.¹⁵⁴ An eleventh-century *Ordo Stellae* from Compiègne was added by a second scribe in the space following the sermon for Epiphany.¹⁵⁵ 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 Deacon¹⁵⁶ and on the Epistles of St. Paul.¹⁵⁷ The *Ludus Paschalis* from Klosterneuburg was copied into a gathering including rhymed offices for St. Catherine and Thomas Becket that was appended to a group of gatherings containing sermons and other exegetical works.¹⁵⁸ Similarly, an expanded *Visitatio Sepulchri* is preserved in an Eindiedeln manuscript containing works of Peter Abelard and Adam

¹⁵² Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 1213, 81^{r-v} (Klosterneuburg ordinal, 1325).

¹⁵³ See the ceremonies cited by Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1, pp. 484–91 (Ascension and Pentecost) and 2, pp. 225–57 (Marian feasts).

¹⁵⁴ Orléans 201, pp. 176–243. See n. 40 and 221 above. See also Michel Huglo, “Analyse codicologique des drames liturgiques de Fleury (Orléans, Bibliothèque Municipale, 201,” Calames et Cahiers, *Mélanges de codicologie et de paléographie offerts à Léon Gilissen*, ed. Jacques Lemaire and Émile van Balberghe (Brussels, 1985), pp. 61–78 as well as the several essays given in *The Fleury Playbook: Essays and Studies*, Early Drama, Art, and Music Monograph Series 7, ed. Thomas P. Campbell and Clifford Davidson (Kalamazoo, 1985).

¹⁵⁵ Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS lat. 16819, fols. 49^{r-v}. See Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2, 53, n. 5.

¹⁵⁶ Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS lat. 6264a, fol. 1^r. See also n. 130 above.

¹⁵⁷ Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS lat 6264, fol. 27^r. See also n. 130 above.

¹⁵⁸ Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 574, fols. 142^v–44^v. On the rediscovery of the Osterspiel in this manuscript, see n. 55 above.

Monachus,¹⁵⁹ while a Latin/Bohemian *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Prague is copied within a manuscript containing sermons on the saints and a *passionale*.¹⁶⁰

Other venues are also evident. A twelfth-century *Ordo Stellae* from Bilsen, Belgium is copied at the end of a gospel book, just after the colophon,¹⁶¹ while another is copied over an erasure in a manuscript containing the *Bellum Catilinae* of Sallust and Berno of Reichenau's *Prologus in Tonarium*.¹⁶² Two additional settings of the *Ordo Stellae* survive as fragments entered into manuscripts of quite disparate types: a fragment from Compiègne is given in a flyleaf in the Psalter of Charles the Bald,¹⁶³ while another from Malmédy in Belgium survives as a fragment in a manuscript of the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Josephus.¹⁶⁴ A few surviving texts with music are included in collections that are more explicitly performative. The

¹⁵⁹ Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 300, pp. 93–94. See n. 60 for Karl Young's assessment of the irrelevance of the surrounding texts.

¹⁶⁰ Prague, Národní knihovna, MS I.B.12, fols. 135^v–137^v. This setting of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* was edited by Ignac Jan Hanuš, *Die lateinisch-böhmischen Oster-Spiele des 14–15. Jahrhunderts* (Prague, 1863), pp. 34–42 (as *Das zweite Drei-Mariem-Spiel*) and again by Jan Máchal, *Staročeské skladby dramatické původu liturgického*. Rozpravy České Akademie císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, slovesnost a umění 3.23 (Prague, 1908), pp. 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 Ernst August Schuler, *Die Musik der Osterfeiern, Osterspiele und Passionen des Mittelalters* (Kassel, 1951), pp. 95, 385, and *passim* (as *Prager Osterspiel II*). The *Visitatio Sepulchri* from this manuscript is also treated in Amstutz, *Ludus de decem virginibus*, *passim* (as *PragO.C*) and by Ursula Henning, "Die lateinisch-liturgische Grundlage der tschechischen Marienspiele," *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 96 (1977): pp. 89–102. A comparison of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in this manuscript to others from German-speaking Europe is given in Peter V. Loewen 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), pp. 595–641. While Walther Lipphardt treated this setting in *Die Weisen der lateinischen Osterspiele des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1948), he did not include it in *Lateinische Osterfeiern und Osterspiele*.

¹⁶¹ Brussels, Bibliothèque des Bollandists, MS 299, fols. 179^v–80^v. See Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2, pp. 446–47.

¹⁶² Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS lat. 14477, fol. 1^{r-v}. The *Ordo Stellae* in this manuscript is copied over an erasure that precedes the Sallust. See Young, *op. cit.*, 2, p. 445.

¹⁶³ Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS lat. 1152, fragment on final flyleaf. See Young, *op. cit.*, 2, p. 443.

¹⁶⁴ Rome, Biblioteca Vaticana, MS lat. 8552, fol. 1^v. See Young, *op. cit.*, 2, pp. 443–44.

Ludus Paschalis of Tours, first published in 1856 by Victor Luzarche, is given in the same manuscript as the *Jeu d'Adam*,¹⁶⁵ while that from Jáchymov, now in the Czech Republic, is

¹⁶⁵ Tours, Bibl. municipale, MS 927, fols. 1^v–8^v. See n. 76. See Lipphardt, *Lateinische Osterferien*, 5, 1669–81 and Young, *op. cit.*, 2, 438–50.

found in a collection of plays compiled by Rector Stephan Roth for the Latin School in that city.¹⁶⁶ The “plays” of the *Carmina Burana* are included in a manuscript of songs.¹⁶⁷

Aside from their lack of liturgical context, many of these texts also show a lack of liturgical propriety, having been built on themes not otherwise found liturgically or on a scale that exceeds that of their more clearly liturgical cousins. The Fleury Playbook, for example,

¹⁶⁶ Zwickau, Ratsschulbibliothek, MS XXXVI. I 24, fols. 1^r–6^r. See Lipphardt, *Lateinische Osterferien*, 5, pp. 1540–46 and Young, op. cit., 1, pp. 669–73.

¹⁶⁷ Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MSS lat. 4660, fols. 99^r–104^v (Christmas Play), 105^v–6^v (fragmentary *Ludus de Rege Aegypti*), and 107^r–12^r (Greater Passion Play) and lat. 4660a, fols. iii^v–iv^v (Shorter Passion Play), v^r–vi^v (*Ludus Paschalis*), and vii^r–v (Ordo *Peregrinorum*). This manuscript was first reported by Johann Christian von Aretin in a series of letters describing the manuscripts he encountered as he was gathering up the books 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 *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Literatur vorzüglich aus den Schätzen der pfalzbaierischen Centralbibliothk zu München* 1 (1803): pp. 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 Bernhard Joseph Docen in later volumes of the same journal: 7 (1806): pp. 297–309 (Latin poems): pp. 497–508 (Greater Passion Play) and 9 (1807): pp. 1304–22 (Latin love songs — Docen also give additional citations for treatments of this manuscript’s contents by others) and in the *Miscellaneen zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, 2, pp. 189–208. The Greater Passion Play was published again thirty years later by Heinrich Hoffman von Fallersleben, *Fundgruben für Geschichte deutscher Sprache und Litteratur*, 2 vols. (Breslau, 1830–37), 2, pp. 239–58. The Latin and German songs were published by A. Schmeller, *Carmina Burana: lateinische und deutsche Lieder und Gedichte einer Handschrift des XIII. Jahrhunderts aus Benedictbeuern auf der k. Bibliothek zu München* (Stuttgart, 1847; 2nd ed. Breslau, 1883). 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 Wilhelm Meyer, *Fragmenta Burana* (Berlin, 1901). More recent studies and editions include Bernhard Bischof, *Carmina Burana. Faksimile-Ausgabe der Handschrift Clm 4660 und Clm 4660a* (Munich, 1967); Walther Lipphardt, “Zur Herkunft der Carmina Burana,” *Literatur und Bildende Kunst im Tiroler Mittelalter*, ed. Egon Kühlbacher (Innsbruck, 1982), pp. 209–23; Georg Steer, “Carmina Burana in Südtirol. Zur Herkunft des clm 4660,” *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 112 (1983): pp. 1–37; Günter Berndt, ed. *Die Lieder der Benediktbeuer Handschrift. Vollständige Ausgabe des Originaltexts nach der von Berhard Bischoff aubeschollenen kritischen Ausgabe von Alfons Hilka und Otto Schumann. Übersetzung der lateinischen Texte von Carl Fischer, der mittelhochdeutschen Texte von Hugo Kuhn*, 5th ed. (Munich 1991); and Thomas M. S. Hehtonen, *Fortuna, Money, and the Sublunar World: Twelfth-Century Ethical Poetics and the Satirical Poetry of the ‘Carmina Burana,’* (Helsinki, 1995).

contains ten “plays,” six of which have no known liturgical parallels (the four plays of St. Nicholas, the Resurrection of Lazarus, and the Conversion of St. Paul). Two of the remaining four are expanded versions of their liturgical cousins while the others are more closely allied with their non-liturgical brethren.¹⁶⁸ The so-called “Play of Herod,” for example, combines what is effectively an *Officium Pastorem* and an *Officium Stellae* into a single unit. Although not to quite the same degree, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* also offers a structure that is more broadly conceived than those of other liturgically grounded ceremonies. 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 *Visitatio Sepulchri* 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-St. Michel, and Barking Abbey.¹⁶⁹ Edith Wright observed a further connection with settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the church of St. John the Evangelist in Dublin as well.¹⁷⁰ While the Fleury *Visitatio Sepulchri* was likely based on an Anglo/Norman model, 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.¹⁷¹ De Boor observed further differences with regard to its presentation:

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 . . . von Station zu Station führte und erst für die Schlußkündigung wieder in die Welt entließ. 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.¹⁷²

[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

¹⁶⁸ Cite Young here . . .

¹⁶⁹ Susan K. Rankin, “The Mary Magdalene Scene in the ‘Visitatio Sepulchri’ Ceremonies, *Early Music History* 1 (1981): 227–55 (esp. the tables, pp. 250–51 and 252). [List MSS](#)

¹⁷⁰ Edith Wright, *The Dissemination of the Liturgical Drama in France* (Bryn Mawr, 1936), 152. This same connection was noted by Young three years earlier. Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1, pp. 393–97.

¹⁷¹ De Boor, *Die Textgeschichte*, p. 259–62.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 261.

into the realm of sacred events, . . . led from station to station and released back to the world only with the closing announcement. Here the women turn away no fewer than five times, and always to the congregation, not as an action within the choir.]

Klosterneuburg, Freising plays, etc.]

Possible Liturgical Context

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 (see Table 3). The best-known example of such an ambiguous placement is the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139. The so-called liturgical drama (or dramas) of Paris 1139 is (or are) copied between a series of *versae* and a group of *Benedicamus* tropes.¹⁷³ 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 *versae* whose liturgical intent has been more assumed than demonstrated. A liturgical miscellany from Einsiedeln comprises a collection of liturgical fragments containing hymns and sequences as well as group of folios containing a *Visitatio Sepulchri*, an incomplete *Officium Stellae*, and an *Officium Prophetarum*.¹⁷⁴ These three ceremonies, though, were copied together and are not found within a context that makes their liturgical intent apparent.¹⁷⁵ 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, following Easter Vespers and preceding the procession to Mass, a placement that is common to the rite when entered into graduals and rituals. Three additional texts are included at the conclusion of this section of the manuscript, following items for the feasts of St. Andrew and St. Nicholas: an *Ordo Prophetarum*, *Ordo Stellae*, and

¹⁷³ On the structure of the *versarium* in Paris 1139, see Sarah Fuller, “The Myth of ‘Saint Martial’ Polyphony: A Study of the Sources,” *Musica Disciplina* 33 (1979): pp. 5–26. An outline of the structure of the *versaria* portion of the manuscript is given in p. 8.

¹⁷⁴ Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 366 [olim 179], pp. 53–56.

¹⁷⁵ See note 126.

an incomplete *Ordo Joseph*.¹⁷⁶ 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. The famous *Danielis Ludus* of Beauvais is preserved in a manuscript that also contains the liturgy for the feast of the Circumcision, although the liturgical position for the *ludus*, if any, is not given.¹⁷⁷

In the end, what we have then are the same broad categories of texts that were recognized by the scholars who preceded Magnin and by those who followed: a sizeable group of representational rites since deemed to be drama and a noticeably smaller group of more overtly dramatic texts since deemed to be liturgical. Each grouping has had its adherents. The larger collection of liturgical texts has attracted those most interested in questions of origin, transmission, and liturgical function, while the smaller collection has tended to

¹⁷⁶ Laon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 263 (hereafter Laon 263). The *Visitatio Sepulchri* is given in fols. 145^r–46^r, the *Ordo Prophetarum* in fols. 147^r–49^r, the *Ordo Stellae* in fols. 149^r–51^r, and the *Ordo Joseph* in fols. 151^r–53^r. For the latter three “plays,” see Robert Langeux, “Glossing Christmas: Liturgy, Music, Exegesis, and Drama in High Medieval Laon” (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 2004). A structural outline of Laon 263 is given in pages 229–30 (drawn from the description given by Heinrich Hussman, *Tropen- und Sequenzenhandschriften*, RISM vol. BV1 (Munich, 1964), p. 104). On the *Ordo Prophetarum* in particular, see idem, “Sermons, Exegesis, and Performance: The Laon *Ordo Prophetarum* and the Meaning of Advent,” *Comparative Drama* 43 (2009): 197–220. The *Ordo Joseph* is treated also by Max Harris, *Sacred Folly*, pp. 125–27.

¹⁷⁷ London, British Library, MS Egerton 2615. The music for the feast of the Circumcision is given in folios 1^r–68^v while that for the *Danielis Ludus* is given in folios 95^r–108^r. 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 David Hiley, “Sources, MS, IV: Organum and Discant,” *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed., 23, pp. 871–72. This play has received much attention in recent years. See especially Fassler, “The Feast of Fools,” *passim* and Harris, *Sacred Folly*, pp. 113–25.

attract those whose focus was more on the drama. Few, however, have been concerned with their intersection.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁸ 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* (2nd ed., 2001). The discussion offered by John Stevens in the article “Medieval Drama,” for example, moves quickly from an introduction dealing with the liturgical rites of Easter to a broader discussion of the larger, and more dramatic texts, drawing largely from the earlier work of Karl Young with little reference to more recent scholarship (John Stevens, “Medieval Drama, 2: Liturgical Drama,” *New Grove Dictionary of Music*, 2nd ed., ???, ???). The discussion by John Emmerson in his article on “Plainchant,” on the other hand, incorporates recent critical work and maintains its focus on the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and other liturgical settings (John Emmerson, “Plainchant, 6: Expansion of the Repertory, [vii] Liturgical Drama, laments,” *New Grove Dictionary of Music*, 2nd ed., 19, pp. 841–42.

IV. WHAT'S IN A NAME?: LITURGY, DRAMA, AND LITURGICAL DRAMA

The origins of the notion and the complexion of its repertory notwithstanding, the expression “liturgical drama” is problematic on its face. Both the words “liturgy” (with its adjective “liturgical”) and “drama” (with its adjective “dramatic”), while ancient in origin, are neologisms as currently understood, both words entering into modern usage in the sixteenth century. Each has accrued meanings and associations that are both vast and nebulous, and each has come to carry meanings and associations for which no medieval equivalents exist.

Liturgy

The word “liturgy” (Latin: “liturgia”) derives from from the Greek “λειτουργία,” a composite word that referred in Hellenistic times to the public service expected of a citizen.¹⁷⁹ 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.¹⁸⁰ For the Eastern Church, the word “λειτουργία” 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, as, for example, the *Liber de Officiis Ecclesiasticis* of John of Avranches (before 1067),¹⁸¹ the *Liber de Divinis Officiis* of Rupert of Deutz (d. 1129),¹⁸² the *Summa de Ecclesiasticis Officiis* of John Belet (ca. 1160),¹⁸³ the *Mitræ, sive, De Officiis Ecclesiasticis Summa* of Sicard of Cremona (ca. 1180),¹⁸⁴ or the *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum* of William Durand (late-thirteenth

¹⁷⁹ Anscar J. Chupungco, *What, Then is Liturgy* (Collegeville MN, 2010), pp. 51–52.

¹⁸⁰ 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. Aimé Georges Martimort, “Definitions and Methods,” *The Church at Prayer: Principles of the Liturgy*, ed. A. G. Martimort (Collegeville MN, 1987), p. 9. Chupungco, *What, Then, Is Liturgy*, p. 52, though, saw the emphasis more on service than ritual.

¹⁸¹ René Delemare, *Le De officiis ecclesiasticis de Jean d’Avranches, archevêque de Rouen, 1067. Étude liturgiques et publication du text inédit du manuscrit H. 304 de la bibliothèque de la Faculté Montpellier* (Paris, 1928).

¹⁸² Hrabanus Haack, ed., *Ruperti Tuitiensis Liber de divinis officiis*, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medievalis 7 (Turnhout, 1967). See also John van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, Publications of the UCLA Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies 18 (Berkeley, 1983).

¹⁸³ Herbert Douteil, ed., *Iohannis Belet Summa de Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 41–41a (Turnhout, 1976).

¹⁸⁴ Gabor Sarbak and Lorenz Weinrich, ed., *Sicard of Cremona Mitræ de Officiis* 6.15, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 228 (Turnhout, 2008).

century).¹⁸⁵ For these authors, such *officii* extended beyond the Mass itself. They encompassed also the Divine Office along with processions and sacraments, and, in the case of Beleth, Sicard, and Durand, a number of popular devotions from the Christmas and Easter seasons as well.¹⁸⁶

By the early-sixteenth century, the Latin form of the word, “liturgia,” had entered the vocabulary of the west, and among Roman Catholic writers at least, it retained the sense of the Greek “λειτουργία” in referring to the Mass, 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 adiecta co[n]cione*.¹⁸⁷ 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

¹⁸⁵ Anselme Davril and Timothy M. Thibodeau, *Guillemi Duranti Rationale divinorum officiorum*, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 140, 140a, and 140b (Turnhout, 1995–2000). New English translations of the prologue and books one through three are also available: Timothy M. Thibodeau, *The Rationale divinorum officiorum of William Durand of Mende: A New Translation of the Prologue and Book One* (New York, 2007) and Timothy M. Thibodeau, *On the Clergy and Their Vestments: A New Translation of Books 2–3 of the Rationale divinorum officiorum* (Scranton PA, 2009).

¹⁸⁶ All three commentators include descriptions of such practices as the Feast of Fools, the game of pila after Easter, and the practice known in German as *Schmackostern* or *Stiepern*, where women flogged their husbands with a switch on the day after Easter and the husbands returned the favor two days later. Magnin discussed this latter practice in the seventh lecture of the second semester (“Magnin Cours” 4/91, p. 515 [NYPL, Magnin Papers, fol. 257^r]). On *Schmackostern*, see also Wilhelm Mannhardt, *Die Baumkultus der Germanen und ihrer Nachbarstämme. Mythologische Untersuchungen*, 2 vols (Berlin, 1875), 1, p. 261. On the game of pila and other popular practices during the Christmas and Easter seasons, see Craig Wright, *The Maze and the Warrior: Symbols in Architecture, Theology, and Music* (Cambridge MA, 2001), pp. 129–58, Constant J. Mews, “Liturgists and Dance in the Twelfth Century: The Witness of John Beleth and Sicard of Cremona, *Church History* 78 (2009): pp. 512–48. A more comprehensive view of the ceremonies associated with Christmastide and Epiphany is given by Harris, *Sacred Folly*.

¹⁸⁷ Desiderius Erasmus, *Virginis Matris apud Laurentum cultae Liturgia adiecta co[n]cione* (Basel, 1523)

this and the Mass of other eastern rites in his discussion.¹⁸⁸ Later Catholic writers 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.¹⁸⁹

Among Protestants, on the other hand, the word “liturgia” and its vernacular equivalents had a more wide-ranging compass that was more akin to the *officii* of the medieval commentators than to the *liturgiae* of Catholic Renaissance writers. This new 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*.¹⁹⁰ 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.¹⁹¹ These books included a number of rites beyond the celebration of the Eucharist, including rites for baptism, the election of ministers, marriage, excommunication, as well as midday and evening prayer. By the end of the sixteenth-century, the word “liturgy” became established

¹⁸⁸ Georg Witzel, *Typus Ecclesiae Prioris: Anzeigung wie die heilige Kirche Gottes invendig siben und mehr hundert yaren nach unsers Herrn Auffart gestalt gewesen sey* (Mainz, 1541). 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 Kyrchen vor tausent jaren gewesen. Aus S. Joan. Chrysostomo verdeuscht*. For Witzel, “Liturgy” clearly refers to the Mass. On fol. 25r, for example, he notes: “Aus S. Cypriani schrifftten ist offenbar das dise 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.)

¹⁸⁹ Among these were Jacques de Joigny [Pamelius], *Liturgica Latinorum* (Cologne, 1571), Georg Cassander, *Liturgica de ritu et ordine dominicae coenae quam Graeci liturgiam, Latini missam appellarunt* (Antwerp, 1588), and Jean Étienne Duranti, *De Ritibus Ecclesiae Catholicae* (Rome, 1591). Duranti reserved his use of the word “liturgia” to settings of the Mass from early Christian and from eastern rites. This focus on the Mass continued into the following century as well, as, for example Giovanni Cardinal Bona, *Rerum liturgicarum libri duo* (Rome, 1671) and Jean Mabillon, *De liturgia Gallicana* (Paris, 1685).

¹⁹⁰ Valérand Pullain, *Liturgia sacra, seu ritus ministerii in ecclesia peregrinorum profugorum propter Euangelium Christi Argentinae* (London, 1551). See also Valérand Poullain, *Valerandus Pollanus Liturgia Sacra (1551–1555). Opnieuw Uitgegeven en van een Inleiding Voorzien*, ed. A. C. Honders (Leiden, 1970), which provides an introductory essay (in Dutch) and an transcription and translation (into French) of both the 1551 and 1554 editions. On the 1554 edition see n. 191 below. An overview of the circumstances surrounding these publications is provided by Stanley Morrison, *English Prayer Books: An Introduction to the Literature of Christian Public Worship* (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 81–82.

¹⁹¹ *Liturgia sacra: sive ritus ministerii in Ecclesia Peregrinorum Francofordia ad Moenum* (Frankfurt am Main, 1554).

in English common usage as well. A notice in *The London Advisor and Guide*, published by the Rev. John Trusler in 1586 and intended as a guide for both those living in London and those visiting, noted with regard to public worship:

All persons, having no lawful or reasonable excuse for being absent, shall resort to their parish church or chapel, or, upon reasonable let thereof, to some usual place where divine service shall be performed, according to the liturgy and practice of the church of England, upon every Sunday and holiday, on pain of punishment by the censures of the church, or of forfeiting 1s for every office to the poor, to be levied by the churchwardens by distress.¹⁹²

For the Rev. Trusler, “liturgy” was a word that was commonly understood and required no elaboration, and it encompassed the use of the Church of England as a whole, distinguishing between what was specified (liturgy) and what was done (practice).¹⁹³

Definitions for the word “liturgy” (in whatever form) before the twentieth century are rare, and for the most part, depend on the religious tradition from which its authors were 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 more 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:

¹⁹² The Rev. John Trusler, *The London Advisor and Guide: Containing Every Instruction and Information useful and necessary to Persons Living in London, and Coming to Reside There; In order to enable them to enjoy Security and Tranquillity, and conduct their Domestic Affairs with Prudence and Economy. Together with an Abstract of all those Laws, which regard their Protection against the Frauds, Impositions, Insults and Accidents to which they are there liable* (London, 1586), p. 127.

¹⁹³ Following the return of Charles II to the English throne, the 1662 edition of the *Book of Common Prayer* incorporated the the word “liturgy” into the language of Anglican worship itself. Its Preface opened 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. *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* (London, 1662), np.

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.¹⁹⁴

The article on "Liturgy" in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* of 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."¹⁹⁵

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 approaches to the word:

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.¹⁹⁶

[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.]

In recent years, Catholic approaches to the word, while expanding to include the rites of the Church as a whole,¹⁹⁷ have tended toward more theological concerns, an approach

¹⁹⁴ John Selden, "Liturgy," *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*, Richard Milward, ed. (London, 1689), p. 76.

¹⁹⁵ "Liturgy," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 3rd ed., 18 vols. (Edinburgh, 1788–97), 10/1, p. 103.

¹⁹⁶ Jean François de la Croix, "Liturgie," *Dictionnaire Historique des Cultes Religieux, établis dans le Monde depuis son Origine jusqu'à Présent*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1770), 2, p. 654.

¹⁹⁷ This shift among Catholic scholars is relatively recent. Martimort, "Definitions and Methods," pp. 7–8, notes that the word "liturgia": "... hardly 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.

encouraged by the encyclical *Mediator Dei* of Pope Pius XII (20 November 1947).¹⁹⁸ Most recent Protestant writers, on the other hand, have maintained the sense that governed earlier discussions, taking a decidedly more concrete approach to their understanding of the word.¹⁹⁹

Authors looking at liturgy from other perspectives — authors not charged with liturgy's day-to-day observance — can see this 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:

¹⁹⁸ Encyclical *Mediator Dei*, no. 22, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (Vatican City, 1947), p. 529. Martimort, “Definitions and Methods,” p. 10, notes that in the words of the encyclical, the sacred liturgy is not “merely the outward or visible part of divine worship or as an ornamental ceremonial,” nor is it “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.” Anscar J. Chupungco, in the “Introduction” to his *Handbook for Liturgical Studies: Fundamental Liturgy* (Collegeville MN, 1988), vii, 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.

¹⁹⁹ 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. It distinguishes this from the personal prayers of the individual christians who make up the church, and even from the common prayer of selected or voluntary groups within the church, e.g. Guilds or societies. 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. (Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, New Edition [New York, 2005], p. 1.)

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.²⁰⁰

Drawing from the work of anthropologists, that of Victor Turner in particular,²⁰¹ 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 just given. 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. While these acts were not preserved in any ordo, they were a part of the ritual observance for the feast nonetheless, and thus, one could argue, of a kind with the popular devotions that were included in the medieval commentaries of Belet, Sicard, and Durand discussed above.²⁰²

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 in 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

²⁰⁰ Richard Crocker, *An Introduction to Gregorian Chant* (New Haven, 2000), p. 13.

²⁰¹ See especially Victor Turner, *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play* (New York, 1982).

²⁰² C. Clifford Flanigan, Kathleen Ashley, and Pamela Sheingorn, “Liturgy as Social Performance,” *The Liturgy of the Medieval Church*, 2nd ed., Thomas J. Heffernan and E. An Matter, ed. (Kalamazoo, 2005), pp. 635–52.

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."²⁰³

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'."²⁰⁴ 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 has noted, "dramatic" was for medieval commentators but one of three modes of narrative.²⁰⁵ 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 [sc. in his own person] 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*.²⁰⁶

Clopper went on to observe that "[w]hen we see the word 'drama' in a medieval text, therefore, 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.²⁰⁷ In her study of *The Idea of Theater*, Donnalee Dox demonstrated similarly that the word "theatrum" was used by medieval commentators not to denote theatrical activity in their own day, but rather to recall the performative traditions of

²⁰³ Mark Searle, *Liturgy Made Simple* (Collegeville MN, 1981), p. 12. This sense appears to be generally held among contemporary Catholic liturgists. Joseph Jungmann, for one, noted in a similar vein that "No complete agreement has been reached about the definition of the liturgy." Joseph Jungmann, "The Liturgies," *Encyclopedia of Theology: A Concise Sacramentum mundi*, Karl Rahner, ed. (Freiburg-im-Brigau, 1975), p. 851.

²⁰⁴ Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, p. 3.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.* The quote is taken from Alastair Minnis and A. B. Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism c. 1100–1375* (Oxford, 1988), p. 344.

²⁰⁷ Copper, *Ibid.*, p. 9.

antiquity.²⁰⁸ Representing the space where drama took place, 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.²⁰⁹ 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.²¹⁰

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, largely in response to the rediscovery of Aristotle’s *Poetics* by Renaissance Humanists.²¹¹ 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 (or in imitation of those 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*.²¹² Over the next several decades, a number of Lutheran schoolmasters included such phrases as *drama novum*, *drama comicotragicum* or *drama tragicum* as a part of the titles or subtitles for plays written for student performance. Among these titles were Johannes Baptista Hebenstreit’s *Daniel Scholico-Theoneico-Crites: Drama novum* (1534),²¹³ Sixt Birck, *Iudith, drama comicotragicum* (1539),²¹⁴ and the several titles of Hieronymus Ziegler, including *Protoplastus: Drama comicotragicum* (1543), *Cyrus maior, drama tragicum* (1547), and

²⁰⁸ Dox, *The Idea of Theater*. See also Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, pp. 25–62.

²⁰⁹ Dox, 86.

²¹⁰ Clopper, *Drama, Play, and Game*, 12–19.

²¹¹ On the reception of the *Poetics* in the Renaissance, see Marvin A. Carlson, *Theories of the Theatre: A Historical and Critical Survey from the Greeks to the Present* (Ithaca NY, 1984), pp. 37–89. See also E. N. Tigerstedt, “Observations on the Reception of Aristotle’s *Poetics* in the Latin West,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 15 (1968): pp. 7–24 and Stephen Halliwell, *Aristotle’s Poetics* (Chicago, 1968), especially the chapter on “Influence and Status: the Nachleben of the *Poetics*,” pp. 286–323.

²¹² Locher’s play survives in a single manuscript copy: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 11347, fols. 66^r–75^v. See Cora Deitle, *Die Dramen Jacob Locher und Humanistenbühne in süddeutschen Raum* (Berlin, 2005), pp. 319–38 and 515–30. I would like to thank Prof. Glenn Ehrstine for bringing this work to my attention.

²¹³ Johannes Baptista Heibenstreit, *Daniel Scholico-Theoneico-Crites: Drama novum, de regio Monarchae Babylonia collegio* (Ulm, 1534).

²¹⁴ Sixt Birck, *Iudith, drama comicotragicum; exemplum reipublice recte institutae; unde discitur, quomodo arma contra Turcam sint capienda* (Augsburg, 1539).

Ophiletis: Drama comicotragicum (1549).²¹⁵ A collection of plays published by Johannes Operin in 1547 and including works by both Birck and Ziegler, moreover, appeared under the title *Dramata sacra*.²¹⁶ 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 1688–89, for example, 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. In 1699, an anonymous pamphlet entitled *The Stage acquitted : being a full answer to Mr. Collier and the other enemies of the drama . . .* (1699)²¹⁷ took issue with the arguments advanced the year before in another anonymous pamphlet entitled *The Stage Condemn'd . . .* (1698)²¹⁸ By the eighteenth century, the words “drama” and “theater” were used interchangeably to designate drama writ large, as, for example, the *Histoire du théâtre*

²¹⁵ Hieronymus Ziegler: *Protoplastus: Drama comicotragicum in Memoriam humanae conditionis, et vitae nostrae miserrimae* (Augsburg, 1543); Cyrus mair, *drama tragicum* (Augsburg, 1547); *Ophiletis: Drama comicotragicum argumento ex D. matthaei Evangelio sumpto* (Ingolstadt, 1549); and *Christi vinia: Drama sacrum, ex Mathaei cap XX argumento sumpto* (1551)

²¹⁶ Johannes Operin, *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, iuventuti Christianae proponi utilius possit : magna parte nunc primum in lucem editae: Earum vero catalogum statim a praefatione invenies* (Basel, 1547).

²¹⁷ *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, 1699).

²¹⁸ *The Stage Condemn'd, and The Encouragement given to the Immoralities and Profaneness of the Theatre, by the English Schools, Universitys 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, 1698). These anonymous pamphlets continued a debate that had been ongoing at least since William Prynne's *Histrio-mastix : the players scourge, or, actors tragdie, divided into two parts . . .*, 2 vols. (London, 1632). The argument was rekindled by Jeremy Collier in *A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage* (London, 1698) which was then answered by William Congreve in *Amendments to Mr. Collier's False and Imperfect Citations* (London, 1698) in defense of his own plays.

françois of Claude and François Parfaict (1739), the *Recherches sur les théâtre de France* of Pierre-François Godard de Beauchamps (1740) and a generation later, the *Origin of English Drama* of Thomas Hawkins (1775), all of which were largely collections of scripts.²¹⁹

Difficulties in dealing with the word “drama” continue to ensue from the various and overlapping senses that the word can convey: a script, a play (which may or may not have a script), a style, a genre, a species of poetry, etc. Also problematic are the overlapping senses and the often-interchangeable uses of the words “drama,” “play” (or “Spiel” or “jeu” or “ludus”) and “theater.” The words “drama” and “play,” for example, are often used synonymously when referring to individual works. Both can refer to a script or text — as in “reading a play or drama” — and both can refer to an enacted event — as in “seeing or attending a play or drama.” “Drama” also has a more broad sense not shared by the word “play.” A play is an individual event, whereas “drama,” and in particular “the drama,” can refer to a constellation of events, including those we might call “plays” and those 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 reunions,” and let us not forget, “drama queen.” The word “play,” on the other hand, 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 used to describe 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

²¹⁹ Claude and François Parfaict, *Histoire du théâtre françois* (1739), Pierre-François Bodard de Bauchamps, *Recherches sur les théâtre de France* (1740) — for these two titles see n. 25 above, and a generation later, Thomas Hawkins, *Origin of English Drama*, 2 vols. (London, 1775).

which action takes place, such as a theater of plants and of insects, a theater of passions, the theater of God's judgment, or a theater of war.²²⁰

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 vexing. 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 to be *ludi*, and there are a number of

²²⁰ The word "theater" is used in this metaphorical sense in a number of publications during the seventeenth century, including John Parkinson's *The theater of plants* (London, 1640) and *The theater of insects* (London, 1658), Thomas Beard's *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, 1631), and David Jones' *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, 1698). In the English version of Nicolas Talon's *The Holy History*, translated from the French by the Marquess of Winchester (London, 1653), the author speaks of the various "theaters of passions" in his discussion of the creation of Adam (p. 14):

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?

others, similarly configured and without an overtly liturgical connection, that might well have been considered to be *ludi* as well.²²¹ For these, the label “drama” might be appropriate, even if such a notion were unknown at the time such *ludi* were written down. 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 scholars, 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. They looked like drama, with what appeared to be characters enacting scenes using dialogue, therefore they became drama.

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 *officii* 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.” Indeed, the word “liturgical” merely inverts the problem presented by the word “drama” above. The majority of texts now called “liturgical drama” were clearly liturgical, although not drama by terms known to the Middle Ages. Those that appear most clearly drama, on the other hand, have no clear liturgical connections. They are neither preserved within service books nor do they offer evidence that they were routinely celebrated.

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

²²¹ The texts of the so-called Fleury Playbook offer the most notable instances of such potential *ludi*. In his essay “The Fleury Playbook” (see n. 14 above), for example, C. Clifford Flanigan noted that “. . . the Playbook is in no sense a liturgical book, and that whatever liturgical context might have been provided for the performance of these plays came from other books with which it has no necessary connection, and further that it has “. . . no intrinsic relationship to other books in use in a specific liturgical community.” (pp. 352–53) What truly sets this collection apart from others that might be considered to be similar, in Flanigan’s view, was that:

“Every text in the collection [of the Fleury Playbook] is capable of being enacted. And since these texts cannot all be regarded as rituals or school exercises or dialogues whose chief interest is their literary virtuosity, there is only one category which generically encompasses them in all of their diversity: drama, or a form of mimetic activity carried out for the sake of affecting an audience by means of physical enactment.” (p. 361)

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. In his long overlooked 1916 dissertation, for example, 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.²²²

The word “drama” need not be taken in its literal sense either. As originally formulated by Charles Magnin and later punctuated by Felix 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. To be fair, this problem 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 as divisible into two groups, one clearly liturgical and the other not. A century and a half later, the expression “liturgical drama” continues to embrace a variety of texts whose relationships 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 otherwise is anachronistic at best. The others are likely plays or games or sermons 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

²²² Paul Edward Kretzman, *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, 1916), p. 10. More recently, Renate Amstutz has reinforced Kretzmann’s point, reconstituting the liturgical structures that served as scaffold for the the fourteenth-century Thuringian *Zehnjungfrauenspiel*. Renate Amstutz, *Ludus de Decem Virginibus: Recovery of the Sung Liturgical Cycle of the Thuringian Zehnjungfrauenspiel* (Toronto, 2002).

moment. But they are not really liturgical in the same sense as those liturgical rites now called liturgical drama, the *Visitatio Sepulchri* in particular.

V. ALL THAT GLITTERS: REIMAGINING MEDIEVAL 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 alternate theory for drama's medieval roots,²²³ belief in the notion of "liturgical drama" has remained steadfast. 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.²²⁴ Surveys of medieval music generally include a similar treatment as a part of their discussion of tropes, sequences, and other so-called accretions to the medieval liturgy.²²⁵ The notion that drama grew out of the liturgy, or out of ritual more generally, has been treated phenomenologically as well, particularly in the works of

²²³ See the studies of Cargill, Stumpfl, and Hunningher cited above (see n. 3, 4, and 5) as well as those of Rozik and Goldstein (see n. 21). See also Jody Enders, *Rhetoric and the Origins of Medieval Drama* (Ithaca NY, 1992) for a decidedly different take on the origin of medieval drama.

²²⁴ In the collection of documents that constitutes *The Medieval European Stage: 500–1500*, edited by William Tydeman, for example, 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 drama of the British Isles, of France, German-speaking Europe, Italy, the low countries, the Iberian peninsula, and concluding with a discussion of local customs and folk drama. William Tydeman, ed., *The Medieval European Stage: 500–1500* (Cambridge, 2002). While varying in its details, the plan of this book follows in the main the plan of Magnin's lectures from 1834–35. On the book's reliance on the older notions of Edmond Chambers and Karl Young, see Clopper's review referenced above (n. 22). This plan is ubiquitous in the literature of medieval literature, so much so that to provide even a representative listing would require a study of its own.

²²⁵ See, for example, the treatments by Jeremy Yudkin, *Music in Medieval Europe* (Saddle River NY, 1989), pp. 243–48, John A. Emmerson, "Plainchant, 6: Expansion of the Repertory, (vii) Liturgical drama, laments," *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed., 29 vols., ed. Stanley Boorman, et al. (Oxford, 2001), 19, pp. 841–42, and Richard Taruskin, *Music from the Earliest Notations to the Sixteenth Century. The Oxford History of Western Music 1* (Oxford, 2009), pp. 93–94. See also the more extended treatment by David Hiley, *Western Plainchant: A Handbook* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 250–73.

anthropologists such as Victor Turner and performance theorists such as Richard Schechner and Erika Fischer-Lichte.²²⁶

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 performance (and in some cases the entire medieval liturgy) as drama, thus reframing the arch of medieval drama's rise to accord with what was understood to be that of drama's creation in ancient times. This metaphor held for a quarter century, and then, as is often the way with such things, it evaporated, leaving in its

²²⁶ Turner and Schechner have been particularly influential. The studies most often cited are Turner, *From Ritual to Theatre* (see n. 201) and Richard Schechner, *Between Theater and Anthropology* (Philadelphia, 1985). On medieval religious drama in particular, see Erika Fischer-Lichte, "The medieval religious plays — ritual or theater?," *Visualizing Medieval Performance: Perspectives, Histories, Contexts* (Hampshire, 2008), pp. 249–61. Again, this notion of drama's passage from ritual to theater is generally held, and the bibliography is quite large. An assessment of Turner's impact on research in literature and theater in particular is contained Kathleen M. Ashley, ed., *Victor Turner and the Construction of Cultural Criticism: Between Literature and Anthropology* (Bloomington IN, 1990).

place the residue of category that we know today.²²⁷ The transformation from liturgy (or ritual) to drama was thus not so much an historical transformation as it was a rhetorical one — 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 fossilized shell of category.

But were we to remove the notion of “liturgical drama” from our consideration of medieval music and drama, what might be left? Does the study of medieval drama, as Carol Symes appears to suggest, 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. To adhere to a view that projects the notion “drama” onto those past events that bear traces of what we now consider drama to be is to view drama as a universal whose existence is independent of our ability to perceive

²²⁷ 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 Max Black, “Metaphor,” *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 19 (1954): pp. 273–94 (reprinted in Max Black, *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* [Ithaca NY, 1962], pp. 25–47) and Colin Turbayne, *The Myth of Metaphor* (Ithaca NY, 1963). The recent upsurge in interest in what is called conceptual metaphor was sparked by the publication of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson’s small, but influential book, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago, 1980 — 2nd ed. 2003). They collaborated again in *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenges to Western Thought* (New York, 1999). Each has produced individual studies as well, including George Lakoff, *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things* (Chicago, 1990) and Mark Johnson, *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reasoning* (Chicago, 1990). For a more recent take, see also Zoltán Kövecses, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (Oxford, 2002 — 2nd ed. 2010). Many of the more important studies on the philosophical, linguistic, and psychological aspects of metaphor (at least up to about 1980) are reproduced in Sheldon Sacks, ed., *On Metaphor* (Chicago, 1978), Andrew Ortony, ed., *Metaphor and Thought* (Cambridge, 1979 — 2nd ed. 1993), and Mark Johnson, ed., *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor* (Minneapolis, 1981). 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 Max Black, “More About Metaphor,” *Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 19–43, esp. pp. 25–26 and Colin Turbayne, *Myth of Metaphor*, 21–27 (what he calls “being used by metaphor”). This is also treated in Gregory W. Daws, *The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Interpretation of Ephesians 5: 21–33* (Leiden, 1998), pp. 73–78.

it.²²⁸ Such a view gives primacy to our contemporary vision of what kinds of things there are in the world, both real and abstract, and this primacy allows us to see aspects of past activities that reflect concerns more of our own making than those prevailing when such activities were current. While any attempt to project “drama” onto the liturgy of the medieval western Church is surely anachronistic, this projection will ultimately fail when 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 these rites 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.

If this thing we call “liturgical drama” is a modern construct, and if no such notion existed during what Magnin called that “. . . long interval of decay and social reconstruction which [we] must call, like everyone else, the Middle Ages,”²²⁹ then what indeed is left? If it is inappropriate to apply the name “liturgical drama” to the rites and texts that we have long known by that name, then by what names might we know them? This question, at least, is relatively easy to address. To the extent that we can identify meaningful labels, we can address these rites, plays, and other things according to the terms provided in the manuscripts and books that preserve them (or some approximation of these): e. g., *Visitatio Sepulchri* (for the liturgical celebration of the Marys’ visit to the empty tomb of Christ), *Officium Stellae* (for the liturgical celebration of the visit of the Magi), or *Danielis Ludus* (the title given in the manuscript for the Play of Daniel). Each can be identified as a liturgical rite of a particular sort, or as a play (if, indeed, that is what it was), or as something whose type is as yet unclear or unknown (such as the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139).

The more significant question, however, is what happens now to the liturgy/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 in between, thereby validating the concern expressed

²²⁸ In an altogether rare, and even bold, acknowledgment of this point, Eli Rozik argues with regard to ritual drama that “. . . [a]ll 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*, p. 104).

²²⁹ See n. 42.

by Hardison in a different context by having “ . . . attributed present concepts and attributes to a culture of the past.”²³⁰ The notion of liturgy and drama as opposing forces that could balance the individual exemplars 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 the minds of 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 consolidators of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, I can also sympathize with the disappointment that likely followed the efforts of Hardison, of Drumbly, and of Flanigan, as their challenges to the orthodox view fell on deaf ears. But if the merger of “liturgical” and “drama” 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, it has served also as a set of blinders that has inhibited our ability to see what was really there. In the end, it may not be practical to be rid of the label “liturgical drama,” nor politic to abandon the concept. We can, however, redirect our focus to a level of abstraction that renders the issue moot. By concentrating 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 appraise, we can place ourselves in a stronger position to understand 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.

²³⁰ While he is speaking here of the evolutionary approaches of Chambers and Young, Hardison’s remarks retain their force here as well:

They have attributed present concepts and attitudes to the culture of the past. They have assumed that medieval man thought like nineteenth-century man, or out to have done so. The result has been serious distortion. History has become teleological, interpreted both intentionally and unconsciously in terms of what texts anticipate rather than what they are. The texts themselves have been read as though they were intended for production under conditions vaguely foreshadowing Covent Garden and for audiences vaguely like the rowdies in the Victorian gallery. (Hardison, *Christian Rite and Christian Drama*, p. 33).